WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!

the new International

CONTENTS

January 1935

15¢

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

(With which is merged *Labor Action*)

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

OFFICIAL THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Published once a month by the New International Publishing Company, 2 West 15th Street, New York, N. Y. Subscription rates: $1.50 per year; $1.00 per seven months. Canada and Abroad: $1.75 per year. Application for entry as second class matter is pending.

VOLUME II
NUMBER 1
JANUARY 1935

Editors:
MAX SHACHTMAN
JOHN WEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE READERS HAVE THE FLOOR

WITH this issue of our review, we start the second volume of publication. This gives our readers, both friends and skeptics, six issues as a basis for examination, appreciation and criticism.

We address ourselves first of all to those of a critical turn of mind. What are their opinions about our review? It was launched, as its motto says, as a theoretical organ of revolutionary Marxism. Our aim has been to present to the serious workers and students in the working class movement the Marxian point of view on the important problems and events of our day. Unlike the European movement, the American has suffered from a gross neglect of the scientific socialist theory expounded by Marx and Engels and rescued from oblivion and distortion by Lenin. If the weakness of the revolutionary movement in the United States was the cause of this airy attitude to revolutionary theory, the latter in turn helped to perpetuate this weakness. Recent developments, however, have given strong indications that far from remaining at the bottom rung of the revolutionary ladder, the movement in this country is gaining in position, in importance, in vigor, in solidity. There is undoubtedly a greater interest in Marxism in the U. S. today than at almost any preceding period in its history. We have passed beyond the stage of being satisfied with those periodicals that in the past laid a claim to Marxism which could at best be considered dubious. The growing maturity of the movement, the ferment and shifts which mark the end of the old political frontiers, and the abrupt, sometimes bewildering changes which throw to the surface new problems or old ones in new guises, more than ever require an alert and confident guide. That guide, said Engels, is the theory of Marxism. Our review wants to incarnate that guide in its pages.

Have we succeeded fully in attaining this aim? Are we well on the road and moving in the right direction? The editors cannot say that they are entirely content. A good beginning has been made, they feel, and it is indicated by the growing circle of readers. And the latter—are they entirely content? We do not suppose so. That is why we invite specific criticisms and suggestions.

What themes are being dealt with or stressed too much? What is insufficiently covered or even neglected entirely? Are we devoting too much attention or space to international events and too little to events in this country, or the other way around? Are the articles too long or too short, should there be more or fewer in each issue? Our book review section—what books should be reviewed, should more space be allotted to this department or less? What is the reader's opinion of our *Archives*? And of our new department—*The Press?*

We address ourselves also, however, to those who, be they critical or otherwise, are concerned with the security of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. We say confidently that there is no other labor organization in the world, even if it is ten times as large as ours, that is publishing a periodical of the size and contents of our review at so low a selling price. (For example, the similarly priced leading British radical monthly has, in its 64 pages, *only half* the reading matter contained in our 32 pages!) Of all the economies that can conceivably be made, the one we are coldest towards is a reduction in the size or number of pages of the review. Still another way of making ends meet is to raise the selling price, which would be obviously unsatisfactory—at least to our readers! We have hitherto made the most strenuous financial efforts to keep going at the present price and with the present size. We are now compelled to make a direct appeal to our readers to join with our efforts. The review can be stabilized, and we can devote ourselves more completely to improving its contents, if our readers will pledge themselves to generous assistance.

There are three ways you can help: 1. Get subscriptions from your friends, for a solid subscription list is the soundest foundation for our review. 2. Send an outright contribution, and send it immediately. 3. Join our monthly pledge fund list for the coming year. We need a circle of friends who are in a position to donate every month for the coming year a regular sum of money ranging from one dollar upward towards assuring continuous publication. Will you help?

Our readers have the floor!

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOL. II JANUARY 1935 NO. 1

Roosevelt and the New Congress

THERE IS A peculiar character to the contradictions of the Roosevelt administration that deserves more careful study than has yet been given. I do not refer to the central contradictions of a declining capitalism, present to a more or less acute extent everywhere. What interests me here, rather, are the distinctive features of the form these central contradictions are taking within the United States. It is easy enough, and indeed true enough, to say that "the Roosevelt program is in essence the program of monopoly capitalism". Nevertheless, this is not particularly illuminating. The description applies equally well to the programs of most governments—including Fascist governments—in the late stages of capitalism. We must ask why the Roosevelt program takes the special forms we have seen and will see.

The Roosevelt contradictions come to light along a number of approaches. For example, the administration has been frequently attacked from the extreme Right — especially during the first year and a half—as "socialistic" or even "communistic". These attacks cannot be merely dismissed as verbal smoke-screens laid down to fool the masses. They have been seriously made by reasonably intelligent critics. And there can be no doubt of the very real opposition to Roosevelt on the part of many leading bankers and industrialists. There must be, in the Roosevelt program, some basis for these attacks, however confused they may essentially be. Marxism cannot be content to answer political questions by a scornful shrug of doctrinary shoulders.

Parallel to these attacks have come others equally violent from certain quarters of the Left, calling Roosevelt a "Fascist". Here, also, dismissal is not enough. In the Roosevelt program we must find the double foundation for these contradictory charges.

The personnel of the administration is a second striking expression of the contradictions. Roosevelt has drawn into the staff of the New Deal men whose political background varies to an extent that makes it extraordinary that they should form parts of a single organized administration. It is of course true that no Marxist is among them—naturally the real Left cannot be represented. However, the gap that separates the Tugwells or Wallaces from the arch-reactionary Johnsons or Ropers or Clay Williamses is wide and genuine. Moreover, none of these men is mere window-dressing. Each, and each type, has an active rôle to play.

The most open contradictions of all are to be found in the unprecedented contrast between the surface and the substance of the Roosevelt program. This contrast is always present in class society, but at no other time has it been so striking. The contrast is not merely between the promises and their fulfillment (this is to be always expected) but throughout, between intentions and results, between statutes and the enforcement of statutes, activities and the results of activities. The New Deal becomes an aggravated form of the Old Deal. Labor's "charter of freedom" becomes the major strike-breaker. Plans to help the forgotten man oppress him further. Help for the "little man" in business strengthens monopoly. Codes to protect the consumer leave him more naked than before. Curbing the bankers finally completes the subordination of small banks to the financial center. A design for peace and cessation of imperialist aggression builds up the greatest military machine and the most intensive imperialist exploitation.

None of these matters is new to capitalism; all of them are found frequently enough at other times and in other places. It is the exaggerated character of the obvious contrasts that is peculiar to the Roosevelt administration.

The underlying explanation may be found in a double paradox. First: the Roosevelt administration, upon coming to power, was confronted simultaneously with the seemingly contradictory tasks of social democracy and the preparation for Fascism; or putting forward a social democratic program and actually laying the groundwork for a transition to Fascism. To put this in another way: psychologically and to some extent politically, the task of the administration was social democratic; whereas economically the preparation for Fascism was demanded. Or in still a third way: the United States, considered abstractly, from a merely "internal" point of view, was over-ready for social democratic developments; but considered actually, as an integrated part of the world system, it had to make the turn toward Fascism.

The second paradox is bound up with the first. In the case of neither of these tendencies—the social democratic and the Fascist—did the administration have the distinctive and appropriate social base; Roosevelt was neither a working class supported social democratic president, nor a middle class supported pre-Fascist. It is this that has made possible the reconciliation of the two terms of the first paradox. If the class lines of Roosevelt's mass base were more clearly drawn, he could not have bridged the contradictions in his policies. He would have been much more definitely one thing or the other. But this is merely to say that the United States would have been another country at another time.

These two paradoxes require further elucidation to be meaningful.

There is, of course, no "normal" development of capitalism, except in broadest outline. The idea of a normal development is an abstraction, useful for analysis, but in the specific case of any given capitalist nation modified in a thousand ways by the peculiarities of local conditions. From this abstract point of view, the United States has diverged from the normal in not having had a large and strong labor movement, nor a social democratic movement of any importance during the years when these grew in Europe. The major reasons for this have been fairly adequately covered: the "fresh start" possible in the New World, which had no feudal aristocracy to shake off; the vast store of raw materials; the enormous internal frontier; the hegemony over much of two continents; etc. The war brought in an additional factor preserving the "abnormality" of the career of United States capitalism. Through the war the world market almost automatically opened up to United States industry on an unprecedented scale. Together with the financial manœuvres involved—both in foreign loans and the internal installment system of buying—this laid the basis of the post-war "prosperity" on a relatively primitive competitive scheme, without the social democratic checks of a growingly sated capitalist economy.

But the war and post-war developments, while giving the last grandiose spurt to the "unique" career of United States capitalism, likewise eliminated the uniqueness, and destroyed forever the myth that the United States was a special case. The war plunged the United States headlong into the world maelstrom, not merely in that United States citizens died on the European battlefields, but much more fundamentally in that the United States economic and financial structures became irrevocably entangled with the world structure. What meaning could isolation have with a financial set-up leaning on something like twenty billions of foreign loans, and with the great United States corporations intertwined with enterprises in every country of the world? Thus the fate of United States capitalism became not merely ultimately but immediately bound up with the fate of world capitalism. At the same time, such internal factors as the chaotic over-expansion of capital equipment, the growing disproportion of income and ownership, the leaky banking system, the fantastic capital debt arrangements, were exaggerating the country's economic instability.

Then the crisis began gradually to open United States eyes, a generation or so behind time. The masses began to realize more clearly that all was not well, that the chances of good wages and a rise in the world were not favorable enough to be worth taking.

They began to wish for protection against predatory capital. Reform was necessary: reform of the bankers who had brought them to ruin, of advertizers who misled them, of governmental bodies that cheated them, of monopolies that exploited them. Control was necessary: of natural resources, of wasteful competition, of the monetary system, of agriculture. Security was necessary: from old-age, accident, above all from unemployment. Organization was necessary: of benevolent trade unions that could be successful in bargaining collectively with employers. Taxes were necessary: to soak the rich, re-distribute wealth, pay for reforms and new projects. State intervention was necessary: to plan the national economy, curb individualists, and work toward a more coöperative society. Public works were necessary: rehabilitation, roads, housing, government utilities, public services.

At the same time many capitalists saw more clearly that something had to be done to save the profit system from an entire disintegration.

Here, then, was the Roosevelt problem, and his program was the design to meet it. The half-felt mass demands for reform, security, control, public works, are—in spite of many backward glances and merely liberal elements—generally social democratic in character. The Roosevelt program had to give adequate psychological and some actual satisfaction to these.

But the iron demands of United States economy, bound to the world decline of capitalism, decreed that in actuality none of these demands could be met on a large scale, that the Roosevelt program must in fact prepare for the corporative society and a Fascist political structure.

Embodied, then, in the administration speeches, commission reports, even in the laws it passed, has been the curious, perverted, upside-down form of American social democracy. And this, moreover, is the only kind of social democracy the United States will know. For social democracy has no fresh rôle to play in the period of the rapid decline of capitalism, and there is little chance for a major genuine social democratic development in this country, in spite of the occasional quivers of life from the American Socialist party corpse. The large scale development of social democracy depends upon the ability to win concessions from capitalism, and upon a comparatively slow rate of social change. Neither of these conditions is present during the decline of capitalism.

And embodied, secondly, in the practises of the administration is the preparation for Fascism. Some of this has already been carried to considerable length. For example, the concentration of governmental power in the Executive. This is shown not merely by the great multiplication of functions carried on by governmental bodies dependent on the President, but even more strikingly by the increase of socalled "permissive legislation", which is in effect the turning over by Congress to the Executive of the most cherished legislative powers (tariff, coinage, budgetary expenditures, public works, etc.). Again, there is the much more open intervention of government in business, the establishment of labor camps (C.C.C., forced relief work), more open and consistent state intervention in labor disputes, and closer government control over foreign exchange.

Naturally, however, words alone would not satisfy the mass discontent, and the administration has, here and there, had to insert even some social democratic substance. In all cases, however, these have been either of no basic importance, or have operated actually in the Fascist direction. It is well known by now how the raising of minimum hourly wages has decreased the earnings of the working class as a whole, by the advanced price level, by lowering the higher scales of wages, increasing the speed-up, and causing more part-time employment. The partial elimination of child labor in certain industries, unaccomplished by higher annual real wages, has done little more than to lower family incomes below the subsistence level. Some individual capitalists, it is true, have been inconvenienced, but the spectacular investigations have seldom led to indictments and never to important convictions or changes in the practises investigated (the Securities and Exchange Commission, for example, has even milder regulations than the New York Stock Exchange itself, after all the Pecora ballyhoo). The subsistence homestead projects are miserable flops. The home renovation program has amounted to nothing more than newspaper headlines. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has benefitted primarily the holders of doubtful mortgages, who now have their interest guaranteed by the government. The farmers—though chiefly the landlord and capitalist farmers—are the only considerable group (except for the finance-capitalists themselves) that has gained appreciably, and this amounts to very little in relation to the entire national economy (perhaps $500,000,000 after allowances for the rise in prices of manufactured goods).

To sustain popular feeling, the administration has had to rely chiefly on: (1) demagogic attacks on Tories; (2) the masterful handling of patronage by Farley; (3) vast promises for the future; (4) carefully located expenditures of government funds for public works, where these will do the most psychological good; (5) playing off of one group against the other by both promises and threats; (6) keeping taxes down in spite of the increased governmental expenditures (a proportionate rise in taxes would quickly alienate the middle classes); (7) big-time muck-raking investigations (banking, Stock Exchange, advertizing, munitions).

Such a procedure, of course, cannot go on forever. Government finances cannot stand it, for one thing. Nor can this particular brand of demagogy get across indefinitely—it stales. Roosevelt is undoubtedly aware of this. So is everyone else, and even the capitalist critics ask, "Will he turn definitely in the end to the Right or the Left?" Of course, in the end he can turn only to the Right (the turn consists only in being less ambiguously to the Right, not in any real alteration of direction). Declining capitalism is unable to offer the substance of his reforms, no matter how sincerely Roosevelt might will it. The turn, in fact, made its appearance in September 1934, and became clearer with the speech to the bankers' convention, and the repudiation of the June interview that promised social reforms on a wide scale with the new Congress. But the old game still goes on. Roosevelt will do his best, must do his best, to maintain his present double rôle until after the 1916 election.

* * * *

What, then, may be expected from the new Congress? In addition to the background already outlined, which will condition its activities, two further factors must be kept in mind. First, the relation of Roosevelt to his new Congress is almost the reverse of his relation to his first Congress. Then, at the beginning of his administration, by a sweeping popular overthrow, he had been placed in power on the crest of rising mass sentiment. He was the Great Leader whose duty it was to guide a timid Congress into the untried country of the New Deal—new at least in the real sense of being a new step in the advance of United States capitalism to its final collapse. Now, however, Roosevelt is two years removed from direct contact with mass sentiment. Moreover, his unfulfilled promises are drifting back home to roost—in the end, citizens take jobs, security, protection, seriously. It is the members of Congress who, just assembling from the tribulations of November's elections, reflect more directly the mass sentiment. They come from localities demanding additional public works expenditures, more relief, bonus payments, changed labor legislation, mortgage moratoriums, inflation, or what not. Therefore Roosevelt, from having played the Great Leader, must now play the Great Brake; he must calm the wilder members of Congress, shunt aside and compromise "radical" demands, and in general make sure that no accidentally passed "Left" legislation hinder the fundamental "Right" direction.

Second, certain industrial and banking corporations have achieved a temporary relative stability during Roosevelt's first two years, with a reasonable level of profits rolling in. These are consequently anxious to go back to the pre-1929 days, and to take their chances in rugged competition unconfused by the complex intricacies of the New Deal. Their wishes cannot be granted. The pre-1929 days have gone not to return. Individual capitalists have got to be taught that they must occasionally give up a few sweetmeats as individuals to preserve the basic interests of their class as a whole, and its position. And the state—in the days of monopoly capitalism most directly representative of the class as a whole—will be their teacher. However, their reactionary opposition is a useful weapon for Roosevelt both against difficult groups in Congress, and to build up favorable popular sentiment. As against them, Roosevelt can be very Left indeed, and can point to them as the bogeyman who will gobble up Congress and the masses if they don't toe the line.

In general, then, we may be sure that, while the underlying socio-economic drift continues toward a Right solidification, the legislation actually passed by the new Congress will be on no basic question unambiguously one thing or the other. It cannot be openly reactionary without antagonizing the masses in a manner for which Roosevelt is not prepared; it cannot be in reality Left without injuring seriously the position of the bourgeoisie, which position demands now the steady movement to the Right.

I shall apply this general scheme to certain specific problems that will be before the New Congress.

As for "labor legislation", the A. F. of L. and other labor groups are making a drive for legislation to outlaw company unions, enforce the majority principle, guarantee free union elections, etc. From the other side, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and others want in effect to make the company union the universal American form, and to eliminate all traces of the majority principle. Neither of these plans, however, is now possible. The first would immediately be blocked in the courts as unconstitutional. The American masses, politically immature and confused as they are, are not ready for the second, nor is there a Fascist apparatus to enforce it. Section 7a will indeed have to be "clarified". But this will be done by the new Congress in an ingeniously ambiguous manner that will enable William Green to hail a victory for labor, will prompt a series of editorials in the New York *Herald-Tribune* protesting again the undermining of American liberties, and will leave the real issue of unionization to be fought out as it is being now—with independent vs. company unions decided by the relative militancy and determination of the workers involved. Coupled with this clarification of Section 7a will be a modified form of the Wagner Bill, setting up additional means for the peaceful arbitration of industrial disputes, and ironing out certain confusions of jurisdiction among the various labor boards: that is, providing new and more impressive means for labor bureaucrats to tangle up strikers, new ways of sabotaging strikes. The country is not yet ready, however, for compulsory arbitration.

The widespread sentiment for insurances of various kinds, unemployment, old age, sickness, accident, will issue this session in a hodgepodge Federal-State Unemployment Insurance Measure. Far from being a liberal or labor victory, however, this will be a distinct defeat. It will be placed some distance in the future to start operation, and will thus serve to divert present agitation from sounder insurance plans. More dangerous, it will serve further to divide the interests of employed and unemployed (since it will not apply to the now unemployed, even where and when it is put into effect); and it will act as an additional strike-breaker, since its provisions will permit interpretation by the courts to rule strikers as losing any insurance benefits under the law.

One of the bitterest fights in the new Congress will be over the bonus. A majority in both Houses is in favor of immediate payment. If such a measure passed, Roosevelt would be forced to veto it, and would have a hard time to prevent passage over his veto. However, Roosevelt does not want to veto legislation of this kind, supported as it is by a powerful organization of voters. It seems probable that administration forces will arrange a compromise measure providing cancellation of interest owed on present loans against bonus certificates, more liberal loan provisions, and perhaps full payment for veterans in extreme need or even a general system of installment payments.

The present N.R.A. expires on June 16. Some interests wish to let it die altogether, but this is part of the vain wish to get back to '29. Perhaps with a different name, probably still as an ostensibly "temporary" measure, the N.R.A. principles will be extended. There will be changes, however, including the elimination of price —and production—control provisions in most codes except those governing industries making use of natural resources.

The subsidies to agriculture will have to continue, since withdrawing them would have disastrous political consequences for Roosevelt, consequences he is not now in a position to handle. Production control will continue prominent in tobacco, cotton, etc.; but the drought and government destruction have made this matter simpler in the grains and live stock.

The advocates of various forms of inflation will be active throughout the session. These will be partly balanced by the powerful sound-money lobbies of the bankers, the Chamber of Commerce, the American Liberty League, etc. In the end, however, the inflation question will have to be solved by further "permissive legislation", providing a legislative base for further inflationary steps, but leaving the taking of them to Roosevelt's discretion. Perhaps some moves toward re-monetization of silver will be taken by Congress itself, but these will be of minor importance. The proposed Government Central Bank will not get out of committee.

No great changes will be made in taxation. There will be a few increases in higher bracket income and inheritance taxes and perhaps some form of taxation of excess corporate surpluses, both of these for publicity rather than revenue purposes. The special taxes expiring during the next six months (e.g., bank check, gasoline, telegraph, automobiles) will most of them be continued, and a few added. But Roosevelt is resolved to put off that evil day, nevertheless fast approaching, when the middle classes will be forced to feel the full weight of capitalist decline.

Munitions and war legislation will be played up for all they are worth. Some sort of "regulations" will no doubt be voted, and probably something along the lines of the "take the profits out of war" talk. But nationalization of the munitions industry is for the present out of the question. Beneath the ballyhoo, the real job of war preparation will go on; and whatever government regulation is voted will actually help prepare for the War Department's mobilization scheme, already laid down in fundamentals sixteen years ago. The collapse of the Washington Treaty will be used to carry on the expansion programs of army and navy, especially in aviation and mechanization.

The Left guns of the President are going to concentrate on utilities and housing. Here he will continue the social democratic surface, and we may expect a message to Congress on each, a Fireside Talk, and the best products of the presidential publicity agents. Much noise and even increased governmental activities in these fields are to be expected. After all, it will take the government utility "yardsticks" some long time to threaten seriously the gigantic privately owned utilities plants; there are some projects (Boulder, Muscle Shoals, Grand Coulee) which are not in any event profitable for private enterprise; and, lastly, the utilities can richly take a jolt to their profits, for their protected rate position has enabled them to do better than corporations deserved during the crisis. In the power field, the administration can be a trifle socially-minded with no harm—indeed, with considerable aid—to the system.

As for housing, it is connected with the whole problem of public works, and these in turn with relief. Here, too, bitter struggles will be solved in the end by permissive legislation. The balanced budget plans of the White Sulphur Springs conference, stripping away public works and relief, would mean the loss of the 1936 elections for Roosevelt, and nationwide riots. The ten billion dollar annual program of the liberal planners would upset government credit, and the bankers. Therefore, the new formula will be used: fairly large appropriations through several agencies, but only a fraction of them mandatory, the rest left to presidential discretion. Presidential discretion will mean, *à la* Hopkins, enough dole and work relief to prevent too violent outbursts on the part of the unemployed, plus enough haphazard housing and other public works to assure an adequate amount of publicity. There will evidently be an effort to increase the proportion of work relief as against the dole. This cannot, however, be done on a really large scale, and the result will be chiefly to drop some hundreds of thousands from all relief during the various transfers back and forth.

* * * *

This, then, is the general character of the probable (internal) legislation of the new Congress. Meanwhile, below the ambiguous parliamentary surface, the real issues of 1935 will be fought out. The real question—"Will the workers' movement organize its forces fast enough to compensate for the consolidating lines of the Right, and will the relative weight of the working class be heavier at the end than at the beginning of 1931?"—will be decided not in Washington, but in the open field of the class struggle.

John WEST

Behind the Kirov Assassination

REVOLUTIONISTS will be left unmoved by the avalanche of denunciation let loose by the bourgeois press on the occasion of the measures taken by the Soviet Union against those charged with complicity in the assassination of Sergei M. Kirov. Indeed, if whole sections of the working class camp have been driven to the extreme of a blanket endorsement of all the actions of the Soviets, it has been largely as a revulsion against the utter hypocrisy of the bourgeois plaintiffs. Without the twitching of a muscle, the press has, for example, reported the indignation expressed over the recent Russian events by Benito Mussolini, who waded through a river of proletarian blood to attain his present post.

The merited contempt which the revolutionist feels for this choir of pious jackals, does not, however, absolve him from the duty to make a critical analysis of the events. It is not only a duty but a need, in view of the fact that the official communist press has been silent when it should have been voluble, obscure instead of clear, ambiguous instead of unequivocal, and—true to itself—lying instead of truthful. Let us therefore recapitulate the official account of the sequence of events.

On December 1, Sergei M. Kirov was fatally wounded by a shot fired at him in the Smolny Institute in Leningrad, where he headed both the party organization and the Soviets. Only several days later was the name of his assassin, Leonid Nikolaiev, revealed.

Days later, following upon a myriad of unofficial rumors and an astonishing paucity of official details, came the report that several score (the final figure runs to 103) counter-revolutionists, connected with the assassination in one way or another, have been given secret, summary trial and executed on the spot.

Still later, Moscow reports that a number of communist party members or ex-members, connected or once connected with the Zinoviev group, have been arrested as a result either of independent investigation or of information divulged by Nikolaiev.

Weeks after his arrest, Nikolaiev is reported to have confessed that the killing of Kirov was not a personal affair, but was part of an extensive plot participated in by Zinovievists, by a foreign consular agent, who supplied financial assistance, by Leon Trotsky and others unnamed. The goal of the conspirators was the assassination of Kirov, Stalin, Kalinin, Kaganovitch, Molotov and other leading figures of the present régime, and their replacement by Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky.

A few days later, a group of 14 party or ex-party members, plus Nikolaiev, is given a brief and secret trial before a military court, sentenced to death and shot. The fate in store for others who were arrested has, as this is written, not yet been made known.

To expect anything but bewilderment, suspicion, or stupefaction from a worker given this narrative and explanation, one must be imbued with that peculiar faith, sustained by servile and cynical gullibility, which is the compulsory attribute of official Stalinist spokesmen. For what else can be expected from such a polychromatic picture, where all sorts of colors are slapped on, sometimes one over the others, and wide spaces on the canvas are left either confusingly blank or only vaguely outlined? An attempt must nevertheless be made to bring some clarity into the confusion created by the official version of the affair. The handicap of meager information about so sensational a series of events only makes critical analysis more necessary. Such an analysis will be facilitated if those charged with complicity in the assassination are divided into five categories:

The assassin himself, Nikolaiev.

The scores who were shot after the first few days as White terrorists who had recently smuggled their way into Russia.

The fourteen communist party men who were shot in a group.

The C. P. leaders and ex-leaders, like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevodkimov, who are still under arrest.

Trotsky.

* * * *

The official report asserts that the confession made by Nikolaiev just before his execution admitted that his first story, i.e., that he had shot Kirov as an independent personal act without political motive, was without foundation. "He prepared a diary designed to show that he killed Kirov because he was in bad straits and had been badly used," says the Moscow dispatch. But this was merely a ruse to throw off suspicion from the Zinovievists involved, who had plotted a terroristic campaign for political ends. "When he shot Kirov at Leningrad he believed another section of the gang would immediately attempt to kill Stalin and other leaders in Moscow," continues the dispatch, which adds that in his confession Nikolaiev further admitted that "I thought our shot must be the signal for action against the party and the Soviet government" Papers like the *Daily Worker* confirm this as the official view by pointing out the significance of the German Nazi press surmise that Nikolaiev's shot was a personal act and by adding that those who consider such a conclusion possible are only helping to cover up the political conspiracy of the White Guards and their accomplices.

But this story is obviously contradictory. If Nikolaiev and the Zinovievists "who participated in the conspiracy" intended the assassination of Kirov as a *demonstrative political act* against the present régime, to be followed by similar acts against Stalin and others, why then did Nikolaiev insist, upon his arrest (which he must have counted upon), that the act was *not political* in character? Why should a man (or men) who intended to give a *political* signal to the masses, go to the trouble of preparing a diary to be read after his arrest, calculated to prove that his act was not political but personal? One can understand why a trapped assassin would not disclose the fact that he had associates, or give their names. Terrorists—revolutionary or counter-revolutionary—rarely do. At the same time, such terrorists, when apprehended, have never made it a practise to conceal the political motive behind their act by the claim that the affair was purely personal—just the contrary. Examples in both camps: Maria Spiridonova, Vera Figner, Boris Savinkov, Raoul Vilain. If the Stalinist version is accepted, we shall have, we believe, the first case on record of a political terrorist seeking to deny the political nature of his act and admitting it only weeks afterward under stress. Further, why the "personal alibi" diary, if it was expected that half a dozen or more assassinations of prominent figures were to take place almost simultaneously, which would make it as clear as day to a child that a *political movement* was involved? Did the other conspirators also concoct misleading diaries?

Despite the efforts to throw everybody connected with the shooting into one group, there seems to us to be no visible link between the 103 "White terrorists" executed at the beginning, and the 14 executed two to three weeks later. Careful examination of the official accounts shows that nowhere is the assertion made that there was *any direct connection* between the first group and the socalled Zinovievists, although every succeeding day the Stalinist press lumps them together ever more indiscriminately—and vaguely.

Why was no public trial held of the 103? For answer, we have thus far had abuse, blustering condemnations, but no intelligent reply from the Stalinist spokesmen. It goes without saying that our question does not concern the problem of revolutionary terror by a proletarian régime. The Bolsheviks did not launch the Red terror in November 1917. They were compelled to resort to it afterwards only when savage terroristic assaults were made on them by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Even at the present time, despite all the official absurdity about a classless society in the Soviet Union in a couple of years, certain circumstances may well compel the workers' state to resort to measures in its defense, and sometimes in retaliation, which strike terror into the hearts of those class enemies who seek to restore the old order and once more impose capitalist slavery upon the masses. The fact remains, however, that counter-revolutionary groups in the past have been dealt with openly, so that the proletarian government was able to prove its case in public court, by impressive evidence, with the world working class studying both the accused and the accuser and hearing what both had to say. Why not this time? There *is* an explanation, given by the Stalinists in a studied whisper: "A foreign power is involved. The world situation is

very delicate now; the evidence, if brought out, would have precipitated serious international complications." True or not, the explanation is nonsense. In the first place, it is nobody's particular secret that by the "foreign power" is meant Germany. If it was to be kept so strictly secret, why is it now possible for the *Daily Worker* to declare in so many words that the Nazis were behind the terrorists? Why such delicacy? In the 1922 trial of the Social Revolutionists, the Bolsheviks did not hesitate to bring out the connection between the culprits and the French and English governments. In the 1930 trial of Ramzin and associates, there was no hesitation in showing the link between the "wreckers" and France. In the quite recent trial of Mr. MacDonald of Metropolitan-Vickers, there was no sign of this suddenly acquired bashfulness. In addition, in these as well as in dozens of similar cases, open trials were held.

Moreover, what assurances are there that the 103 were what they are purported to have been—White Guards, and persons of similar stripe? There is the Stalinists' word for it—but as Lenin so rightly said, if you take *anybody's* word for anything, you're an idiot who can be disposed of with a wave of the hand. Whoever may look with equanimity upon being placed in such a category, we refuse to be among them. In all the trials of counter-revolutionists mentioned above, and in hundreds of others, those finally imprisoned, exiled, shot, or set free were always listed. There names were given, their political and social biographies were attached, as were the exact and formal charges levelled against them. Under such conditions, it was always possible in the past to know who was involved and why. Why, in this case, have the Stalinists made it impossible? Even aside from Lenin's salutary admonition, one would be a political child, inviting catastrophe, to place blind trust in the integrity of those who have so often abused it. It is therefore impossible to accept offhand and on mere say-so the assertion that all of the 103 were White Guards and counter-revolutionists who deserved prompt execution. For the sake of the Soviet Union and the workers' cause in general, we should like to believe the assertion. But being communicants of no church, we cannot believe it on pure faith.

This uneasiness is enormously heightened by the fate meted out to those who fall into our third category. For the second it is at least claimed that they were out-and-out White Guards. But the fourteen appear to have been members of the communist party, and at least at one time, proletarian critics of the Stalinist régime who had absolutely nothing in common either with counter-revolution or with individual terrorism. There is reason to believe that all fourteen were at one time not only members of the party, but supporters of the former Opposition Bloc (Trotsky-Zinoviev group). Not all the names are familiar, but a search through old periodical files reveals a number of them and indicates their political trend. L. I. Sositsky, one of the executed fourteen, was expelled from the party in Leningrad, on October 11, 1927, for supporting the Opposition. The rest remain unknown to us, except for four others—I. N. Katalinov, Vladimir Rumyantsev, Georgi Sokolov and Vladimir Levin—who were expelled, the records show, by the 15th congress of the Russian party in 1927, also for membership in the Opposition. Ivan Katalinov, the youngest of those executed, was, we recall, the delegate of the Russian Young Communist League on the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International in 1925, from which he was later removed for supporting the Zinoviev group. As for V. Rumyantsev—unless there is someone else bearing exactly the same name—*he was elected to the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union at its 17th congress, that is, as recently as February 1934, to the committee to which was also elected the same Kirov he is now accused of having helped murder!* (It should be remembered, by the way, that the Zinovievists referred to capitulated in 1928 or later, and were taken back into the party.)

"Beaten in open political struggle," exclaims *Pravda* on December 19, "exposed before the masses, the miserable remnants, the degraded dregs of the anti-party Zinoviev group, concealed themselves from the sight of the party, lay in ambush and began to resort to the last, White Guardist and Fascist bandit method—to individual terror."

The charge appears to us to be utterly incredible! It becomes even more fantastic when the Stalinists add to those at whom they hurl it such names as G. Zinoviev, L. Kamenev, G. Yevdokimov, P. Salutsky, G. Safarov (who are reported arrested in connection with the murder) and Leon Trotsky. All of them, plus the 14 executed, have years, even decades, of revolutionary activity behind them. Zinoviev and Kamenev joined the party in 1901; Trotsky in 1898; Yevdokimov in 1903; Salutsky in 1907; Safarov in 1912. All of them were reared in the rigid Marxian tradition of antagonism in principle to the theory of individual terrorism. All of them have occupied posts of the highest trust in the party and the Soviets. Zinoviev was chairman of the Communist International all during Lenin's lifetime and head of the Leningrad Soviet for years. Kamenev was Lenin's literary executor, head of the Moscow Soviet, chief of the Council of Labor and Defense, Lenin's substitute as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and chairman, in his absence, of the Political Bureau of the party. Yevdokimov was secretary of the party in Leningrad, a member of the party secretariat and organizational bureau, and—like Rumyantsev—elected to the Central Committee of the party as late as February 1934. Safarov was a prominent Leningrad leader and editor of *Pravda* in that city.

Is it conceivable that such men could be enmeshed in a conspiracy for individual terrorism, backed and financed, moreover, by Hitler Germany? Terrorism—that is no individual aberration; it arises in certain social conditions. What must be the conditions inside the party that impel 14 young communists, and an unknown number of Bolsheviks of long standing, including two members of the Central Committee, to resort to such a desperate measure as terrorism for the purpose of making what they believe are needed changes in the situation? It is not hard to understand that a desperate supporter of capitalism should "resort to the last, White Guardist and Fascist bandit method—to individual terror". But why a group of communist party members, why a Zinoviev, a Kamenev, why two members of the highest governing body of the party itself? Have they no other recourse—is that what *Pravda* is unwittingly conveying to its readers? Are there no normal channels available in the party through which to express dissatisfaction with a state of affairs and proposals to alter it?

The very charge which it directs against its opponents is a merciless indictment of the bureaucratic Stalinist régime itself!

The more one reflects on the situation, the clearer it becomes that a plot has indeed been hatched, a monstrous and dastardly plot, but one which has no real relation to the murder of S. M. Kirov.

In the first week of the Kirov affair, on December 7, *Izvestia* specifically repudiated the idea that the assassination was the act of opponents inside the communist party and, instead, placed the blame upon a source which is, in any case, possible and plausible: the White Guard and counter-revolutionary elements abroad. Denouncing the theories of the reactionary Finnish paper, the *Huvudstad Bladet* of December 4, Izvestia then wrote: "The fabrications which this paper concocts about 'dissatisfied Left-radical' groups and 'discontentment among the troops' are just as true as the invention of the 'independent North Russia'. Important in the idiotic inventions of the Finnish sheet, is the hint that in its opinion the approachment of the Soviet Union to France is going too far. We are convinced that the counter-revolutionary elements who hatch terroristic conspiracies, aim precisely at this moment at disrupting the approachment of France and the Soviet Union."

It is quite clear that on December 7, it had occurred to nobody in the Soviet leadership to implicate inner-party opponents in the murder. Among the 103 who were instantly shot, no attempt was made to wrest a confession that would involve the Zinovievists or Trotskyists or any other party current. This was done in the case of Nikolaiev, some two weeks later. At the height of the indignation and horror felt by the workers at the assassination, it occurred to the Stalinist leaders (as we analyze the developments) to subject to this indignation *all* of their opponents, both counter-revolutionists and inner-party and proletarian critics, that is, to throw White Guards, Nazis, terrorists, Zinovievists and Trotskyists into the same group.

In the declining days of the French Revolution, the Thermidorians and the trail-blazers of the Thermidorian reaction pursued a similar course. When the revolutionary Hébertists were sent before the tribunal, the reactionaries threw the communistic Mo-

moro, the idealistic "orator of mankind", Anacharsis Cloots and Leclerc into the same group with counter-revolutionary bankers and German agents. When Danton, Desmoulins and Phélippeaux were arrested, they were combined with forgers like Fabre and Delaunay, thieves like Lacroix, and men like Chabot who had taken 100,000 francs from the royalists. This reactionary abomination came to be known as a *Thermidorian amalgam.* It was devised to confuse and bewilder, to make it possible for a growing reaction to dispose of revolutionists under the guise of combatting counter-revolutionists.

Stalin is an old hand at just such Thermidorian amalgams. We have not forgotten 1927, when Stalin accused Trotsky and Zinoviev of conspiring with a Wrangel officer against the party and the Soviets—with a Wrangel officer who turned out to be a confidential agent of the G.P.U.! What we have in 1934 is, if anything, a more despicable and outrageous amalgam. Taking advantage of whatever White Guard elements are involved in the affair, the Stalinists are seeking to kill (literally!) two birds with one stone: White Guards outside the party and revolutionary oppositionists inside the party.

Zinoviev and Kamenev as oppositionists? It is almost as hard to believe as the charges made against them by the Stalinists. Three times they have been charged with "counter-revolutionism", each time more violently. Three times they have capitulated to Stalin, each time more self-debasingly. In 1928, Zinoviev and Kamenev announced the renunciation of their views. On June 16, 1930, Zinoviev begged the party to understand that as a result of his factionalism he had conducted an "embittered struggle against comrade Stalin, who most consistedly and steadfastly combatted deviations from the party line". On October 9, 1932, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others were expelled again for having allegedly connived with the Riutin-Uglanov group for nothing more or less than the "creation of a bourgeois-kulak organization for the restoration of capitalism, especially of kulakdom, in the Soviet Union". On May 20, 1933, the duo again begged for readmission: "I was one of those who often came forward against the Central Committee of the party and against Stalin and agitated strongly against them," wrote Zinoviev. "I was absolutely wrong. The name of Stalin is the banner of the entire proletarian world. He it was who understood, together with the party Central Committee and at its head, how to preserve and augment the theoretical and political heritage of the party. . . ." This was not enough. At the 17th party congress, last February, the leaders of all and sundry groups that had ever opposed Stalin were marched across the stage like so many marionettes—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov, Lominadze, Radek, Preobrazhensky—to beat their breasts in public and to explain how they finally became convinced that they had always been wrong, and Stalin always right, and that obedience to Stalin was the supreme party virtue.

That Zinoviev and Kamenev, at least, were engaged in any active political opposition to Stalin, is highly doubtful. That they have continued to play with such an idea, in the hermetic privacy of their chambers, is entirely possible. Among those arrested, must have been men like them, and also men who, unlike them, were engaged in more active opposition to the bureaucracy. The new blow struck at the old Zinovievists, particularly at the two former leaders, is not only an infamous piece of vindictiveness, but it calculatingly pursues a political aim. The plan to dispose of them—physically, by execution or imprisonment or exile; politically, by calumny and discreditment—is a *preventive* measure.

That there is a basis for a growing opposition, cannot be doubted for a moment. The internal régime has become progressively worse. Imagine a situation where neither the rank and file communist nor the old and experienced party leader can speak his mind publicly, where the bureaucratic lid is screwed down so tightly that men in the most responsible posts must discuss their party problems in secret, in deadly fear of being discovered. In 1929, the world learns that Rykov, head of the government, Bukharin, head of the Third International and Tomsky, head of the Russian trade unions, have been conspiring to restore the power of capitalism and the kulaks. In 1930, the man who had replaced Rykov as head of the government—Syrzov—and a prominent leader of the Central Committee—Lominadze—are expelled for plotting a counter-revolution in the party. In 1931, Riazanov, the head of the Marx-Engels Institute, is expelled and exiled for having plotted with counter-revolutionary Mensheviks. In 1932, two new members of the Central Committee, Riutin and Uglanov, the latter the head of the Moscow organization, are expelled for "having attempted, in an illegal manner" to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union—nothing less. In 1934, one member of the Central Committee is executed for plotting to assassinate other members of that body, a second is arrested on the same charge.

Throughout these years, to an ever-increasing extent, the party régime has become highly personalized. The compulsory flattery of Stalin, the artificial invention and heralding of his virtues and genius, the fawning and toadying and scraping and crawling before the Master and what *Pravda* calls "our Stalinist Central Committee", has had nothing to parallel it since the days of the Byzantine Empire. Were there no other facts, these few would suffice to damn the internal régime.

There are other grounds for the rising revolutionary opposition. In little more than a year, the Third International has revealed its incurable impotence in three decisive events: the advent of Hitler to power, the civil war in Austria, and the Spanish uprising. The fact that only one congress of the Third International has been held in eleven years, is undoubtedly having a disturbing effect upon the serious revolutionary elements in Russia. The fact that while the Comintern crumbles, the Soviet Union enters the League of Nations and hails it as a triumph, that it concludes a close alliance with France, is impressing itself upon the minds of the unstultified Marxists in Russia as the reflection of the Rightward swing of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Coincidentally, has come the marked turn to the Right inside the Soviet Union. At the 17th congress of the party, early in 1934, Stalin issued the slogan: "The collective farm peasants must become well-to-do!"—a new edition of the notorious Bukharinist slogan in 1925: "Enrich yourselves!" Toward the end of the year, the party leadership accentuated the Rightward turn under the guise of a step forward: the bread card system, which has existed for six years, is to be ended at the beginning of 1935. The consequences of this measure will be far-reaching. Up to now, bread has been rationed to the workers by the stamped-card system. Though the ration might be low, it was nevertheless assured. The better paid workers and employees augmented their rations by purchases on the speculators' markets. Now, bread is to be bought at will, in controlled stores, at fixed prices, and the speculators' markets are to be wiped out. Prices are to vary in accordance with the eight zones into which the Union has been divided. On November 26, the Central Committee provided for an increase in the retail price of bread to a point about half-way between the former normalized and the commercial (speculators') prices. So that the workers shall be able to meet the price rise, wages are to be universally increased about 10% by January 1. The better-paid workers, therefore, who previously paid commercial prices for bread, now receive a wage increase and a bread-price decrease. The average and the low-paid workers, who previously obtained bread at the low government-normalized price, must now pay a higher price for it. According to Molotov, the increased revenue accruing to the state from the rise in the retail price of government bread, will be used to pay higher prices to those peasants producing grain, cotton, flax, tobacco, etc. In a word, the division of the national income is being shifted away from the industrial population to the agricultural population.

It is in these economic and political shifts, in the last analysis, that the causes must be sought for the bewildering succession of events following the murder of Kirov. These shifts relentlessly create the basis for the resurgence of a proletarian opposition to the Stalin régime. The Thermidorian amalgam, the shooting, imprisonment and exile of critics—actual and potential—are calculated to behead this opposition or to crush it in the egg. That the real interests of the Soviet Union, and the international labor movement, are profoundly and most adversely affected by these developments, lies in the very nature of the Stalinist course. All the keener must be the vigilence of revolutionists throughout the world, all the livelier their readiness to come to the defense of Russia as her need becomes greater, all the firmer the steps they take toward restoring the movement of the vanguard, the Fourth International.

M. S.

American Trade Union Problems—I

TRADE UNION policy presents problems of far-reaching consequence. At this moment they assume in the United States an unusual significance. The trade union movement has reached the most crucial point in its entire history. Its destiny hangs in the balance. What course will it pursue and what are its perspectives in view of the deep-going changes that are taking place in economic and political life?

Broadly speaking the main problem is the organization of the American working class into unions that will serve as effective weapons of battle against capitalist exploitation. The great majority of the workers are still unorganized. And this is particularly the case of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the basic industries and the mass production industries, who are the most exploited and consequently suffer the most from lack of organization. In turn it is precisely these workers who will now respond the most rapidly and prove their splendid fighting calibre as some of them have done during recent months. It is inconceivable that the large masses of the unorganized workers can be organized without an aggressive policy and a militant leadership fully conscious of the enormous obstacles and fully prepared to meet them. Today there is no such eadership at the head of the existing unions. Still this problem cannot be considered separate and apart from the existing unions. It is perfectly true that the rock-ribbed reactionaries now in control of all leading union positions fear the large scale influx of these healthy proletarian elements much more than they fear the aggressive onslaughts of the employers. They fear it today more than ever and in reality sabotage organization because they know by sad experience that this means a fundamental change in the composition and character of the unions. They know that it tends to throw the unions out of the former more comfortable paths and into taking chances in struggle. The problem that arises is therefore twofold in character. One is the effective organization of the large mass of unorganized workers. The other is the breaking up of the reactionary stranglehold on the existing unions in order to transform them into weapons of battle against capitalism.

At this point, however, another important question arises. Is it conceivable that the American Federation of Labor can actually be the channel through which the unorganized will be organized in the face of the violent hostility of monopoly capitalism, or must other means be created—independent unions, or another federation of independent unions?

At the present juncture the A. F. of L. is the dominant force in the trade union field. Throughout its history the many attempts made to organize independently of it, or in opposition to it, have been ill-fated, or produced pure and simple sectarian movements that were still-born. No doubt, this is not necessarily a precise criterion. Union organization during the period of peaceful growth and expansion of capitalism and during the period of its decline as a world system represent two vastly different problems. For revolutionists and trade union militants, however, no fetishism of organization is permissible. It is clear that they will not abandon the mass unions in favor of new sectarian schemes of more perfectly conceived unions that would carry no social weight and still leave the masses—all the more securely by their own withdrawal—under the domination of the reactionary A. F. of L. bureaucrats. By such methods the militants would never lead any serious struggles, which, after all, is an indispensable prerequisite if they are to raise themselves to the rôle of leadership in the trade union movement. The most vital problem today centers around the question of where the masses are. The next vital question is that the militants never give up the initiative in the struggle for trade union unity. A divided trade union movement only facilitates the progress of reaction and Fascism. The militants will therefore leave the responsibility for any splits that might easily ensue in the process of struggle between the forward looking forces and the reactionary hang-overs where this responsibility rightfully belongs: on the shoulders of the labor agents of capitalism. Of course, it is perfectly true that we cannot rest content with the mere affirmation: the masses of the organized workers are now in the A. F. of L., hence it is the union of the working class and will remain so in the future. Nothing could be more erroneous. On the contrary, we are concerned with the question of an historic process in which the revolutionary and militant forces play a conscious rôle. They must intervene and seek to influence its course and help to mark out its direction.

What will an examination of the basic factors reveal? First of all it would be incorrect to concede to the A. F. of L. the claim to a monopoly in the field of labor organization. Only too often have the Federation officials retreated in the face of employers' offensives and insisted on the antiquated craft union forms that make the serious penetration of the basic industries impossible. Outright treachery, corruption, graft and racketeering during the whole course of their history resulted time and again in forcing large sections of workers out of the ranks of the union movement, discrediting unionism and in every instance playing directly into the hands of the capitalist enemy. Since the inception of the N.R.A. the Federation unions have experienced a stormy revival and growth. In so far as their place in society is concerned their position is today very much different from what existed before. Large masses came to these unions because they were the dominant unions, because there was no other force in the field really capable of building organization, but also in some respects due to the fact that these unions were considered respectable by the bourgeoisie and enjoyed the benefits of the stimulus given by the N.R.A. labor section. Although the reasons for this stimulus, almost exclusively benefitting the A. F. of L. unions, was intended to permit their expansion only in order to prevent more militant organization and action, it was entirely correct to maintain the position that they must be the main point of concentration by the militants. The Stalinists, whose policy tried to fly in the face of this process of revival and growth, found themselves condemned to a futile existence, completely isolated from the actual life of the movement and unable to influence its course. The A. F. of L. bureaucracy could continue its policies unchallenged, or at least without any serious opposition.

The unions organized recently independently of the A. F. of L. or in opposition to it, did not show greater vitality or growth during this period. The "red" unions of the T.U.U.L. remained as could be expected, mere caricature organizations. In September 1932, the Progressive Miners of America came into existence, the major part of the Illinois district splitting off from the parent body. It emerged at a moment when the U.M.W. had been reduced to a mere shell of its former self, when the Lewis machine in control of the organization had become thoroughly discredited, and several rebellious movements were in the making. Under these conditions the P.M.A. undoubtedly had the opportunity to become the central pole of attraction, unite the rebellious sections and build an effective national organization. But it quickly fell into the hands of a new set of bureaucrats. The Left wing was weak and the organization remained confined to a certain part of the Illinois territory; gradually, it lost some of its earlier and justified gains. Other comparisons between A. F. of L. and independent unions during recent times would prove equally illuminating.

The reactionary bureaucracy, headed by Wm. Green, in order to prove more effectively that it merits the confidence and support of the government and its N.R.A. machinery is now launching an onslaught against the reactionary and the militant unionists. In this respect the independent unions have not pursued an essentially different policy. The leadership of the P.M.A. went out of its way to appear just as respectable to the bourgeoisie and attacked the militants in the union. While the A. F. of L. has taken no real steps to make good its convention decision for an industrial union in the automobile industry, the Mechanics Educational Society, also despite its own convention decision of last year, is even more distinctly a craft union in form and more craft conscious in its approach to organization. It would be false to present the issue at this time in the sense of the one union against the other.

The question of policy and leadership is much more to the point. In essence, it is a question of the influence exerted upon the economic organizations of the workers by the revolutionary and militant wing.

Actual leadership and formulation of policy is today still in the hands of Green and Company. Thanks to them the objectives of union recognition are being diverted from the field of struggle through the organized power of the workers, over to simple reliance on the governmental machinery of labor relations and arbitration. Yet it is precisely by this method that the bureaucrats have lost practically every major decision and every gain made in organization. Outstanding is the automobile agreement of last spring which circumvented the strike for union recognition and placed all power of decision in the hands of the Automobile Labor Board. Dating from the time of this treacherous agreement the federal unions in this industry have been reduced gradually to a mere skeleton. Their recent withdrawal from collaboration with the board has not stopped the process of disintegration and demoralization. In the steel industry the reactionary gang of Green and Co. similarly succeeded in diverting the strike movement of last summer for union recognition, for the sake of the National Steel Labor Relations Board. It has made some decisions. Others were made before. All of them, including the famous Weirton case, now keep glib-tongued lawyers busy in the courts with the consequent penalty of set-backs and demoralization to the Union. In similar fashion runs the record through the Budd, Harriman, National Lock, Houde and many other cases. There are at this moment a total of over 200 such cases in the U. S. courts, and there they might as well rest so far as union progress is concerned. Undoubtedly this record will also serve as a means of disabusing the workers of any faith that they might still have in these labor boards. The hundreds of thousands of new recruits, who sought the unions as instruments of struggle for the redress of their grievances, cannot remain satisfied with such results. They are impatient and press forward, set into motion by economic necessity.

The strike wave in the latter part of 1933 was characterized by the one common objective of enforcement of the N.R.A. collective bargaining provisions. It spread easily, gaining momentum from the impulse given by Section 7a and did not encounter very stiff resistence. In the second strike wave of last year the picture had changed considerably. While the objective remained union recognition, economic demands began to enter, introducing certain elements of an offensive character. Most outstanding, however, was the fact that in these strikes the workers placed much less reliance in the magic powers which they had formerly attributed to Section 7a. They found the governmental Labor Board machinery an encumbrance to circumvent their aims and began to look upon it with considerable skepticism as they met the most violent onslaughts of courts, police and military forces in practically every strike. A third strike wave is bound to unloose a veritable torrent of struggle very soon. It is certain that the issues will become much more sharply defined and the clashes consequently more violent in character. Possibilities of conciliation or of any actual redress from the established labor boards will diminish accordingly. Is it not reasonable to assume that in this process the self-complacent bureaucrats, who shrink from the struggle in fear of its consequences, will carry their policy of betrayal to its ultimate conclusion. That will mean to outlaw strikes, and eventually to expel unions which insist on using the strike weapon. Almost every day the A. F. of L. bureaucracy affirms its ardent desire to coöperate in an industrial truce, a no strike policy. But monopoly capitalism would not be inclined to accept a truce policy that does not carry with it a complete union surrender. It is not at all inclined to adopt a policy of union recognition in its real sense of the consummation of stable union contracts. Moreover, in view of the disorganization of capitalist economy, the constantly rising cost of living and the intensified exploitation of the workers, stable union contracts have lost all meaning. The owners of monopoly capital are perhaps more than ever determined to fight it out. Of course, the workers cannot give up the strike weapon, nor any other effective means of struggle. Hence, from the outlawing of strikes either outright expulsions will ensue or the working masses concerned—as a result of these intolerable conditions—will be forced to form independent unions. In other words the policy of the bureaucrats can easily lead to splits and the formation of new unions.

What will the revolutionary party do in such a situation? Will it accept the appellation and condemnation of dual unionism thrust upon these independent unions by Green and Co. and repeated by the Lovestoneites in the miserable fashion so characteristic of them? Of course not. It will support these unions in their efforts and struggles and not adhere to any such degenerate fetishism of organization.

Under the conditions of decline of capitalism as a world system and the greater limitations imposed on the concessions it can give, the trade unions can penetrate the large shops, mines and mills of the basic industries only through fierce struggle. This is a job for the revolutionary and militant trade unionists. Only their forces can give the inspiration that will furnish a rallying point; only they can work out the policies and tactics that can meet effectively the tremendous obstacles and actually give leadership in class battles. At the time of the awakening of new class strata, such as we are now facing, it is imperative that the revolutionists and militants put themselves at the head of every upward-surging movement of the masses, stimulate the struggle, sharpen it, and at the same time harmonize their tactics with the strategy of the revolutionary movement as a whole. Organization of the unorganized in the basic industries can be achieved only by struggle at every step. How then will the militants proceed in regard to the question of the A. F. of L. or the independent unions, bearing in mind the very great possibilities of the officials of the former outlawing strikes, actually preventing organization and even driving whole unions to take independent action? For that we have no ready made formulæ and cannot have any. Policy and tactics in this respect must be in harmony with the objective conditions as well as with the dialectics of the movement itself. Policy and tactics must be in harmony with the existing relation of forces. They must consider the question of advantage in the class struggle.

It is reasonable to assume that wherever possible and practicable the militants will bend all efforts to exert their influence on the A. F. of L. unions existing, even if only in skeleton form, in these industries, with the aim of using them as instruments of organization and struggle. They will then settle the inevitable conflict with the reactionaries as it develops concretely. In other cases it may as likely be necessary to initiate this organization through independent industrial unions, preserving the right to decide upon affiliation as the question arises or to decide upon a combination with other independent unions should the bureaucrats by their policy force deep-going splits in the A. F. of L. It would be foolish to lay down bars against independent union organization. A number of new unions are now arising in this manner, entirely independent of the A. F. of L. What must be insisted upon is that they be real unions; that they be elementary and basic organs of working class defense against capitalist aggression and that the revolutionists and the militants have as their objective the influencing of their course in order to gain further advantages in the class struggle.

For the trade union movement as a whole it is unquestionably true that its very existence as a means of defense of the interests of the working class can be maintained only in violent clashes with the capitalist aggressor. To the same extent that the corrupt officials betray these interests the temper of the rank and file will rise and give a powerful impulse to the demands for action and for militant leadership. The clashes will sometimes tend to take on the character of civil war. This will facilitate the task of infusing the unions with the spirit and policy of the class struggle and the development of a militant leadership in accord therewith. Inevitably these clashes will also facilitate the development of political consciousness of the masses in the trade unions. Political consciousness, however, does not follow as a mechanical process nor does it depend solely on the external circumstances. It requires the active intervention of the revolutionary party. We repeat: the task of the organization of the unorganized and the task of transforming the existing unions into weapons of battle against capitalism are indissolubly bound together.

Arne SWABECK

Will the Auto Industry Strike Next?

THE EVENTS of 1934 educated the auto workers. In 1935 they may translate its lessons into action.

The new year opens on a situation in which it is increasingly obvious that labor will have to fight. It has no alternative if it wishes to maintain its organization and to win a decent existence.

It will be no easy job to make the motor barons back down, to plant unionism so solidly in the industry that it cannot be uprooted. The lack of any organization tradition, the highly seasonal nature of the industry, the power of the employers—to mention only a few of the factors involved—must be realized. But the bright pages that the automobile workers have in these past two years already written into the history of American labor prove that the job can be done and that the workers of the assembly line and at the benches may form the backbone of the labor movement that is to be.

With but one exception there has never before been any organized force in the industry worthy of mention. Right after the World War the United Automobile, Aircraft and Vehicle Workers, an A. F. of L. union organized on an industrial basis, made a considerable stir in the body plants. In 1921, however, a disastrous strike plus the efforts of the Federation to divide it into craft lines killed practically all its influence. It withdrew from the A. F. of L., was later taken over by the communist party and became the base for its Auto Workers Union. During the whole boom period the banner of unionism dragged in the mud and only sporadic departmental walkouts kept the flame alive.

Early in 1933 hell began to pop. Strike followed strike with bewildering rapidity. The long exploited, too long patient auto slaves were getting tired of the game. The year started off with a bang with the Briggs Body strike on January 11, the Motor Product girls on January 20, the Hayes Body at Grand Rapids on January 21, the complete tie-up of the four Detroit Briggs plants on January 23 and 24, the Murray Body workers on January 27, the Hudson Body workers on February 7, the Hudson production workers the following day, the Toledo Willys-Overland workers on February 26. The Chevrolet strike in Oakland, California, and the White Motor Company walkout in Cleveland finish the chronology for the spring and summer.

On September 22 the Mechanics Educational Society pulled out the tool and die makers at Buick, Chevrolet, A. C. Sparkplug and Flint Fisher Body. It spread to Cadillac, Chevrolet, Dodge, Fisher Body, Hudson, Packard, Plymouth, Briggs Vernor Highway, Ternstedt, Murray, Pontiac and G. M. Truck. The production workers at Murray walked out September 27, Henry Ford faced his first strikes September 26 at Chester, Pa. and again two days later at Edgewater, N. J. The Kenosha, Wis., employees of the Nash Motor Company went to bat on November 9, and the more than 4,000 workers at Budd Mfg. Co. in Philly followed suit on November 13.

A pretty good year on the whole, for a great open shop industry. There was an immediate stop to wage cutting. Improved conditions were forced in all Detroit plants. "Dead time" was abolished. The auto workers were learning fast.

The first movement was a chaotic and many-sided surge of revolt. All sorts of local groups and organizations came into being, led strikes, played a rôle in the developing situation. The Industrial Workers of the World, the C. P.'s Auto Workers Union, an organization called the American Industrial Association and many others had their day in the sun. In April 33 the independent Mechanics Educational Society had been organized and had gone out in a spectacular campaign of organization among the tool and die men. By October the M.E.S. had a picket line in front of every auto factory in Detroit except Ford and Graham-Paige. Its first convention in February 1934 approved the organization of a production workers' department and heard reports to show a total membership of some 25,000 in a number of centers. Of all the independent formations the M.E.S. is the only one which has maintained itself as a real force in the industry.

The American Federation of Labor played no leading part in the initial stages of the strike wave. As late as June 1933 there was not a single union of auto workers affiliated with the Federation. In the last half of that year, however, the Federation devoted a great deal of attention to the industry and the auto workers poured into the Federal locals which were formed. The caliber of the organizers was in most cases very low. The few progressives who were sent in found themeselves tremendously handicapped by the craft union question. Workers wanted to know whether the local industrial organizations which were set up would later be united into a national industrial union of auto workers or whether the A. F. of L. would attempt to break them up into craft divisions. The organizers themselves didn't know. All sorts of conflicting orders came from headquarters, but when it came down to an actual jurisdictional fight with the Machinists, for example, it was noted that the craft union always won out. At the time the auto lords began the large scale organization of company unions. All the usual stunts were used to force these phony formations down the throats of the workers. The elaborate spy systems were put to work. The Hudson Industrial Association, for example, was formed in August. The general manager and foremen instructed the men to come. The laws were made for them when they came to the meeting. Only about 150 men took part but the foremen and supervisors were active in putting the idea over. Every new employee automatically is enrolled in the company union. Out in South Bend, Ind., when a worker was hired at the Bendix Brake factory he signed an application that he was "voluntarily" joining the Bendix Employees Association which met once a week while everybody was at work.

Unionization continued. More strikes broke out. The auto workers wanted action on a national scale and the agitation for a general strike to force union recognition grew by leaps and bounds. It was claimed that well over 60,000 were enrolled in the A. F. of L. Finally, forced into action, the Federation chiefs set March 20 as the day on which the auto workers of the nation were to strike and deliver a death-blow at company unionism and industrial autocracy.

March 25 is a famous day in the annals of motor labor. On that date the A. F. of L. chieftains accepted a "settlement" offered by President Roosevelt, which settled nothing. It set up a special board for the industry which was to solve all its problems, stop discrimination and guarantee collective bargaining. The general strike was called off to the accompaniment of loud victory yells by the union leaders.

The M.E.S.A. called out 4,000 tool and die workers. Cleveland, St. Louis, Flint, Racine, Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Tarrytown, N. Y. saw walkouts by Federal locals. A conference of three hundred representatives of A. F. of L. auto unions held April 8, heard the sharpest criticism of the actions of the new Labor Board and a new strike vote was narrowly averted by the Federation representative. And on April 13 the great Toledo strike broke loose and brought down the entire house of cards so elaborately constructed by the Administration and the N.R.A.

There has been grumbling and dissatisfaction ever since. The A. F. of L. lost a good many members but still remained the greatest force in the industry. The auto bosses took advantage of the situation to clap on the speedup worse than ever. Labor provisions of the automobile code were laughed at and active unionists were fired right and left for organization activity. The industry paid its workers an annual wage averaging less than $900.

Labor had looked to the Automobile Labor Board to protect it against discrimination by the auto bosses but even the union officialdom who put it over have had to admit its ineffectiveness. The report of the A. F. of L. executive to the last convention complains that "the Board has failed completely to encourage real collective bargaining. . . . Its action in regard to cases of discrimination has been slow and has lacked definiteness. The Board has proceeded on the assumption that all questions . . . could and should be settled through mediation and arbitration. To this end the Board has consistently refused to make decisions". Less diplomatic but much more to the point was the letter sent by the White Motor Company local union in Cleveland to Dr. Leo Wolman, chairman

of the Board. "It was against the better judgment of our grievance committee," this forthright communication read, "to submit any case to your Board, as past history has shown that many cases . . . have either been sidetracked or biased decisions given. . . . May God forbid that this union ever have any more such moments of weakness."

Labor had been promised an open hearing on the auto code before its expiration on November 3, 1934, hoping thereby to substitute the thirty for the thirty-six hour week and to strike out the hated "merit clause". No hearing was held, the Great White Father Roosevelt renewed the code unchanged, conceding only a commission to study methods of leveling out seasonal peaks and stabilizing employment.

Labor was hot under the collar. The company unions were being pushed with vigor and were being worked into shape by the employers. No other course was left open but to withdraw from the March 25 settlement and in December the A. F. of L. unions in the industry announced that they were no longer bound by the terms of that agreement.

Nor did the announcement of the Board that it would hold elections in the auto plants to determine collective bargaining instruments (a step which it had consistently refused to take), help the situation. The workers were to be polled and all organizations were to be represented on a collective bargaining agency according to the number of votes polled by each. The bonafide unions claimed that this was a recognition of company unionism, that it meant sowing such confusion and division among the workers that collective bargaining would be a farce. Both the A. F. of L. and the M.E.S.A. instructed their members to boycott the first election held under this plan at the Cadillac plant recently.

* * * *

Here the situation stands today. After two years of fighting the unions are just as far away from recognition as they were in the beginning. The efforts of the N.R.A. have not led to a solution. The sole effect has been to put off the issue, to dampen the militancy of labor, to give the employing group the time and the opportunity to rebuild their badly shattered company union fences. There can be no doubt that the situation is coming to a head. What are the forces in the situation? Is labor in shape to put up a battle? Can it depend on assistance in allied industries and from the American Federation of Labor itself? Here are some of the factors involved.

The United Automobile Workers of the A. F. of L.: It was reported to the 1934 convention of the Federation (held in October) that 106 federal unions existed in the industry, and that these locals were in every major plant in the country. The number of members has been estimated all the way from sixty thousand to one hundred thousand though it is probable that the smaller number comes nearest to the truth. Last June saw the establishment of a national council of auto workers to coördinate activities. The leadership was placed in the hands of the A. F. of L. representative Collins, who has since been withdrawn because of his complete inefficiency and helplessness in the situation. The recent Federation convention voted to grant the auto locals an international union charter, with the provision, however that the Federation maintain its leadership of the organization for an indefinite period. A movement began in the spring of 1934 on the part of a number of locals, especially in the St. Louis-Kansas City sector, to withdraw from the A. F. of L. and to form another national organization. Most of them, however, subsequently reaffiliated.

The Mechanics Educational Society of America: This large independent union has a strong hold on the key tool and die workers. Organized by radical and progressive elements, it has known how to carry on spectacular and effective campaigns and strikes and today numbers its membership in the neighborhood of 25,000. Originally organized for machinists only it went out for the production men in 1934. Its recent trend has been all the other way, unfortunately, and instead of building itself as *the* union of the auto workers it has become more and more craft-conscious, organizing machinists in sewing machine factories, instrument and radio plants. At present the M.E.S. lives chiefly on the memory of its past, although it still holds tremendous potential strength. No reliable news has come from Cleveland where the organization is holding its convention, as I write. It is doubtful however, that the sharp turn and the new start that is necessary, will be made.

Other organizations: Most of the smaller grouplets have vanished from the scene. The I.W.W., the American Industrial Association, and the Auto Workers Union have been unable to stand the competition. In August 1934, the Hudson Motor Company local broke away from the Federation to organize the Associated Automobile Workers of America. Its leader, Arthur E. Greer, has given evidence of company union leanings but the break can be attributed directly to the conservatism and the do-nothing policy of the A. F. of L. leadership. Greer is lined up with Richard Byrd, labor's representative on the Auto Labor Board who has split with the A. F. of L. big shots who originally put him there.

Industrial Unionism: This issue is far from settled in spite of the decision of the last A. F. of L. convention to grant an international charter to the Federal unions in the industry. Various craft groups have been active and, since craft feeling is still strong in some groups, have been able to gain some strength. The pattern-makers and machinists, for example, are said to be well entrenched in automobiles.

Such a set-up holds tremendous potentialities for trouble. In the great Toledo strike members of the machinists' union worked all through the fight. This threat to the solidarity of auto labor will never be overcome till the craft groups are forced to give up their jurisdictional rights over craft groups in the industry. In the rubber industry the Federation leadership has installed a fake industrial unionism by which a basic craft structure is given some industrial touches. Any attempt to introduce such a conception into autos must be fought. Complete and thorough-going industrial unionism provides the only answer to the overlords of the industry.

Allied Industries: 1935 should be an especially good year for joint action by unions in the various subsidiary and allied industries. A real blow-up in steel seems likely and the powerful rank and file group of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers has already approved united action with the organizations of labor in coal, autos, glass, etc.

The rubber workers of Akron face a crisis also. Their request for Labor Board elections to determine the collective bargaining agency for the industry, has been dragged into the courts by the companies. They know from the experiences of other unions that a long drawn out court battle must inevitably kill the morale of the workers and weaken the hold of organized labor. There can be no evasion of the issues. The existence of unionism in the great tire factories is at stake.

The recent convention of the Mechanics Educational Society went on record for joint action with all labor organizations in the metal industry, thus aiding the movement for a concerted organization and strike drive. One of the most important tasks facing the auto workers is that of getting together with the unions in steel, rubber, glass and some sections of the metal and machinery industry. Such a united phalanx of labor would be an irresistible force.

Will the A. F. of L. Help? The national textile strike showed the futility of looking to the international unions of the Federation for financial or other help. In that great conflict only four unions —the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Hat and Cap, and the United Mine Workers —helped out with money or organizers. The large and wealthy craft organizations have no interest in helping to make the industrial unions of the unskilled and the semi-skilled, strong. The auto workers cannot depend on them.

There is, however, another source of aid for the auto workers. According to the constitution of the A. F. of L., the Federal unions are assessed regularly for a central defense fund which is supposed to be used for strikes or lockouts. Last year the Federal organizations paid in $133,615 to this fund while only $1,084 was expended. At the A. F. of L. convention the fund was reported to have reached over $460,000 and was growing at the rate of about $12,000 per month. It is certainly the job of the auto workers to see that the Federation shells out when the fight comes.

The Progressives: It is hard to say just what the strength of the militant forces in the industry amounts to. At the conference held last June which formed the National Auto Workers Council, the A. F. of L. leadership put over an arrangement by which the

National Chairman of the Council was to be appointed by William Green. A hard fight by militant elements, however, rolled up about 50 votes in opposition. There is no doubt that considerable progressive sentiment exists. A number of auto delegates to the last Federation convention introduced resolutions on unemployment and social insurance, on industrial unionism, remission of dues for unemployed, etc. A conference of delegates representing 18 local unions, held early in November in Flint, Michigan, called for the immediate formation of a genuine industrial union under control of its membership.

Another advance was made by the auto unionists of Toledo, Ohio, when the old guard leadership which had sabotaged the strike, fought the militants and kept the union down, was forced to resign. A progressive administration has taken its place and is going places fast.

* * * *

The overlords of motordom have issued hallelujah statements about the prospects for the coming year. Production is to be higher than last year or the year before that. Profits are going up. Labor is going to embrace the employee representative plans which the kindly cut-throats have set up for its special benefit.

"Not much!" says organized labor. Karl LORE

The End of the Naval Truce

THE FIRST international truce for the fixation of naval armaments among the imperialist powers at ratios corresponding to the relation of forces a decade ago, has come to its inevitable end. Theoretically Japan's denunciation of the Washington Naval Pact of 1922 will dissolve the pact only in 1936; actually the preparations for the fierce, relentless race to win naval supremacy as the preliminary to the second world war, are already under way. The gigantic cartels operating on an international scale are compelled periodically to sign temporary agreements allocating the world's markets for their mutual benefit. Just so are the national imperialist states forced to resort to diplomatic pacts which, at bottom, grant recognition of the existing division of the world into colonies and spheres of influence belonging to the various capitalist powers. And just as the competing trusts and combines cast aside their agreements the moment they feel that changed conditions permit a greater share of the world market to be wrested from their opponents by a renewal of open warfare; so the truce among the powers is broken the moment the opportunity presents itself to one or more of the imperialist robbers to seize new, undivided territory or to redivide the old at the expense of a weakening competitor. Thus the ending of the naval truce is an additional portent of the nearness of imperialist war.

The Washington "covenant" of 1922 was in reality a treaty that postponed the second world war that already threatened the moment the first had ceased. That war ended in defeat for Europe, victors and vanquished alike, and victory for America. German imperialism came out of the war completely bankrupt and crushed for a long time to come; but British finance capital likewise emerged so much weakened by the struggle that it could no longer maintain its position as sole master of the seas. The American colossus, taking advantage of the entire world situation during the war, had furthered its own exploiting interests at such high speed that it had been transformed in a few short years from a debtor nation still absorbing capital from abroad to develop its productive powers, to a domineering creditor with a total foreign investment almost equalling that of British imperialism. U. S. capitalism had secured an iron grip on the world's trade and it meant—indeed as a matter of life and death—to keep and to strengthen its hold. But in a robbers' world in which the advanced capitalist nations ruthlessly exploit the weaker and more backward ones, the possibility of squeezing enormous profits out of the populations of the remotest corners of the earth depends in the last analysis not merely on capitalist technique but on military and naval strength to defend one's conquests against other robbers. On this score American imperialism, under the leadership then of Wilson, had no illusions and had begun its preparations for the next war even before entering the first.

The first explicit notice that American imperialism was definitely embarked on a course leading to world hegemony, was given to the world by the "1916 program" proposed by Wilson and Daniels for the construction of "incomparably the best navy in the world". This program contemplated the laying down of such super-dreadnoughts that all the other navies in the world would have been rendered immediately obsolete. In naval warfare—the determining factor in all modern wars being control of the sea lanes—the things that count are the size and range of the floating batteries, the speed of motion which enables the choice of range of action, and the ability to stand punishment as incorporated in the thickness and arrangement of armor. The battleships planned by the naval arm of American imperialism in 1916 would have outclassed all existing ships in these respects. But before the appropriations already made by Congress could be expended, the U. S. had entered the war and the 1916 program was temporarily shelved. Wilson was too well aware however that the income of the big American bankers was "scattered broadcast over the ocean" in ship bottoms to abandon his goal. Hence in 1919 his message to Congress just before sailing to the Paris Peace Conference stated: "I take it for granted that the Congress will carry out the naval program which was undertaken before we entered the war." The 1919 program as outlined by Secretary Daniels stunned the world. In three years time the U. S. was to lay down and to complete as much as possible ten super-dreadnoughts, six battle cruisers, ten scout cruisers and one hundred and thirty other ships. Nor was this to be the end, for a second three year program was in store after the first.

Under the reign of imperialism the armaments of any single capitalist power are either actually or potentially weapons aimed at all the others. The two powers that felt most keenly the threat of U. S. capitalism were naturally Japan and England. The latter was being challenged openly and directly for supremacy on the seas. Despite the fact that at the end of the war the British possessed a fleet far greater than the fleets of all the rest of the world combined, their navy was far too costly to be maintained during peace by a nation on the verge of bankruptcy. And besides the new American battleships would render powerless by their size, speed and concentration of fire, the largest fighting ships in the English fleet. Japan knew that the new fleet was intended to solve the first immediate and primary problem of American imperialism: mastery of the Pacific for the exploitation of the vast Chinese market and the control of Asia. The world has moved since pre-war days, but all that has changed within the ring of capitalist powers are the major rivals in the coming war and the main scene of battle. The technique and the productive powers of American capitalism are the most advanced in the world, but to use to full advantage its mighty forces, fettered by the national boundaries and by the present division of world markets, it is pushed inevitably towards war, and war first of all against aggressive Japanese imperialism. The Japanese ruling class had, like America, taken full advantage of its opportunities while its rivals were helpless to resist, and had fastened the chains of colonial dependency on China, besides invading Siberia for similar purposes. The future of American capitalism was at stake and in the crisis of 1919 to 1921 war seemed imminent and was openly predicted.

In the face of the immediate threat of war neither Japan nor England, despite their financial straits, could afford to permit America's challenge to go unheeded. Hence began a naval race in comparison with which the Anglo-German building program of 1907-1914 appeared the veriest bagatelle. As against the six largest ships already partly laid down by America, Japan in its eight-eight program proposed to construct eight battleships partly equal to and partly greater in tonnage and superior in arms to the American ships. England planned to lay down twelve vessels, four of which were to incorporate all the lessons of the battle of Jutland and to be the largest dreadnoughts afloat—fifty thousand tons. Nor was the race confined to this one category of ships for it extended to cruisers, aircraft carriers, and to the scouting and screening boats so essential to modern fleets in order to give maximum mobility

and effectiveness to the dreadnoughts. By the middle of July 1921 the naval race was in full swing on a far more stupendous scale than in pre-war days. The three major powers had building or projected, thirty-six of the largest fighting vessels ever conceived, to cost a total of one and a quarter billion gold dollars.

The naval race was not confined solely to the construction of bigger and better ships. Warfare, whether on land or on sea, is an affair of positions and such positions are all the more important in the case of a vast trackless waste like the Pacific Ocean. Navies are limited in action by the need for refueling and repair (particularly after a battle) to a specific cruising radius from a base of operations. In the first world war this radius was about five hundred miles but the change to oil fuel and the increase in size of ships has extended the radius of action so that it is put today at three times that distance. What counts in naval warfare is security of the base of operations and safety and freedom of communications. Thus to secure itself against the breaking of its lines of communication with its colonies in the East, England has a whole string of powerfully fortified bases—Gibraltar, Malta, Port Said, Aden, Ceylon, Rangoon and now Singapore and Colombo. American imperialism has reached out into the Pacific to build a string of bases towards China and Asia. In the period preceding the Washington Conference the U. S. began to fortify its possessions closest to the Asian mainland, Guam and Manila, and to strengthen the bases of Hawaii and Samoa. But what aroused the greatest apprehension in Japan was the attempt to lease from China the coast of Fukien province to establish a base directly on the mainland itself. It is clear from statements in the Japanese press that had this lease been accomplished, Japan was prepared to declare war at once.

The direct naval expenditures of the United States had more than trebled after the war. American capitalism was prepared to spend more in a few years of arming than Germany had spent in a quarter of a century. And yet as a result, unless it were prepared to continue the race indefinitely at increasing cost, it would have been left with a second-rate fleet, outclassed by the English and Japanese navies. Furthermore, despite the reservation made by England in the Anglo-Japanese Alliance concerning the U. S., there was every reason for America to fear that its fleet would have to encounter the combined naval forces of these two rivals. Again the Panama Canal put a limit on the size of battleship useful for the time being to America. When Admiral Fisher first projected the modern dreadnought for the English navy, Germany had been forced to widen the Kiel Canal at enormous expense to allow passage to the new ships. Similarly the Panama Canal could not be used for the passage of battleships the size of the new Japanese and English ones. That is one strong reason for the revival of the old plan for a Nicaragua Canal. All in all, these factors, combined with the economic situation after the war, forced America to seek a truce and to bide its time. The Washington Conference was the result. It provided a breathing spell during which the powers could gather new strength for the inevitable struggle to come.

If Japan now appears as the imperialist force ready to start the naval race anew, it is because the Japanese militarists feel themselves in the most favorable position to carry out their policies of subjugating China and wresting the maritime provinces from the Soviet Union. Japan controls Manchuria, the "historic road of invasion into China". The Chinese revolution is at its lowest ebb. Time can only aid Soviet Russia and China, not Japan. Furthermore the internal situation in Japan itself is so desperate that the militarists are driven to seek a "solution" in war. That this would be the attitude of the Japanese ruling class was clear to the powers in advance. Hence they have not waited for the actual denunciation of the Pact to commence preparations for the next war. England began some time ago the feverish construction of added facilities and fortifications at Singapore, first begun in 1923. Japan is ready with her submarine bases strung out along the string of mandated islands in the Pacific. America has strengthened her bases in Pearl Harbor and Cavite. All countries are laying in vast stores of technical supplies and working their munitions plants three shifts a day.

The immediate answer given by the United States to Japan was the sending of the entire fleet into the Northern Pacific for a "war game". This game involves the most stupendous naval force ever known in history with its 177 warships and its 154 war planes. It is engaged in working out the strategy and tactics of the War of the Pacific. Evidently that strategy will avoid the dangerous passage directly west from the United States and will concentrate on an approach from the Aleutian Islands and along the coast of Siberia. The Aleutian Islands are 1,500 miles from the tip of Japan. American capitalism is determined to risk war for the sake of its future. For it is not only the Chinese market that is involved. Once American can secure a base of operations on the mainland of Asia—and this it can only acquire by defeating Japan in war—it can then proceed to oust its greatest competitor, England, from China and from Southern Asia. For though the immediate problem for American imperialism to solve is the replacement of Japanese domination in China by its own, its main problem remains of breaking up the British Empire in order to secure the redivision for its own benefit of the markets of the world now kept closed to it. The conquest of Asia by America would leave England in an almost completely exposed position in the East despite Singapore, so that the U. S. could then proceed to attack India from a direction most open to attack.

When the Philippines were seized from Spain the revolt of the natives did not cease but redoubled in intensity against the new conqueror. We may expect a similar occurrence in China, if America defeats Japan. This conflict between American imperialism and the exploited Chinese may very well develop during the war itself. In either case it will be the task of the American Marxists to lead the American working class in opposing the imperialist war for plunder, in giving every assistance to the oppressed Chinese workers and peasants in their desperate fight to throw off the yoke not only of Japanese but of the American imperialists. A defeat of American capitalism by the proletarian revolution at home, by the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war, would have the most far-reaching consequences on the entire situation in the East, now filled with the promise of untold misery for the masses, and throughout the entire world. War is a game of politics, of capitalist politics in wars for plunder. The workers must practise proletarian politics during war as during peace. Our tasks are not those of the ruling class for they involve first and foremost the forcible overthrow of that ruling class. We are opposed to the ruling class in all its policies at every stage because in solving its problems abroad it also solves the major problem of maintaining its exploitation of the working class at home. Our appeal must be to the sailors, to teach them the true meaning of the imperialist war, to enlighten them as to the rôle cut out for them. We must exemplify the meaning of naval war through such affairs as the Battles of Tsushima and Jutland with their appalling loss of life. In modern naval battles, despite the size of ship and the strength of armor and the use of all kinds of safety devices, the largest ships are snuffed out with startling suddennes. It was Winston Churchill who spoke of modern gunfire, of naval salvos, as the use of sledge-hammers to smash eggshells. We must prove to the sailors as to the workers that this is not their war, that it is in reality a war directed against them.

The naval truce has ended and the new armaments race is on. There will unquestionably be further negotiations, further veering and tacking in the attempt to foster illusions among the masses at home by a propaganda of justification for the murderous course pursued by the capitalist class. Under the guise of "disarmament" each of the powers presents schemes involving its own interests and defense. Japan would like to secure limits of size of ships so that she could feel safe from attack by the American fleet. America would like to limit the tonnage and the size of submarines permitted to Japan in order to feel greater safety for a fleet operating at great distances from naval bases. All this propaganda must be exposed for what it is and the reality of the approaching war made manifest to the workers. The naval race is the prelude to war. Down with imperialist war!

Jack WEBER

WE REGRET that technical difficulties made it impossible to include in this issue an article originally planned by us for the anniversary, namely, one dealing with the relations between Lenin and Luxemburg. It will appear in February.

Marx's Criticism of 'True Socialism'

MARX'S criticism of "true socialism" was motivated primarily by his opposition to the political tactics of the "true socialists", the ultra-revolutionary strategy which controlled it, and the philosophical rationalizations they offered in its support. We shall not concern ourselves here with the special historical circumstances of the political struggles but with the principles with which Marx approached them—principles which have a scope and validity much wider than the particular milieu in which they originally arose. The philosophical constructions of the "true socialists" have shown a greater vitality than their politics. Like most of the theories Marx contended against, they have turned up again and again in different historical situations, tricked out in new phrases and flounces, for all the world fresh and unravished by criticism. Their systematic exposition and analysis may serve to illustrate the Marxian criticism of the *type* of view they illustrate. In any concrete case the specific meaning of these doctrines depends upon the historical context in which they function but the general logic of the argument can be considered in relative independence of the particular historical situation.

1. *Intransigeant Theory and Reactionary Practise.* Despite widespread opinion to the contrary, Marx and Engels were never doctrinaries. Clear about their principles, they never sought to force them upon a movement if such action threatened to disrupt or paralyze the forces which had been assembled for a common action. "Every step towards a real movement," Marx once wrote, "is more important than a dozen programs." More important not because principles are unimportant—for without correct principles action is blind—but because principles which were not taken up by mass movements and linked to immediate interests are ineffectual. Behind this view was a deeper conception of what a principle is. On many occasions Marx and Engels maintained against those who talked nothing but principles that "communism is not a doctrine but a movement. It starts not from principles but from *facts*". (*Gesamtausgabe*, I, 6, p. 294.) What they meant was simply that social and political principles express the real situations in which men find themselves and the needs of those situations. To transfer principles which express the felt needs of masses of people from one historical situation, to another in which class forces and relations are quite different, is to make abstractions of these principles. No matter how revolutionary those principles may originally have been, once they become abstractions imported from without *into* a different situation, they invariably help reaction rather than hinder it.

This was the case with the "true socialists", many of whom were so radical that for years they were the comrades-in-arms of Marx and Engels. The revolutionary socialism of the French proletariat had developed in the course of the struggle of the French workers against the bourgeoisie which had been firmly entrenched in power since 1830. In Germany, however, the bourgeoisie far from having attained power was objectively the most dangerous foe of the existing government. The ultra-revolutionary "true socialists", however, had read the literature of French socialism to some purpose. They attacked the German bourgeoisie with the greatest vigor and in the name of socialism opposed all the liberal reforms as half-measures designed to strengthen the position of the bourgeoisie at the costs of the working class. In Marx's eyes they were obstructing a real mass movement against the semi-feudal Prussian régime and lending objective aid and comfort to the reactionaries. The reactionary press actually used their denunciations of the bourgeoisie as evidence that the workers themselves were opposed to "immoral" liberalism.

Marx and Engels did not of course believe that the bourgeoisie should not be criticized and their theoretical hypocrisies exposed. But they held that the chief emphasis of the criticism should fall upon the reactionary *status quo* in Germany, and that the criticism of the bourgeoisie should be of such a nature that none but those who were more radical than the bourgeoisie could use it. "Our attack upon the bourgeoisie," wrote Engels, "distinguishes itself as much from that of the true socialists as it does from that of the reactionary nobility, e.g., of the French legitimists or of young England. The German *status quo* cannot exploit our attack because it is directed even more strongly against it than against the bourgeoisie. If the bourgeoisie is, so to speak, our *natural* enemy whose overthrow will bring our party to power, the German *status quo* is much more our enemy because it stands between us and the bourgeoisie and prevents us from coming to grips with the bourgeoisie. That is why we do not in the least exclude ourselves from the oppositional mass movement against the German *status quo*. We constitute only its most advanced faction—a faction which through its unconcealed *arrière-pensée* against the bourgeoisie assumes a definite position." (*Gesamtausgabe*, I, 6, p. 234.)

In the course of their criticism of the "true socialists", Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasize the dangers of the over-simple classifications which the "true socialists" made of class forces and oppositions in Germany. As opposed to the "true socialists" who saw only three classes struggling for power—the landed nobility, the industrialists, and the workers—they stress the greater complexity and diversity of social stratifications. They make not only the distinctions indicated above but many others just as relevant to the formulation of realistic political policy. They recognize the social importance, because of the special interests involved, of the landlords who have heavy holdings in industry, of the free peasant, of the peasants still in feudal ties, of the officialdom, of the petty bourgeoisie, of the handworker, and demonstrate that the demands of the bourgeoisie, if granted, carry with them the possibility of a *partial* and *temporary* fulfillment of the immediate needs of all groups except the feudal landlords and bureaucratic officialdom. (*Ibid.* p. 243.) The bourgeoisie in the struggle for democracy against reaction must be supported even by communists. Any other attitude, no matter how principled it may appear and no matter how sincere its proponents, is political madness which aids reaction.

2. *Socialism by Education or Socialism by Struggle.* It was not only against the politics of the "true socialists" that Marx and Engels took the field. They objected to the way they expressed the ideals of socialism and the methods they stressed as necessary for its realization. The "true socialists" believed that socialism could be achieved by educational enlightenment and the dissemination of culture. Socialism was presented as a cultural demand with only a casual reference to the economic facts which made that demand both possible and reasonable. The driving forces for the organization of socialists were to be humanitarian, æsthetic and moral. Starting from the proposition that "the true (or ideal) man is an harmonious creature", they deduced the organizational schemes of socialism—as well as its right and might—from a knowledge of human nature. According to this Platonic conception, social systems were to be judged by their capacity to further the realization of self-harmony for the great masses. Capitalism of course is condemned out of hand as a barbaric throwback compared to which even feudalism is a human and sensible social order. What are called the economic necessities of society and the needs of economic development can only be understood as indicating the ethical direction of social activity. A conscious and clearly formulated ethical philosophy is, therefore, of primary importance for the revolutionary movement.

The ethical ideals of socialism, supported on the fixed basis of true human nature, are to penetrate the masses by organized educational effort. "There is only one way," wrote Lüning, "to make the proletariat conscious of their humanity, that is through the organization of education." All the fundamental assumptions behind this position were challenged by Marx and Engels—the assumptions concerning human nature, the nature of morality, the character and efficacy of education. A great many of the criticisms directed against the "true socialists" on these points were intended for Feuerbach and conversely. We shall therefore postpone detailed consideration of Marx's views until we discuss his relation to Feuerbach. But here a brief indication of the drift and impact of their criticism can be given.

First of all, Marx and Engels insist that the human nature to which the "true socialists" appeal as the guide to social organization is an historical variable. It does not explain society but

society explains its specific expressions. To understand human nature, then, at any definite time we must understand the nature of the society in which human beings live. When we do this we find that human nature is not something homogeneous to which we can appeal for justification of any concrete social proposal. Class divisions, interests, and values enter as refracting and polarizing influences upon it. Failure to understand this leads to an identification of the special psychological type which prevails in a given society with the concept of "man as such"—a familiar phrase in the writings of the "true socialists" and other Feuerbachians. Politically, this failure to make the necessary differentiations leads to the attempt to think in terms of the "public", "the community", "the nation", and blurs the clash of interests in a vague formula interpretable in opposite ways. Whether aware of it or not, the lucubrations of the "true socialists" which they addressed to all classes really celebrated the virtues of the progressive-peace-and-comfort-loving citizen. In the *Communist Manifesto,* Marx accuses "true socialism" "of proclaiming the German nation to be the normal nation and the German philistine to be the normal man". (*Gesamtausgabe,* I, 6, p. 552.)

Secondly, the arguments which Marx urged against Stirner's abstract morality he turns against the "true socialists". Where Stirner had glorified selfishness, Hess and his followers had preached unselfishness. Marx points out that selfishness and unselfishness are in themselves neither virtues nor vices. The social context and content of psychological impulses give them their moral quality. The concrete *needs* of the working-class must be the point of departuref or its morality. Conventionally, this may appear to be selfishness but it is only through its self-assertion as a class that a decent life can be won for the individual members of the class, and ultimately, for all individuals. Where the concrete needs are not sufficiently stressed the invocation to selflessness, to humanity, weakens the immediate struggles of the class, leads to concern over the enemy's "soul" and to despair about one's own. Marx comments very bitterly on the religion of self-abasement implied in Kriege's words: "We have more important things to do than to worry about our miserable selves: we belong to humanity."*

"With this infamous and disgusting servility towards a 'self' which is distinguished and separated from 'humanity'—and which is therefore nothing more than a metaphysical and even religious fiction—with this certainly 'miserable' slavish degradation, this religion like all others, ends. Such a doctrine which preaches crawling and self-contempt is perfectly fitted for brave—*monks,* but never for energetic men especially in times of struggle." (*Gesamtausgabe,* I, 6, p. 18.)

It was not the fact that the "true socialists" spoke in the name of morality which led Marx to oppose them but the *nature* of the morality they professed—a morality which was timeless and placeless, that dealt in injunctions which were never specific and turned men's attention away from the determining social forces of human behavior.

Thirdly, when the "true socialists" spoke of the necessity of organizing the education of the working class they seemed to imply that socialism as a fully formed theoretical doctrine was to be carried into the working class from without almost in the same way in which the apostles brought Christianity to the women and slaves of Rome. Again, it was not their stress on education but on the kind of education which was at fault. And the kind of education they advocated followed from the kind of socialism they believed in. Since the realization of socialism was conceived to be the task of all enlightened people and not particularly the special job of the working classes, there was no provision for linking up socialist teachings with their daily life and struggles. Since the appeal was to the "good sense", "reason" and "conscience" of humanity, it "condemned the destructive tendencies of communism and proclaimed its impartial detachment towards all class struggles" (Marx). Since the social question was first and last an ethical question, the "socialist" education of the "true socialists" dwelt not upon the objective tendencies of social development, which Marx and Engels taught were the basis of revolutionary program and practise, but upon the miserable and inhuman consequences of capitalist production. It turned the attention of the German workers and petty bourgeoisie not to the mechanisms of social institutions but to the individuals who were most prominently identified with them. It dealt with the individual motives of the kings of politics and finance; it encouraged the hopes that their humanity would triumph over their greed for profit and power.

Already in his controversy with Bruno Bauer, Marx had settled with this kind of education but whereas Bauer was engaged in propaganda for social enlightenment in general, Hess and his friends were convinced that socialism as a specific form of social enlightenment could be effectively propagated in this way. Marx and Engels had the greatest respect for the French Utopians from whom the "true socialists" borrowed many of their arguments. But what was already a mistaken point of view in France was doubly mistaken when reasserted in a different country a generation later. Since "true socialism" was not only a political movement but a literary one as well, Marx and Engels were compelled to follow them into *belles-lettres* to expose the mis-education wrapped up in their fragrant metaphors.* Engels' criticism of Karl Beck's *Lieder vom armen Mann* may serve as illustration of the themes the "true socialist" poets selected, how they developed them and the point of view from which the critical analysis was made.

In his poems Beck sung about the cares and trials of "the poor man", "the little man" and called the rich men—the Rothschilds of the day—to account for existing social misery. But there was no inkling of the real source of the trouble in any of his writings. Pitiful appeals alternated with empty threats to those whom Beck, together with the other "true socialists", held personally responsible for the course of German economic life. *A propos* of Beck's opening poem *An das Haus Rothschild* Engels writes:

"Right off in his ouverture, he reveals his petty bourgeois illusions that gold 'rules according to Rothschild's caprice'; an illusion which carries with it a whole series of fantastic misconceptions about the power of the House of Rothschild.

"The poet does not threaten the destruction of the real power of Rothschild, the social foundation upon which it rests; he merely desires that it be applied in a human way. He complains that bankers are not socialistic philanthropists, dreamers or purveyors of human happiness, but just bankers. Beck celebrates the cowardly petty bourgeois *misère,* sings of the 'poor man', the *pauvre honteaux* with his miserable, pious and inconsequential wishes, of the 'little man' in all his forms but not of the proud, threatening and revolutionary proletariat. The reproaches and threats with which Beck overwhelms the House of Rothschild . . . rest upon childish illusions concerning the power of the Rothschilds, upon an entire lack of knowledge of the connection between this power and the existing situation, and a complete misconception of the means which the Rothschilds had to use to become and remain a power." (*Gesamtausgabe,* I, 6, p. 33.)

Socialist education for Marx and Engels had to be based upon a knowledge of the fundamental economic tendencies which determined the social existence and conditions of life of the proletariat.

Otherwise they were likely to be infected by all sorts of Utopian illusions peddled by "well-wishing" representatives of other classes. But more important, such education must be acquired in the struggles and battles of the class war. The class struggle is not a doctrine but the school in which doctrines arise, are tested and used or discarded. The working class not only becomes conscious of itself in these struggles, but it changes and reëducates itself by its revolutionary practise.

3. *Nature, All-Too-Peaceful-Nature.* The ethical ideals of the "true socialists" flowed from their conception of a peaceful and harmoniously developed human nature. The model for this human nature was physical nature, especially in its peaceful modes. A diluted and vulgarized Spinozism was propagated as the chief philosophical support of this ethical and social theory. The organic bonds by which the totality of existence was held together in a mystic unity could serve, once they are recognized, as the ties of social life. The *feeling* of natural kinship between man and world without, experienced when we recall the physical conditions of our origin and of our achievements, establishes its existence. That

*"*Wir haben noch etwas mehr zu tun als für unser lumpiges Selbst zu sorgen: wir gehören der Menschheit."*

*Marx in *Die deutsche Ideologie* and Engels in a series of articles in the *Deutschen Brüsseler Zeitung,* entitled "German Socialism in Verse and Prose".

kinship is a metaphysical fact which holds, since men are part of nature, for human relationships, too. A false education has obscured this feeling and clouded our consciousness with artificial distinctions. We need only reflect, however, upon those qualities which have always been regarded as social virtues to see that they presuppose a fundamental unity between man and man, and man and nature.

All sorts of arguments were adduced by the "true socialists" to win support for this sugary natural piety. Even formal logic was laid under toll. For did it not teach that differences between species could only be made on the basis of a *common* genus? And that any distinction between man and nature therefore presupposed their fundamental unity? Was not this the central theme of Hegel's expositions of the socially organized Absolute? Was it not the abiding spiritual insight of Christianity which stressed the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God or Nature? "See the lilies in the field!" And does not science bring daily proof that man cannot set himself up against nature or seek peace by flight to a supernatural realm? "Has not man arisen," asked the "true socialists" in the *Rheinischen Jahrbücher,* "out of a primal world, is he not a creature of nature like all others? Is he not built out of the *same* stuff and endowed with the *same* general powers and qualities which animate *all* things?"

Marx's response to this mysticism reduces itself to two simple points. First, he denies that nature is as peaceful as the "true socialists" seem to think and protests against the tendency to make of the term "unnatural" an ethical category. Strictly speaking, nature is what it is discovered to be and nothing can be dismissed as unnatural. Secondly, whatever the facts of nature may be which make social life possible, it is a mistake to regard man and man's consciousness from the point of view of what they have in common with everything else. When this is done we get a false conception of man and his mind, with all the important things left out; human beings are considered to be natural bodies, and the self-consciousness of man is transformed into "the self-consciousness of nature". This constitutes respectively the first steps towards mechanical materialism or absolute idealism. The "true socialists" take them both and the mélange of materialistic Hegelianism and idealistic Spinozism is the philosophical result.

A) That nature is not as peaceful as the kind-hearted "true socialists" believed, Marx has little difficulty in proving. In the face of the manifest facts of natural cruelty or rather the indifference of nature to peace or war, the illusions of the "true socialists" can be explained only as the pathetic fallacy of reading their ideals of what society *should* be into natural processes. "See the lilies in the fields!" "Yes," comments Marx sarcastically, "see the lilies in the field, how they are chewed by the goats, transplanted by 'men' to the lapels of their coats, and how they snap together under the unchaste lovemaking of the cow-girl and donkey boy." (*Gesamtausgabe,* I, 5, p. 456.) The psychological motivation of the apotheosis of natural peace and of the "true socialist" lament that no human society in the past ever modelled itself on the laws of nature, Marx explains as follows:

"Ideas were smuggled into nature which the 'true socialist' wished to see realized in human society. Just as earlier the individual man became the mirror of nature, so now the whole of society. From the ideas smuggled into nature conclusions were drawn bearing upon human society. Since the authors did not concern themselves with the historical development of society and satisfied themselves with this barren analogy, it is not hard to understand why society was not always a faithful picture of nature." (*Ibid,* p. 459.)

This is a significant passage because Marx has been accused of precisely the same intellectual procedure—reading his wishes into the natural world and then adducing the world, as so conceived, as evidence in behalf of his dreams. It is unlikely that any man as critical-minded as Marx would fall a victim to a type of thinking which he so often condemned. Marx's emphasis upon the changing historical patterns of society and his stress upon the transformative effect of struggle show how little he shared the illusions of the "true socialists".

"We would gladly believe that 'all social virtues . . . are derived from the feeling of natural human kinship and unity'. It is well to remember, however, that on the basis of this natural kinship' feudalism, slavery and the social inequality of all epochs, rested. In passing, let us also note that this 'natural human kinship' is an historical product which is constantly being transformed in daily activity. It is always something quite natural no matter how inhuman and unnatural it appears before the tribunal not only of 'man' but of a subsequent revolutionary generation." (*Ibid,* p. 464.)

B) The attribution of what is true of part of nature to the whole of nature, as well as the inferences from one part to another, usually reduces itself to the logical fallacy of the undifferentiated middle-term. Everything that happens to man is in one sense a natural fact but it does not warrant drawing conclusions about Nature as a whole, or about other natural facts, unless an analoguous structure is observable. Social phenomena, for example, may suggest approaching certain natural occurrences with definite categories just as the division of labor observable in human societies may help us discover something about the organization of a colony of bees or ants. But such hypotheses are at best weak and conjectural, and even when they seem to be confirmed, closer examination will generally show significant differences between the behavior patterns of men and those of any other living or nonliving things. All materialistic and idealistic reductions of the totalities of experience to one set of categories whether it be of matter or mind ultimately rest upon the systematic neglect of difference, novelty and uniqueness. What Marx wrote of the "true socialists" in this connection is just as valid against numerous schools of idealism and materialism which have succeeded them. I give only a fragment of his interesting analysis. Speaking of the shift from the term nature in one meaning to nature in another, he writes:

"This whole prologue is a model of naïve philosophical mystification. The true socialist takes his point of departure from the idea that the split between life and happiness must cease. In order to find a proof for this proposition he calls nature to his aid and tries to make it appear that such splits do not exist within it. From this he concludes that since man is likewise a natural body and possesses the general characteristics of bodies, this split ought not to exist for him. With much greater justification could Hobbes derive his *bellum omnium contra omnes* from nature, and Hegel upon whose constructions the true-socialist stands, see in nature the lewd [*liederliche*] moments of the absolute Idea and even refer to the animals as the concrete anxiety of God. After having mystified nature, our true socialist mystifies human consciousness in that he makes it into a 'mirror' of mystified nature. Of course, as soon as ideas which are nothing more than the conceptual form of pious wishes concerning the human relationships of *nature,* are smuggled into the expressions of consciousness, then it follows forthwith that consciousness is only a mirror in which nature sees itself. And just as it was previously established by considering the qualities of man as a natural body, so here by considering his qualities as a merely passive mirror [*blosser, passiver Spiegel*] in which nature comes to consciousness, it is proved that the splits which were read out of nature must be eliminated from the human sphere. . . . 'Man possesses self-consciousnes.' That is the first fact which is expressed. The drives and powers of the particular natural creature are transformed into the drives and power of 'Nature'. They then naturally 'appear' in this creature *particularized.* This mystification was necessary in order to establish later the union of these drives and powers of 'nature' in man's self-consciousness. Herewith the self-consciousness of man was easily transformed into the self-consciousness of nature in him. This mystification undergoes the appearance of being dispersed by the subsequent fact that man takes his revenge upon nature, and because nature finds *its* self-consciousness in him, he seeks his self-consciousness in it—a procedure through which he finds no more in nature than that he has put into it by the above described mystification." (*Gesamtausgabe,* I, 5, p. 456-7.)

4. *Was Marx a "True Socialist"?* We now turn to the comparatively unimportant question whether Marx himself was ever a "true socialist"—a question about which many scholarly disputes have been waged. As distinct from Engels he never called himself a "true socialist". And if "true socialism" be defined politically, he was never within hailing distance of the doctrine. But neither was Engels. Marx on many occasions employed phrases which appeared in the writings of the "true socialists". He did this,

however, not only in the '40's but throughout his life. For example, in the statutes of the First International which he wrote we read that the purposes of the International are: "to acknowledge truth, justice and morality on the basis of conduct . . . towards all men, without regard to color, creed or nationality" (*cf.*, Stekloff, *The First International*, p. 446.). The use of such phrases was permissible, Marx explains in a letter to Engels, because the substance of the doctrine is not obscured by them and some people find their way to a revolutionary position through them. *Suavitur in modo, fortiter in re*, was the principle which guided him when he came into conflict with working class views which were similar to his own. Where he recognized, however, a fundamental difference in point of view, Marx was loath to compromise even on terminology, for fear of obscuring issues. That is why he called himself and his party communist, when the *Manifesto* was written. And when there was a possibility that enemy groups might masquerade with the same phrases that the socialists of the time used, he scrupulously insisted upon the necessary qualifications.

For Marx the essence of "true socialism" was its abstract, classless morality. Neither in his Left-Hegelian nor materialistic phase, then, can he properly be regarded as having been a "true socialist". His opposition to the "true socialists" would not have been so intense if he had not observed the way in which extreme reactionaries were making use of their slogans. The *Rheinischer Beobachter*, for example, a Catholic government sheet, was almost calling itself communist and using the phrases of the "true socialists" in criticizing bourgeois hypocrisy. And those whom Marx in the *Manifesto* calls feudal or tory-socialists were trying to capitalize upon the impressions which the literature of "true socialism" was making on the German public. Of this tory-socialism, Marx wrote: "They waved the beggar's wallet in their hand as a flag in order to get the people behind them. But as often as this took place, the people caught sight of the old feudal coat of arms upon their behinds and dispersed with loud and scornful laughter." (*Gesamtausgabe*, I, 6, p. 546.) It was Marx's consciousness of the fact that the feudal socialists were waving the doctrinal flags of the "true socialists" which gave his words the sharp bite they had whenever he discusses "true socialism". That many of the things he said of Hess were unjustified, Marx's subsequent attitude towards him reveals clearly. But politically, Marx felt it was his revolutionary duty to oppose with all energy those who blocked the possibility of making any gains by the working class, no matter how small, in its struggle for liberation. He did not spare his friends any more than he spared himself. And although he was furious at stupidity, it was not out of intellectual *hauteur* but out of a realization that if correct theories have practical consequences, mistaken theories have no less practical consequences. There were many things that he did not see; but he always saw the implications of doctrines, programs, and sometimes even the choice of words, for the class struggle. It is in this sense that the following passage which treats of the terminological sentimentalities of the "true socialists" must be understood:

"In the real world there exists, on the one side, owners of private property and on the other, a propertyless communist proletariat. This opposition becomes sharper day by day and is heading for a crisis. Consequently, if the theoretical representatives of the proletariat desire to accomplish anything by their literary activity, they must above all get rid of all phrases which weaken the intensity of this opposition, all phrases which glide over the opposition and which offer the bourgeoisie an opportunity, impelled by its sentimental quest for security, to approach the proletariat. All of these bad characteristics we find in the slogans of the true socialists. . . . We are well aware that the communist movement cannot be corrupted by a pair of German phrasemongers. But it is necessary in a country like Germany where philosophical phrases have for centuries had a certain power, and where the absence of the sharp class oppositions which prevail among other nations makes the communist consciousness less militant and decisive—to oppose all phrase-making which waters down and weakens still further the consciousness of the total opposition of communism to the existing world order." (*Gesamtausgabe*, I, 5, p. 453.)

Sidney HOOK

Bureaucratism and Factional Groups

THE QUESTION of groupings and factions in the party has become the pivotal point of the discussion. In view of the intrinsic importance of the question and the extremely sharp form it has taken on, it demands to be treated with perfect clarity. Often enough, however, the question is put in an erroneous manner.

We are the only party in the country and, in the present period of dictatorship, it could not be otherwise. The different needs of the working class, of the peasantry, of the state apparatus and its functionaries, act upon our party, through the medium of which they seek to find political expression. The difficulties and contradictions inherent in our epoch, the temporary discord of interests of various sections of the proletariat, or of the proletariat and the peasantry, act upon the party through the medium of its workers' and peasants' nuclei, of the state apparatus and of the young students. The nuances of opinion, the episodic divergences of view may express the remote pressure of definite social interests and, under certain circumstances, may transform themselves into stable groups. The latter, in turn, may sooner or later take on the form of organized factions which, pitting themselves as such against the rest of the party, are by that token even more subject to external pressure. Such is the logical evolution of groupings in an epoch when the communist party is obliged to monopolize the leadership of political life.

What results ensue? If one does not want factions, there must be no permanent groups; if one does not want permanent groups, temporary groups must be avoided; finally, in order that there be no temporary groups, there must be no differences of opinion, for where there are two opinions, persons inevitably group themselves together. But how, on the other hand, are divergences of view to be avoided in a party of half a million men which directs the country under exceptionally complicated and painful conditions? This is the essential contradiction that resides in the very position of the party of the proletarian dictatorship and from which it is impossible to escape by purely formal procedure alone.

The partisans of the "old course" who vote for the resolution of the Central Committee with the assurance that everything will remain as it was in the past, reason about as follows: Just see, the lid of our apparatus has barely been lifted and already tendencies toward groupings of all sorts are manifesting themselves in the party. The lid must be brought down again vigorously and the boiler hermetically sealed. This is the short-sighted wisdom with which numerous speeches and articles "against factionalism" are permeated. In their innermost conscience, the partisans of the apparatus regard the resolution of the Central Committee either as a political mistake which an effort should be made to render harmless, or else as a manœuvre which should be utilized. In my opinion, they are grossly mistaken. And if there is a tactic calculated to introduce disorganization into the party, it is that of those persons who persist in the old orientation while feigning to accept respectfully the new one.

It is in conflicts and divergences of view that the working out of the public opinion of the party inevitably takes place. To localize it in an apparatus charged with subsequently supplying the party with the fruit of its labor in the form of instructions, of orders, is to sterilize the party ideologically and politically. To make the whole party participate in the working out and the adoption of resolutions, is to promote temporary ideological groupings which run the risk of being converted into lasting groups and even into factions. What is to be done? Is it possible that there is no way out? *Is it possible that there is no intermediate line for the party between the régime of "calm" and that of crumbling into factions?* No, there is one, and the task of the leadership consists, every time it is necessary and particularly at turning points, in finding the line that corresponds to the given real situation.

The resolution of the Central Committee says plainly that the bureaucratic régime is one of the sources of factions. This is a truth which now hardly any longer needs to be demonstrated. The "old course" was pretty far from democracy, and yet it did not preserve the party from illegal factions any more than the present stormy discussion which, one cannot conceal it from himself, may lead to the formation of temporary or lasting groupings. *In order to avoid it, the leading organs of the party must lend an ear to the voice of the mass, without regarding all criticism as a manifestation of the factional spirit and thereby driving conscientious and disciplined communists to maintain a systematic silence or to constitute themselves into factions.*

But this is neither more or less than a justification of Miasnikov* and his supporters!—the bureaucrats will say. How so? In the first place, the phrase which we have just underlined is only a textual extract from the resolution of the Central Committee. Furthermore, since when is *explanation* equivalent to *justification?* To say that an ulcer is the result of a defective blood circulation due to an inadequate afflux of oxygen, is not to "justify" the ulcer and to consider it a normal part of the human organism. The only conclusion is that it must be scarified, the wound sterilized, and above all, the window must be opened up to permit fresh air to supply the oxygen needed by the blood. But the trouble is that the most militant wing of the "old course" is convinced that the resolution of the Central Committee is wrong, particularly in the passage dealing with bureaucratism as a source of factions. And if it does not say so openly, it is only because of formal reasons, quite in harmony with a mentality impregnated with that formalism which is the essential attribute of bureaucratism.

It is incontestable that factions are a scourge in the present situation and that groups, even if temporary, may be transformed into factions. But as experience shows it is far from enough to declare that groups and factions are an evil for their appearance to be prevented. They will be forestalled only by a correct policy, adapted to the actual situation.

It is enough to study the history of our party, be it only during the revolution, that is, during a period when the constitution of factions is especially dangerous, to see that the struggle against this danger can not be confined to a formal condemnation and a prohibition.

It was in the autumn of 1917, in connection with the cardinal question of the seizure of power, that the most formidable disagreement arose in the party. The furious rhythm of events invested this disagreement with an extreme sharpness which led almost immediately to the constitution of a faction. Involuntarily, perhaps, the opponents of the forcible overturn made a bloc with elements not belonging to the party, published their declarations in outside organs, etc.† At that moment, the unity of the party hung by a hair. How was a split averted? Solely by the rapid development of the situation and its favorable outcome. The split would inevitably have occurred if the events had dragged out, and even more certainly if the insurrection had terminated in a defeat. Under the firm leadership of the majority of the Central Committee, the party, in an impetuous offensive, passed over the heads of the opposition; the power was conquered and the opposition, not very numerous but qualitatively very strong, adopted the platform of October. The faction, the danger of split, were overcome at that time not by formal decisions on the basis of the statutes, but by revolutionary action.

The second big dissension arose on the occasion of the Brest-Litovsk peace. The partisans of the revolutionary war‡ constituted at that time a genuine faction with its own central organ. How much truth there is to the recent anecdote, according to which Bukharin was almost prepared, at one moment, to arrest the government of Lenin—I am unable to say*! However that may be, the existence of a Left communist faction represented an extreme danger to the unity of the party. To proceed to a split at that time would not have been difficult and would not have required on the part of the leadership . . . any great intellectual exertion: it would have sufficed to issue an injunction against the Left communist faction. Nevertheless, the party adopted more complex methods. It preferred to discuss, to explain, to prove by experience, and to resign itself temporarily to that menacing anomaly represented by the existence of a faction organized in its midst.

The question of organizing the military work also engendered the constitution of a fairly strong and fairly obdurate grouping, opposed to the creation of a regular army with a centralized military apparatus, specialists, etc.† At times the struggle became extremely sharp. But as in October, the question was resolved by experience: by the war itself. Certain blunders and exaggerations of the official military policy were straightened out under the pressure of the opposition, and that not only without harm but with profit to the centralized organization of the regular army. As to the opposition, it exhausted itself little by little. A large number of its most active representatives participated in the organization of the army, in which they often occupied important posts.

Clearly defined groupings constituted themselves at the time of the memorable discussion on the trade unions.‡ Now that we have the possibility of embracing this whole period at a glance and clearing it up in the light of subsequent experience, we observe that the discussion did not at all revolve around the trade unions, nor even around workers' democracy. What was expressed in these disputes was a profound uneasiness in the party, whose cause was the excessive prolongation of the economic régime of war communism. The whole economic organism of the country was in a vise. The discussion on the rôle of the trade unions and of workers' democracy concealed the quest for a new economic road. The way out was found in putting an end to the requisitioning of food products and to the grain monopoly, and in the gradual liberation of state industry from the tyranny of central economic direction.§ These historical decisions were unanimously adopted and completely smothered the trade union discussion, all the more so as, following upon the establishment of the N.E.P., the rôle of the trade unions themselves appeared in a completely different light and as, a few months later, it became necessary to alter radically the resolution on the trade unions.

The most lasting and, from certain aspects, the most dangerous group, was that of the "workers' opposition".|| It reflected in a distorted manner the contradictions of war communism, certain

*Old worker-Bolshevik, expelled in 1922 for Menshevik tendencies. Years later, Stalin sent him into exile, whence he escaped to Persia in 1929, then to Turkey.—ED.

†The principal opponents, Zinoviev and Kamenev, revealed and criticized the party's plans in Gorky's paper on the eve of the uprising. They were supported by Rykov, Nogin, Miliutin, Losovsky, Shliapnikov, Riazanov, Larin and others.—ED.

‡Led by Bukharin, they published an independent extra-party paper in Petrograd, *The Communist*, violently attacking the Lenin policy. Others in the group included Radek, Krestinsky, Ossinsky, Sapronov, Yakovlev, Pokrovsky, Piatakov, Preobrazhensky, Safarov, etc. Trotsky, before abstaining from the vote in order to accord Lenin a majority for his standpoint, defended the position: "Neither peace nor war."—ED.

*On December 21, 1923, *Pravda* published a letter signed by nine of the former Left Communists, confirming the anecdote. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Soviets, the Left Social Revolutionist, Kamkov, said "in a joking tone" to Bukharin and Piatakov: "Well, what are you going to do if you get the majority of the party? Lenin will resign and we will have to constitute a new Council of People's Commissars with you. In that case, I think we would elect Piatakov as chairman. . . ." Later, the Left Social Revolutionist, Proshyan, said laughingly to Radek: "All you do is write resolutions. Wouldn't it be simpler to arrest Lenin for a day, declare war on the Germans and then reëlect him unanimously chairman of the Council?"—ED.

†The "military opposition" of 1918-1919 was led by V. M. Smirnov, and supported by Voroshilov, Piatakov, Mezhlauk and Stalin, among others, against Trotsky. The Eighth Congress of the R.C.P. in 1919 voted support for the latter's policy.—ED.

‡From November 1920 (Fifth trade union Congress) to March 1921 (Tenth party Congress). The Central Committee was divided into two groups, one of eight led by Lenin, the other of seven, including Trotsky, Bukharin, Dzherzhinsky, Andreyev, Krestinsky, Preobrazhensky and Serebriakov. The party congress supported Lenin's group. —ED.

§The directing centers (*glavs*) of production, vertically divided, as it were, had to be abolished in 1921 as an unhappy attempt at economic organization.—ED.

||Led by Shliapnikov, Kollontay, Medvediev, Kisseliev, Lutovinov and others, who advocated that the management of economic life be turned over to the trade unions.—ED.

mistakes of the party, as well as essential objective difficulties of socialist organization. But this time also we did not limit ourselves to a formal prohibition. On the questions of democracy, formal decisions were made, and on the purging of the party effective and extremely important measures were taken, giving satisfaction to what was right and healthy in the criticism and the demands of the "workers' opposition". And what is most important, it is only thanks to the decisions and the economic measures adopted by the party, the result of which was to lead to the disappearance of the divergences of view and the groupings, that the Tenth Congress was able to lay down a formal prohibition against the constitution of factions, with reason to believe that its decision would not remain a dead letter. But, as experience and political common sense show, it goes without saying that, by itself, this prohibition contained no absolute or even serious guarantees against the appearance of new ideological and organizational groupings. The essential guarantee in this case is a correct leadership, attention to the requirements of the moment which are reflected in the party, the flexibility of the apparatus which must not paralyze but rather organize the initiative of the party, which must neither fear criticism nor seek to put a stop to it by the bugbear of factions. The decision of the Tenth Congress prohibiting factions can have only an auxiliary character; by itself, it does not give the key to the solution of all the internal difficulties. It would be "organizational fetishism" to believe that regardless of the development of the party, the mistakes of the leadership, the conservatism of the apparatus, the influences from without, etc., a decision is enough to preserve us from groupings and from the disorder inherent in the formation of factions. To look at things in this way would be to give proof of bureaucratism.

A striking example of this is furnished us by the history of the Petrograd organization. Shortly after the Tenth Congress, which interdicted the constitution of groups and factions, a very lively organizational struggle arose in Petrograd, which led to the formation of two groupings flatly opposed to each other. The simplest thing, at first thought, would have been to issue an anathema against at least one of these groupings. But the Central Committee categorically refused to employ this method which was suggested to it from Petrograd. It assumed the rôle of arbitrator between the two groups and, in the long run, succeeded in assuring not only their collaboration but their complete fusion in the organization. There is an important example which deserves to be kept in mind and which might serve to clarify some bureaucratic heads.

We have said above that every important and lasting group in the party, and this is even truer of organized factions, has a tendency to become the spokesman for some social interests or other. Any deviation may, in the course of its development, become the expression of the interests of a class hostile or semi-hostile to the proletariat. Now, bureaucratism is a deviation, and an unhealthy one; that, let us hope, is not open to dispute. From the moment that this is the case, it threatens to run the party off the right road, off the class road. Therein precisely lies its danger. But—and this is a fact which is instructive to the highest, and at the same time the most alarming degree—those who asseverate most flatly, with the greatest insistence, and sometimes most brutally, that *every* difference of opinion, *every* grouping of views, even if temporary, is an expression of the interests of classes opposed to the proletariat, do not want to apply this criterion to bureaucratism.

And yet, the social criterion is perfectly in place in this instance, for bureaucratism is a well-defined evil, a notorious and incontestably harmful deviation, officially condemned but still showing no signs of disappearing. Moreover, it is pretty difficult to make it disappear at one blow. But if bureaucratism, as the resolution of the Central Committee says, threatens *to detach the party from the masses* and consequently to weaken the class character of the party, it follows that the struggle against bureaucratism can in no case be the result of non-proletarian influences. On the contrary, the aspiration of the party to preserve its proletarian character must inevitably engender resistance to bureaucratism. Obviously, under cover of this resistance, various wrong, unhealthy and injurious tendencies may manifest themselves. And they cannot be disclosed save by the Marxian analysis of their ideological content. But to identify resistance to bureaucratism with a grouping which allegedly serves as a channel for alien influences, is to be oneself the "channel" for bureaucratic influences.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to understand in too simplified a manner the thought that party differences and, even more so, groupings, are nothing but a struggle for influence of opposed classes. Thus, in 1920, the question of the invasion of Poland produced two currents of opinion, one advocating a more audacious policy, the other preaching prudence.* Did that show different class tendencies? I do not think that that can be affirmed. There were only differences in the appraisal of the situation, the forces, the means. But the essential criterion of appraisal was the same in both camps.

It often happens that the party can resolve one and the same problem by different means. And if a discussion then arises, it does so for the purpose of learning which of the means is the best, the most expedient, the most economical. According to the question involved, these differences may embrace substantial layers of the party, but this does not necessarily mean that there is a struggle of two class tendencies.

There is no doubt that we shall still have many disagreements, for our road is a painful one and the political tasks as well as the economic questions of socialist organization will unfailingly engender divergences of view and temporary groupings of opinion. For our party, the political verification of all the nuances of opinion by means of a Marxian analysis will always be one of the most effective preventive measures. But it is this concrete Marxian verification that must be resorted to, and not stereotyped phrases which are the defense mechanism of bureaucratism. If the road of the "new course" is trod more seriously, it will be possible to control all the better the heterogeneous political ideology which is now rising against bureaucratism and to cleanse it of any alien and injurious element. But this is impossible without a serious turn-about-face in the mentality and the intentions of the party apparatus. But what we are witnessing on the contrary at the present moment is a new offensive of the latter, which pushes aside all criticism of the "old course", formally condemned but not yet liquidated, by treating it as a manifestation of factional spirit. If factions are dangerous—and they are—it is criminal to close one's eyes to the danger represented by the *conservative bureaucratic faction*. It is precisely against this danger that the resolution of the Central Committee directs its main shafts.

The maintenance of the unity of the party is the gravest concern of the great majority of the communists. But it must be said openly: if there is a serious danger at present to the unity or at least to the unanimity of the party, it is unbridled bureaucratism. It is from this camp that provocative voices have been raised. It is there that some have dared to say: we are not afraid of split. It is the representatives of this tendency who dig into the past, hunting there for everything that might be used to inject more rancor into the discussion, who artificially revive the memories of the former struggle and the former split in order imperceptibly to accustom the mind of the party to the possibility of so monstrous, so disastrous a crime as a new split. Some wish to counterpose the need of unity in the party to its need of a less bureaucratic régime.

If the party let itself be swayed, if it sacrificed the vital elements of its own democracy, it would succeed only in exacerbating its internal struggle and in shaking its cohesion. One cannot demand of the party confidence in the apparatus when he himself has no confidence in the party. There's the whole question. Preconceived bureaucratic distrust towards the party, towards its mind and its spirit of discipline, is the principal cause of all the evils engendered by the domination of the apparatus. The party does not want factions and will not tolerate them. It is monstrous to think that it will smash, or permit anybody to smash its apparatus. It knows that this apparatus is composed of the most valuable elements, embodying the greatest part of the past experiences. But it wants to renew it and to remind it that it is *its* apparatus, that it is elected *by it* and that it must not detach itself from it.

In meditating well on the situation created in the party and which has showed itself in a particularly clear light in the course of the discussion, one sees that the future presents itself in a double perspective. Either the organic ideological regrouping which is now taking place in the party along the line of the resolutions of the

*Lenin led the former, Trotsky and Radek the latter.—ED.

Central Committee will be a step forward along the road of the organic growth of the party, the beginning of a new great chapter—and that would be the most desirable way out for all of us and the most beneficial one for the party, which will then easily overcome excesses in the discussion and in the opposition and, with greater reason, vulgar democratic tendencies. Or else, passing over to the counter-offensive, the apparatus will fall more or less under the sway of its most conservative elements and, on the pretext of combatting the factions, will throw the party back and reëstablish "calm". This second eventuality would be incomparably more grievous; it would not prevent, it goes without saying, the development of the party, but this development would take place only at the cost of considerable efforts and disturbances. For this method would only still further foster tendencies which are harmful, disintegrating, opposed to the party. These are the two eventualities to envisage.

Leon TROTSKY

Moscow, *December* 1923.

A Nazi Confesses

THE REICHSTAG fire is more than an event in the history of the Third Reich. It is the symbol of Hitler's power over public opinion, the touchstone of the trust and confidence of the German masses in the fundamental integrity of their rulers.

That is the reason the Reichstag fire question continues to play such an important part in the anti-Fascist movement. Conclusive proof of the complicity and guilt of Hitler, Göring, Göbbels and the rest, if it could be brought home to the German people, would undermine the foundation of hopes and fears on which National Socialism rests.

When the smoke cleared after the June 30 massacre, anti-Hitlerites made the startling discovery, that almost without exception, those persons who had been variously implicated in the Reichstag fire were among the victims. The suspicion that Hitler had used this favorable opportunity to rid himself of dangerous witnesses against his criminal régime was strengthened a few weeks later by the depositions made by the S.A. man Kruse who, having made his escape to Switzerland, claimed to be the last surviving accomplice in the Reichstag fire tragedy. The depositions of this man, S.A. Commander-in-Chief Röhm's personal staff, were borne out some time later when Paris reported the existence of a document written by Karl Ernst, S.A. Commander for the district Berlin-Brandenburg, one of the most brutal and conscienceless scoundrels in the Nazi movement. Persons whose integrity cannot be doubted —among them Senator Dr. Georg Branting of Stockholm whose *White Book on the June* 30 *Massacre* has just been published— investigated the circumstances surrounding the origin of this letter sent by Ernst to a friend outside of Germany on the 3rd of June, and were completely satisfied as to its authenticity. On December 3, the Paris *Journal* published the Ernst letter in full. Göring called a meeting of foreign correspondents and diplomats in Berlin in a palpable effort to whitewash himself and the Nazi régime. The sophistry of his defense was hardly convincing. It proceeded from the axiomatic assumption that communists prepared the Reichstag fire. To believe that Göring had had his hand in this dastardly crime would be to believe that he had worked in collusion with these deadly enemies of the new Germany. What could be more ridiculous! Calling the Reich court in Leipzig as witness to his innocence, Mr. Göring chose to ignore the fact that this same court had exonerated and freed the communists as well. Altogether his attempt to discredit the Ernst letters was a singularly unhappy one. The Reich government ordered the confiscation of the *Journal*. No other serious attempt has been made by the Nazi leadership to disprove the statements it contains.

"I, the undersigned Karl Ernst," the statement reads, "S.A. group leader of Berlin-Brandenburg, Prussian state councillor, born on September 1, 1904 in Berlin-Wilmersdorf, do hereby declare that the following is a true report of the circumstances attending the Reichstag fire in which I took part. I am acting on the advise of my friends for there is a rumor that Göbbels and Göring intend to do me an evil turn. In the event of my arrest, Göbbels and Göring will be informed of the existence of this document outside of Germany. This document is to be published only if I or one of the comrades whose names are appended thereto [Fiedler and Mohrenschild] authorizes publication or if I should die as a result of violence.

"I hereby depose that I set fire to the Reichstag building and was therein aided by the above named assistant S.A. leaders. We were convinced at the time that we were acting in the interests of our Führer to enable him to fight Marxism, the worst enemy of the German people. . . . I have no cause to regret my deed. I would do it again. What I do regret is the fact that it has paved the way for the rise of creatures like Göbbels and Göring who betrayed the S.A., who are betraying the Führer again and again and are trying to trap him with their lies and calumnies into a net of intrigue against his S.A. leaders.

"Several hours after we came to power, I was ordered by Count Helldorf to report to Göring. Together with Helldorf I went to him. On the way, Helldorf explained to me that the Führer must be provided with convincing grounds for the immediate suppression of the communist movement. Göbbels was present at the interview and it was he who revealed the plan. During an election meeting to be held in Breslau there would be staged an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the Führer as he left his plane. This was to be the signal for a general anti-Communist movement. Heines had been called to Berlin, we learned, to arrange the necessary details.

"Two days later we met in Göring's residence. Göring objected to the idea of a pretended assassination. It might inspire others to imitation. Göbbels, he told us, was vain and would insist on his plan. Would we do what we could to dissuade him? On the following day I received a telephone message asking me to come to Göbbels. When I arrived there the others had already decided to drop Göbbels' plan. Göring was of the opinion that something else would have to be tried.

"How about firing the palace? Göbbels replied with a grin: Better still set fire to the Reichstag. Göring agreed at once. Helldorf and I objected to the plan as too difficult to execute but Göbbels convinced us that it could be done. After some discussion it was agreed that Heines, Helldorf and I should arrange for the fire a week before the election. Göring promised to supply us with an especially inflammable chemical. It was decided that we meet in the party's office in the Reichstag on February 25. As soon as the building was empty we could set to work. I was entrusted with the preparations.

"I saw Göring again on the following day. He had thought the matter over and had decided that it would be a mistake to let well known S.A. leaders take a hand in the fire. If they should be discovered everything would be lost. We called Göbbels by telephone to meet us and told him of our scruples which he did not share. But the plan was dropped at the last moment because the communists whose room in the Reichstag was just opposite our own, met that night until ten o'clock."

Karl Ernst's confession continues with a description of what followed—how Göring proposed that they make use of the underground passage which leads from his palace to the Reichstag building; how he together with Helldorf investigated the possibilities of the plan; how it was finally decided to postpone the plan for a few days more.

"Two days before the date set we concealed the incendiary material which Göring had provided in a little-used passage. There were several cans of a self-igniting phosphorous preparation and several quarts of petroleum. I hesitated for a long time in my choice of the persons to be entrusted with the work and finally decided that I would have to take a hand myself, together with a few absolutely reliable comrades. After some urging Göbbels and Göring agreed with my plan. Later it came to me that they accepted my offer as a means of keeping me more securely in hand."

Ernst chose his friends Fiedler and Mohrenschild and pledged them to absolute silence. A few days before the date set Count Helldorf, Ernst continues his story, called his attention to a young

Dutchman called Van der Lubbe who, he had learned, was known as a slightly demented firebug. Van der Lubbe was persuaded by a certain Sander to enter the Reichstag building from the outside and set fire to it on his own account. The real work, however, was to be done by the S.A. men.

"I met my friends at eight o'clock," the story continues, "at the corner of Neue Wilhelmstrasse and Doretheenstrasse. We were in civilian clothes. A few moments later we entered the palace unnoticed. We had put on rubbers to deaden the sound of our footsteps. We reached the underground passage unobserved. At 8:45 we were in the *Sitzungssaal.* One of my friends went back to the passage to get the rest of the material while we set to work under the life-size portrait of Emperor Wilhelm in the corridor. Here and in several places in the *Sitzungssaal* we arranged small heaps of the incendiary material. The phosphorous liquid we poured over the chairs and tables. Curtains and carpets were soaked with kerosene. A few minutes before nine we were back in the *Sitzungssaal.* At 9:05 the work was done and we hurried out of the building. Haste was important for the phosphorous preparation would ignite of its own accord within half an hour. At 9:15 we climbed the outside wall."

In closing, Ernst explains that the reports which were published in the world press were false. Only three men were involved in the actual incendiary work. Besides Göring, Göbbels, Röhm, Heines, Killinger and later Hanfstängel and Sander, no one knew of the plan. The Führer himself was left in ignorance until it was all over.

Ernst closes with the words: "As to that I cannot say. I have known and sworn by the Führer for eleven years. I will remain faithful to him until I die. What I did, every other S.A. leader would have done for the Führer but it is inconceivable that the S.A. should be betrayed by the very men who raised it to its present power. I am convinced that the Führer will defeat the dark machinations of those who are conspiring against it. I am writing this for my own protection against the plans of Göbbels and Göring. This document will be destroyed when these traitors have received the reward they deserve."

Two days after he wrote this letter, Commander Ernst wrote another, less formal but much more characteristic of the man, to his friend Edmund Heines, district leader of the S.A. in Breslau, a notorious anti-Semite, whose name has become a synonym for cruelty and terrorism throughout the German speaking world. This document is taken from Dr. Branting's *White Book.* The letter was written after Röhm had gone to Hitler to warn him of the danger of ignoring the needs of the mass of his followers. Both sides were ready to strike a decisive blow. The letter follows:

"June 5, 1934

"Dear E.,

"The chief has been to see HIM at last. Long conference. The chief tells me it lasted till late in the morning. HE, as usual on such occasions, cried like a baby and earnestly besought the chief to believe that he would a hundred times rather see him at the head of the army than some old codger from the Neudeck Society for the Aged. But Röhm must see, he argued, that this was impossible. The difficulties, international complications, the meeting in Venice and more of that sort. You know his line. You will see the Chief himself shortly and he'll tell you the rest. The end of the conference was a mutual promise to do nothing for the present, to wait for the old man to kick the bucket, they would see.

"That means we'll have to take the matter into our own hands. It's clear as sh— that if we wait for that perfidious Egyptian [Hitler's personal representative, Hess, who was born in Egypt] to unite Gimpty [Göbbels the lame one] and the clotheshorse [Göring] against us, we go to the dogs. We must act and beat these fellows to it. Hermann means business. He can't stand the lame one's guts but against us he joins hand with the Black One [Reichsleader of the Black S.S. troops, Himmler]!

"We'll light a fire under his behind. I want to settle accounts with Gimpty in person. Too bad that R. stopped me that time. I wanted to bash his head in, you remember, when he made that dirty crack about my marriage.

"I mentioned your letter to the chief. You know I haven't much use for talk and writing. He agrees with you that we must be ready for anything. Gimpty is capable of anything. The chief has his material in safety. After talking it over with him I signed the statement about the February affair that M. wrote under his direction. It is in safe hands. If anything happens to me, the thing will go off. To be doubly sure I am sending you a signed copy. Take good care of it. You should find a safe place for your things. Read it over. It's our best bet if everything else fails. Maybe it will help. Maybe not. When it comes to writing, Gimpty has us beat. Our strength lies in another direction and that's the way we'll have to go.

"But this time you'll have to go through with it. I have a plan that's got anything Gimpty can do beat to a standstill. But you must hold your horses till the thing goes off. It's Gimpty we have to get—that's my idea. The chief is after Hermann's skin. We can get them both. But first we'll have to separate them from HIM. If he goes with us the rest is easy. Fi. will tell you more about my plan. You can trust him blindly. Too bad I can't be with you when you drink on it. I am with the chief all the way but Gimpty belongs to me after he's had his licking. I haven't forgotten the way that dog got me into trouble and then made fun of me for it.

"The chief thinks we should lay low till after the party convention. He's been told the old man is likely to live another ten years. I don't believe it. But the others agree with him so I'll have to go along. But after the convention they'll have to go ahead. I'm taking my vacation next month. I've promised to go away with her. Send me a copy of your material through Fi. Don't put that off. Be careful with Sch. There is all kinds of talk. Don't be seen with him too often. The chief says he spoke to you about that.

"Get things out of the way. Our friend in the Albrechtstrasse [secret police] tells me that the Black One plans to look into our affairs one of these days. Let him come to me. I'll have a nice surprise for him.

"My best, old man.

"Your, Karlos."

Ludwig LORE

Thorstein Veblen, Sociologist

VEBLEN cannot be indiscriminately lumped with the common run of American academicians. Compared to the academic fossils of his time he was indeed one of the few outstanding original thinkers in America.

He introduced the heresy of liberalism and objectivism into those spheres where dogma had previously ruled unchallenged. Some forty years ago John Bates Clark and William Graham Sumner were the infallible popes who decreed that "rugged individualism" was the immutable law of socio-economic development; they sanctioned private profit as a natural right; capital, they said, was the reward of abstinence, and labor was its next and dearest of kin enjoying the same freedom of contract and having illimitable fields for advancement provided only it could measure up to the superior standards of ruggedness. This body of dogma was crowned by Clark's bull that "each man is paid an amount that equals the total product he personally creates". Into this massive optimism Veblen introduced a very discordant—and somewhat pessimistic—note. He riddled the logical subtleties and the fatuous apologetics of American "classical" economy; he ran roughshod over its methods: he rejected the economics of the past as a taxonomic science, reasoning from the premise that social institutions must be approached dynamically and not statically; he declared the economics of the past untenable in the face of evolutionary science. In a number of books, particularly *The Theory of Business Enterprise,* he laid low the natural right of private property by analyzing the social "serviceability of business" and by attempting to elucidate the inner logic and the actual development of capitalism.

He was a rebel in the liberal sense. He paid for it by becoming the black sheep of the academic world. He was dismissed from one university after another. He sealed his excommunication by publishing his analysis of the influence of business upon *The Higher Learning in America,* which book from the standpoint of critical analysis marks the peak of liberal social thought in America.

Veblen unquestionably accepted his own approach as scientific. It is equally incontestable that he attempted to analyze economic life as a process. His attempts, however, did not pass beyond criticism. He thought himself that his own generalizations were in part novel—and in so far as American thought of his day was concerned this is correct. For this reason he is reputed by many to be a modern iconoclast. By imputation Veblen's views have been interpreted as an attack upon existing institutions. However, while there is much in Veblen that runs counter to convention, essentially his work can serve only as a basis for liberalism because his theoretic approach is founded on pre-conceptions and not laws. Many of his views are novel only in so far as they are far-fetched. Many of his seemingly iconoclastic postulates are in reality conformist.

Veblen's theoretic approach derives not from Marx whom he rejected as unscientific but from Herbert Spencer. His "scientific" approach to society is based on Spencer's assertion that sociology is an evolutionary science in the Darwinian sense. It is self-evident that to assert that sociology is an evolutionary science is a different thing from establishing it as such. Comte also made this assertion, but Comte's contribution to sociology bears the same relation to science as astrology does to astronomy. Veblen not only failed to pass beyond the stage of mere assertion but he was more than circumspect about his avowed manner of approach. Why should an avowed disciple of Spencer and a Darwinian discriminate against using the term "evolution" prominently? Yet Veblen, who originally presented his most popular book, *The Theory of the Leisure Class,* as an "economic study in the evolution of institutions", omitted the term "evolution" in subsequent editions, and changed the subtitle to read: "an economic study of institutions".

His attempt to establish sociology as a science sums up to the extension of Darwinism to sociology in a manner which departs factually but not methodologically from that of Spencer.

Herbert Spencer sought to synthesize Darwinian biology with sociology. He saw no profound distinction between the laws that governed biologic evolution, and those governing social evolution. He viewed the social organism as corresponding at all points with the physical organism. Accordingly, Spencer decreed that the same laws operated in the evolution of man in society as in the evolution of the psycho-physical man in nature. In society, just as in nature, the life of the species is a struggle for existence; in both spheres the process of selective adaptation takes place; and just as the biologically fittest survive in nature, so the socially best survive in society through natural selection.

Veblen likewise confounded the development of the organic species with the development of society. He wrote that "the life of man in society, just like the life of other species, is a struggle for existence, and therefore it is a process of selective adaptation. The evolution of social structure has been a process of natural selection of institutions".

Veblen differs from Spencer on two points: on the general definition of Darwinism (evolution), and upon the terms in which social institutions must be defined. Neither of these differences is so decisive or scientific as might appear off-hand.

Spencer subscribed to the concept of progress both in natural and social evolution; to him the modern system of free contract was both beneficent and an ideal of nature. Veblen, however, discarded the concept of progress as non-scientific, recognizing only development through cumulative change, only movement without trend. He defined evolution (Darwinism) as follows: "A scheme of thought, a scheme of blindly cumulative causation in which there is no trend, no final term, no consummation." Spencer, on the other hand, did recognize trend in evolution—the trend from a "relatively indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a relatively definite coherent heterogeneity".

To estimate the significance of this point of divergence between Veblen and Spencer, one need only recall that Veblen's viewpoint translated into the language of economic theory coincides with that of the revisionist, Bernstein, who said that, "Movement is everything, the goal nothing." Veblen was aware that the views of the revisionists were akin to his own. He rejected Marx as unscientific. In his opinion, the position of Bernstein, Conrad Schmidt, Tugan-Baranovski, Labriola, Ferri, etc., was one "tending to bring them abreast of the standpoint of modern science, essentially Darwinist". His own definition of the Darwinian standpoint did not, however, prevent Veblen from referring illogically in his writings to progress, as for example: "the progress which has been and is being made in human institutions and in human character". Veblen's "iconoclasm" flows in part from this coincidence between his views and those of the revisionists. But, it should be added that there is no foundation for the opinion that Veblen's thought was deeply indebted to Marx, as is sometimes inferred. Whatever should be debited against Veblen on this score must be credited entirely to the revisionists.

As regards the second point of divergence, Veblen sidestepped Spencer's ingenious correlation of biology with sociology only to construct an equally fanciful synthesis of later-day psychology (instinct-habit) with sociology. Instead of defining social institutions and biological terms, he defined them in terms of psychology: "The institutions are, in substance, prevalent *habits of thought* with respect to particular relations and functions of the individual and of the community." In the last analysis, therefore, Veblen's views only superficially diverge from Spencer's. Without keeping this definition in mind, one may easily read into Veblen, an outright idealist, a standpoint—i.e., Marxism—altogether alien to him. Thus, when Veblen asserts that "the cornerstone of the modern industrial system is the institution of private property", he does not at all subscribe to the Marxian standpoint. To him the substance of this cornerstone is psychological. It is made of mind-stuff because all institutions, including private property are in substance only habits of thought.

Again, one meets with the assertion that according to Veblen the primary motive force in social change is the advance of industrial arts and the growth of science. This is an error; to Veblen this advance is derivative and not primary. His position on this point is in all respects similar to Spencer's who also wrote that "the development of the arts of life, consequent upon the advance of science, which has already in so many ways profoundly affected social organization (instance the factory system) is likely hereafter to affect it as profoundly or more profoundly".

To Veblen the primary motive force is the human mind. "Social evolution is a process of selective adaptation of *temperament and habits of thought* under the stress of the circumstances of associated life." When Veblen says that the development of societies is the development of institutions he implies that the development of institutions is the development of human motives. He does not at all imply what Marx maintained—that the development of the institutions and therefore of society is governed by laws not only independent of human will, consciousness and intelligence, but rather, on the contrary determining that will, consciousness and intelligence. Veblen accepts no such laws; he derives the development of institutions from human nature. In his definition he merely repeats what Plato said, to wit, that "the states are as the men are, they grow out of human characters"; a dictum which was rehashed by Spencer to read: "the forms of social organization are determined by men's natures".

But just how do the social forms evolve? And why? Spencer accounted for social change in terms of improvement, or progress: "only as their [men's] nature improve can the forms of life become better". Veblen recognized only cumulative and correlative changes in nature, and in human nature. But his attempt to explain the causes that underlie the variation of human nature is as ageworn as the mummies of the Pharaohs. Far from being scientific, it boils down to the animistic formula of explaining a phenomenon in terms of the spirit. Human nature varies because it is the nature to vary; or, more exactly, the variability of human nature is due to the stability of human nature. In Veblen's own words, "this variation of human nature . . . is a process of selection between several relatively stable and persistent ethnic types or ethnic elements".

No doctrine in sociology is more reactionary than the doctrine which seeks to interpret human history and culture in terms of the

racial equation. The logic of his theoretical standpoint, or rather the lack of logic, forces Veblen to align himself with the assumers of the White Man's Burden, and of White Supremacy. To subscribe to the existence of certain stable types of human nature is to believe in the existence of specific and distinct races. How many races are there in the blood? Virey said two; Jacquinot claimed three; Kant found four; Blumenbach—five; Buffon—six; Hunter—seven; Aggassiz—eight; Pickering insisted on—11; Bory St. Vincent—15; Desmoulins—16; Morton—22; Crawfurd—60; Burke—63 . . . and the latest ethnologist, the supreme specialist in blood, Hitler, recognizes the One and Only Race, the rest of mankind being sub-humans. Veblen does not compute the number of races the world over; he is concerned only with those races that have created the modern industrial community, that is, the Europeans, including the Scandinavians. His authority on European races is Ripley. Their number is odd, being three: the Nordic, the Alpine, and the Mediterranean races; or, in terms of the shape of the skull, and the color of the hair: the dolico-blonds, the brachy-brunettes, and the dolico-brunettes.

This is the history of mankind according to Veblen. In our industrial communities, man tends to breed true to one or another of these three main ethnic types. In their turn, these three stable and persistent types tend to breed in two main directions of variation: variant A and B; variant A, or savage human nature, the peaceable or ante-predatory man with industrial virtues; and variant B, or barbarian human nature, the predatory man with acquisitory virtues.

In the beginning there was savage human nature, primitive and peaceable; and the forms of social organization which grew up conformed to this human nature, all deviations from the norm being repressed by natural selection. During this primitive and peaceable epoch of savagery, man tended to breed true to type A of human nature. Society evolved, without trend, without consummation. Savagery passed from low into high and then into higher. And when the high times passed, society entered into the epoch of barbarism, the period of predation and exploit, the epoch of the system of status. All this came to pass because slowly but surely variant B of human nature began to predominate, and the forms of social consciousness that grew up conformed to this human nature, all deviations from the norm being repressed by natural selection. Society kept on evolving, without trend, with no final term. From low, barbarism shifted into high. And the higher stage of barbarism was feudalism, both European and Asiatic! Imperceptibly, the struggle for existence passed into the struggle to keep up appearances. There ensued the quasi-peaceable stage. And presently came the dawn of the peaceable epoch proper, which is the epoch of the modern industrial community, popularly misunderstood as the capitalist system. And throughout the epoch of barbarism, and the quasi-peaceable epoch, and the era of peace, man still continued to breed true to variant B of human nature.

To recapitulate. There are two types of human nature, though the skulls may be dolico, or brachy, though the hair be blond or brunette. The savage type A, in each case, is nearer to the generic human type, being the reversional representative of the type that prevailed at the earliest stage of associated life; and representing the ancestors of modern man at the peaceable savage phase of human development which preceded the predatory culture with its régime of status and so forth. This atavistic type is characterized by honesty, diligence, peacefulness, good will, absence of self-seeking, and suchlike prosy humanitarian traits. The barbarian type B, in each case, is the survival of a more recent modification of the main ethnic types and their hybrids, as they were modified, mainly by selective adaptation under the discipline of the predatory culture and the later emulative cultures. An individual of this type is characterized chiefly by ferocity and astuteness.

The history of society has been the history of the natural selection of these two types of human nature. Two social systems have prevailed in history: the system of status, and the system of contract. The type of the system of status is the military organization, or also a hierarchy, or a bureaucracy. The other type is the modern industrial community. The author of this method of classification is Sir Henry Maine. And Veblen borrowed it from Maine as did Spencer who also said that "societies may be grouped as militant and industrial; of which one type is organized on the principle of conipulsory coöperation; the other on the principle of voluntary coöperation".

Both of these systems were hard on type A of human nature. So much so that modern man still breeds true to variant B, particularly the Nordics (the dolico-blonds) who are "possessed of a greater facility to barbarism than the other ethnic elements with which that type is associated in the Western culture". All this is according to Veblen.

And according to Veblen, should the type persist, so would the system, since the social institutions must conform with human nature. Is mankind perhaps sentenced forever to the ascendancy of human nature type B, with its prime exemplar the Nordic, and the institutions suitable to its temperament and habits of thought? Or. may society continue to evolve? According to Veblen, the answer is No to the Nordic and Yes to evolution. From this flows a goodly share of his repute as iconoclast.

But why is the persistent barbarian not dominant eternally? First, because variations occur with some frequency at all times the proneness of men to revert to the past being proverbial. Secondly because "this barbarian variant has not attained the highest degree of homogeneity or stability. The period of barbarian culture, though of great absolute duration, has been neither protracted enough nor invariable enough to give an extreme fixity of type". And finally, because there is a New Deal in store. Hitherto conditions have been ideal for the breeding of variant B; and by natural selection those stray orphans of type A that did manage to sift through were repressed. The trend, however, is becoming favorable for variant A to reassert itself, become dominant and suppress variant B, with God's help, or, rather, by natural selection. In our time the reversions to type A "are becoming noticeable because the conditions of modern life no longer act consistently to consistently repress departures from the barbarian normal".

Veblen's saga of the struggle that has been going on the historical arena between the two types of human nature suffers because it must be submitted to examination not as the work of a poet but that of a scientist. Allowing Veblen his flights of fancy, his races, his human variants, social systems and epochs, he must still explain what it is that operates to suppress the Nordic ascendancy so prevalent in modern life, and what made it possible for the barbarian variant to emerge on so universal a scale.

According to Veblen himself, the latter type is neither stable nor homogeneous. It is further removed from the generic human type. On the other hand, its relative by blood, but its antagonist by nature, type A, is not only closer, but it had persisted over a period much more protracted. The social forms which had been generated to meet its own requirements must have tended to repress all departures from the norm. Yet the gifts of "good nature, equity and indiscriminate sympathy" (the characteristic traits of savage nature) did come to be repressed by natural selection in favor of the barbarian type with its "freedom from scruple, from sympathy, honesty and regard for life". How come? Veblen's answer is nothing if not inspired. To put it prosaically, at the root of social evolution, as well as of all evil, is human nature again, but this time in a skirt. Just as the original male, Adam, was ejected from paradise because of Eve, so women are responsible for the entire course of history to date. Or, to put it in the language of poetry:

"Who was't betrayed the Capitol? A woman!
"Who lost Mark Antony the world? A woman!
"Who was the cause of a long ten years' war,
"And laid at last old Troy in ashes? Woman!
"Destructive, damnable, deceitful woman."

Veblen's version is equally masterful, due no doubt to his Viking ancestry. Long, long ago, women, being feminine, applied themselves to peaceable pursuits and industry; while men, by virtue of their masculinity, resorted to predatory pursuits and exploit. Women drudged, expending energy to create new things out of passive brute material, while men converted to their own ends the creations of nature and of mankind. "Virtually the whole range of industrial employment is an outgrowth of what is classed as woman's work in the primitive community." As a consequence, an early discrimination arose between the employments of men and women: the men tending naturally to look down upon feminine employments; the women sullenly submitting as objects of con-

tempt. From this original invidious distinction between the occupations of men and women—whose occupations coincide with the difference between the sexes—there sprang up those institutions which tended to repress variant A in favor of variant B. For obviously, under the régime of exploitation, emulation and competition, the individual fared better in proportion as he had less of the gifts of human nature A. In his appraisal of women, Veblen agreed not only with the poets but with the patriarchs, among them Spencer who held that "the slave class in a primitive society consists of women". Worse yet, women are directly responsible for the institution of private property: "the earliest form of ownership is the ownership of women by the able bodied men of the community." Destructive, damnable, deceitful woman!

Are women, perhaps, also responsible for the pending resurgence of type A of human nature? Not quite. This time, it is entirely due to evolution. With the dawn of modern enterprise social evolution enters a stage unknown to natural evolution, or anyone else save Veblen. He shares with no one the honor of formulating this discovery: "Under modern conditions, the struggle for existence has in very appreciable degree been transformed into a struggle to keep up appearances." As a consequence, the evolution of economic life "takes such a turn that the interests of the community no longer coincide with the emulative interests of the individual". To millions in the world today who are being forced to keep up the appearances of being alive while unemployed this might sound like satire, but no satire was intended. The formulation is a logical one, the logic pertaining to what Kant called psychologic logic.

Veblen agreed not only with Spencer but with the revisionists that under the modern régime "life is generally occupied in peaceful intercourse with fellow citizens". Peaceful intercourse and the struggle for existence are mutually incompatible.

And this is how peace came to man. Originally type B had to specialize in both force and fraud, mostly force. With the passage of time, and the gradual improvement of industrial efficiency, predation turned more and more in the direction of fraud. From being ferocious, the barbarian by natural selection tended to become a specialist in perfidy. Thus the era of rapine passed into the quasi-peaceable stages, until finally the modern peaceful epoch of fraud was attained. So peaceful that wars had become implausible. Spencer, too, was sure that "the vast increase of manufacturing and commercial activity must lead to a long peace". All this is pure psychology.

Veblen brings the argument from psychology for every aspect of social life. Thus, the ground for social unrest and the resulting movement for socialism is "very largely jealousy—envy, if you choose". To Mill's question, why has machinery not lightened the day's toil of any human being?—Veblen replies consistently enough, "Because the increment of the output is turned to use to meet the demand of conspicuous consumption, and this want is indefinitely expansible."

To sum up. In order to provide his Spencerian synthesis of sociology with psychology, with logical consistency, Veblen had to invent not only polar types of human nature but such human wants as the indefinitely expansible human want of conspicuous con-umption; not only unheard-of instincts but also mystic broad principles or laws, such as the Law of Conspicuous Waste. This law together with another Law of Industrial Exemption affects "the cultural development both by guiding men's habits of thought and so controlling the growth of institutions and by selectively conserving certain traits of human nature that conduce to facility of life under the leisure class scheme, and so controlling the affective temper of the community".

These wants or principles or laws are Veblen's embroideries upon conventional economics; and they are as fraudulent (in a non-invidious sense) as his *Instinct of Workmanship*. No such wants, laws, and instincts are known to science as yet.

Veblen's capacity for embroidering pre-conceptions is perhaps best illustrated by his literary style. Let us take, for example, the sentence just quoted above. Since the laws Veblen speaks of are nothing but habits of thought; and since he defines institutions also as habits of thought, this complex sentence merely sums up to the assertion that habits of thought are engendered, controlled, selectively conserved and so forth by habits of thought. Striving for precision, he achieves a formality and massiveness so hypnotic as to put his readers into a trance. Many critics have conceived of his writings as satiric, and when they do not revile him, they speak of him as a ruthless analyst. This opinion is largely unwarranted. Veblen was Spencer's disciple even in the sphere of style; what he strives for is not satire but detachment, in the best scientific manner. He attempts to achieve in his writings "an almost passionless consciousness". For, as Spencer held, "trustworthy interpretations of social arrangements imply an almost passionless consciousness". Without much difficulty one could extract from Spencer's writings as many "ruthless analyses" as may be located in Veblen; and as like a close parallel could be drawn between them. There is no more conscious satire in Veblen than in Spencer. Veblen was no more of an iconoclast than Spencer.

It may be argued that Veblen was no supporter of the existing system since he forecasted that the social engineers would build an industrial structure "on a system different from either status or contract". One may just as well argue that neither was Spencer, since he also forecasted that the future type of society would be a type differing as much from the industrial as this does from the militant.

Those who insist on the contrary must begin by explaining Veblen's obvious lack of enthusiasm over the prospect of the future society, and over the type of human nature that would be naturally selected under the press of institutions: "Not much is to be said for the beauty, moral excellence, or general worthiness and reputability of such a prosy human nature as these traits imply; and there is little ground of enthusiasm for the manner of collective life that would result from the prevalence of these traits in unmitigated dominance."

John G. WRIGHT

The Anti-Catholic Drive in Mexico

FOR OVER A hundred years church and state in Mexico have been engaged in a struggle for power. The question of whether or no the Catholic church is to retain the position and privileges it always claims, in a Catholic country, appears at the head of the list when the bourgeois democratic revolution begins in 1810, because the Church fights to retain:

1. Complete control of education and social welfare.
2. Complete control of intellectual activity.
3. Tax-exemptions and financial support.

These claims conflict with the bourgeois democratic program, since because of them the church condemns freedom of speech, press and assembly, freedom of belief, and the doctrine that sovereignty resides in the people—supporting instead the theory of divine right. Within the church itself, however, a class division appears, the poorer priesthood agitating for democratic government, against the episcopate and the rich orders, such as the Jesuit company, who support the absentee-landlord system and the rights of royal monopoly attacked by the bourgeoisie.

Inevitably the church fights all liberal governments and uses all its power to overthrow them. In Mexico the process of this struggle can be seen in cycles: liberal government overthrown, reactionary government in power, liberal government again triumphant, and so on, and each time a liberal government takes power the economic and political privileges of the church are cut into. The climax of this struggle is reached in 1857, when the church, together with French bankers and the Hapsburg crown, put Maxmilian and Carlotta on the Mexican "throne" in order to crush the Juarez democrats. Juarez victorious, a far-reaching reform is carried out. Church and state are separated, church property is nationalized, convents and monasteries are dissolved and made illegal, education is taken over by the state, and the democratic liberties are proclaimed in the new constitution.

This constitution and these laws really break the back of Catholic power in Mexico. The Diaz counter-revolution does not restore the church to its old position, but arranges to ignore some of the more radical laws, especially those having to do with

education. Catholic schools are openly "bootlegged" for some thirty to forty years, and convents and monasteries exist in weakened disguise. The church therefore fights the Madero revolution of 1910, and when Madero is murdered, and the popular agrarian revolution breaks out, peasants sack, burn, and destroy churches, and drive the enormous majority of the clergy out of the country.

The constitution of 1917, writen towards the end of the agrarian civil war, embodies the laws of 1857 and sharpens and emphasizes them, completing what is probably the most radical body of anti-church laws in the world. Against this constitution and all the governments which support it, the church mobilizes what is left of its power. Object: to overthrow the government and revise the constitution—in alliance with landowners, oil companies, mining companies, and other capitalist and semi-feudal interests affected by the new laws. In other words, the goal is counter-revolution.

In 1926 the anti-constitution campaign breaks out openly. It appears as part of other rebellions: generals planning palace revolts, leaders financed by foreign and native capitalists, and others. The spearhead of the movement, however, is the Catholic campaign. The government hits back hard, and the church then calls out all its reserves—it goes on strike, and orders a national economic boycott, with the object of paralyzing business and thereby bringing the government down. Few historians foresaw the outcome. It was taken for granted that, given the great piety of the overwhelming majority of the population, the church challenge constituted a major threat and would mean, probably, civil war.

But the civil war that the church thought it could start by pushing a button, fizzled into scattered rioting and some skirmishing by guerrilla bands. Ninety-five percent of the people did nothing at all. They talked excitedly, but they neither boycotted nor fought. And when in 1929 Morrow arranged to have the churches reopened, the priesthood returned on the government's terms—and found that in hundreds of villages, welcomes were markedly cool. The people had discovered that they got along very nicely without the priests. They saved money.

Today the situation is that of a Catholic country that is nevertheless indifferent to the pleas, orders and instructions of the Catholic clergy. The power of the church is almost totally gone, and it can count for social support only on the wealthier layer of the upper class, and a small part of the petty bourgeoisie. The majority of the petty bourgeoisie, the workers, and the peasants, are either indifferent or hostile to the political program the church presents. Most of the women, however, are definitely pro-church, but at present they have very little political weight, and moreover are guided—weeping but obedient—by the wishes of their men folk.

The church-state question has therefore, no longer the importance of being Number One goal for the bourgeois democratic revolution. For by now, the Mexican workers and peasants are growingly class conscious and interested in concrete economic gains: land distribution, higher wages, union organizations, workers' insurance, and other issues part of a class-revolution program. They are uneasily, suspiciously, angrily wondering what happened to the "Revolution" in which they all fought so hard. The constitution makes many promises, but nevertheless living conditions have not changed enough to justify the fighting that was done. Prices, governed by an inflationary policy, are beginning to climb. The mines are now working full time, roads are being built, factories are being started, but of this boom they get nothing but the uncomfortable feeling that they have been gypped.

Just before the last elections, strong deep-flowing currents of revolt were already perceptible nearly everywhere in Mexico. Strikes, guerrilla raids on Calles' party headquarters, all sorts of minor and major incidents signalled clearly that the Mexican working cass was on the move. At the same time, naturally, the old and new capitalists, alarmed, began to mobilize too, in order to take the government over, either as an old-style dictatorship, or in Fascist form. The church campaign began again, started cleverly on a very small issue, spread methodically by Jesuit agents particularly, since it is they who constitute the backbone of the clerical Fascist movement all over the world. (Spain, Austria, Portugal, Argentine.)

It was easy, convenient, and spectacular for the government to pick that movement up and make a big show of revolutionarism by cracking down hard on the Catholic clergy and Catholic agitators. This was done especially by the nationalist demagogues such as Garrido Canabal, Adalberto Tejeda, and others jockeying for political position on a combined agrarian-anti-foreign-anti-church program. Calles shrewdly gave them plenty of room, admitting most of the saint-eating gang into the new Cabinet in order to color the new government a good cheap red.

It wasn't enough, however. The *Partido Nacional Revolucionario,* struggling hard to maintain its grip on the government, had to make a number of startling concessions. They are all put down in a beautiful red book called the *Plan Sexenal* (Six-year Plan). It is worth detailed consideration, for it states in black and white that the class struggle is inherent in the economic system under which we live, calls for a strengthening of the working class in order to "go towards socialism", and provides for: universal closed shop; minimum wage laws; free medical care of workers; unemployment, old age and sickness insurance; government-supported producers' and purchasers' coöperatives; nationalization of mines, railways, oil, and electric power. And finally, for socialist education (undefined).

How much of this amazing plan, which also contains some neat chiselling in favor of native versus foreign capitalists, and opens the door to glittering vistas of graft in semi-state, semi-private finance, mortgage, and other enterprises—will be carried out depends, of course, on how much pressure is exercized by each favored class. With all its jokers, it should not be underestimated, for it gives the workers a good deal of leverage. So far it has had one important effect. It has stimulated organization, so that now for the first time in several years, Mexico has a strong labor movement again.

To be sure, the "pro-worker" clauses in the Six-Year Plan exist because the workers were already powerfully organizing. They are significant clues to a rapidly developing revolutionary situation. In the face of it the Calles gang manuœvres to keep the struggle in the cultural field. It is easier, obviously, to go "Left" in painting, writing, and teaching, than to give way to revolutionary pressure where it touches Calles and Co. capitalists and affects imperialist pockets. Hence the focus of the fight now is the "socialist education" law which constitutes exactly nothing more and nothing less than a stiff blow to the church. For the only economic basis left the clergy is teaching in "lay" private schools. Obviously they cannot teach "socialism" as the law requires; it means excommunication from the church. The church takes a desperately defensive position, calling for American intervention, since that is now, literally, its only hope. The government meanwhile, builds a good rousing show out of the fight. It gives the petty bourgeois demagogues something to do, and the intelligentsia—noisily "socialist" on the Left wing of the Calles party—something confusing to think about. Presumably it is supposed to convince the workers and peasants that Calles is Lenin after all.

But they are not impressed. They take no part, unless paid well, or threatened formidably, in either pro-church or pro-government parades. Riots around churches are, as a rule, artificially provoked by one or the other side. The bourgeoisie is half-indifferent, half-hopeful, and gives secret but weak support to the Catholic agitators. Certain parts of it—the liberal professionals especially—have made some attempt to support the church agitation on a "free speech" issue, claiming curiously that the socialist education measure was objectionable because: 1) It violated free speech; and 2) it wasn't socialist enough. This petty piece of irresponsible gesturing was supported—in fact inspired by—the communist party. It made bedfellows of the reactionary rector of the University, and the radical intelligentsia, F.S.U. brand. Much to the advantage of Calles, the Mexican working class has now reason to wonder whether the Stalinist party and the Catholic clergy are sisters under the skin. Apparently its leaders have been unable to grasp the fact that all the progressive measures advocated by the Cardenas (Calles) government were *forced* upon it by working class pressure. Instead of supporting them, insisting that they be carried out, they attack them on the anarchist theory that anything governmental is to be repudiated and condemned. For them too, the goal of all activity is to put on a howling revolutionary show; even if in tacit alliance with the Fathers of the Holy counter-revolution itself.

Jean MENDEZ

THE NEXT ISSUE

After several years of rigid opposition to the idea that the communist party should initiate or help in the formation of a labor party in the United States, or that such a party would constitute a progressive step for the working class of this country, the C. P. was jerked out of its sleep one morning this month to find itself committed to exactly an opposite course. The commitment was made for it quite unexpectedly in a speech delivered by Earl Browder at the "congress for unemployment insurance" at Washington. The next issue of our review will devote an article to the question of a labor party in the United States.

The Peasants' War in China

WHAT PRECISELY is the situation today as regards the Red armies and the peasant war in China? What is the perspective for the peasant war and what does it mean for the Chinese revolution? Correct answers to these questions are vitally necessary before we can take a single step forward in formulating a revolutionary program for China consonant with the existing relationship of forces. It is not enough to look back over the long list of Stalinist crimes in the Chinese revolution, from the subordination of the workers and peasants to the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang in 1924-27 to the transposition of emphasis from city to village in the present day. This leads all too easily to a negative rejection of the enormous progressive significance of the peasant war in China. This we must first understand and from all available facts draw every possible positive conclusion favorable to an effective revival of the revolutionary movement in the cities.

The peasant Soviet districts in Kiangsi have suffered a series of crushing defeats in Chiang Kai-shek's sixth campaign. For this campaign Chiang marshalled a formidable war machine, an army of 350,000 men, a fleet of more than 100 planes, nearly 20,000 impressed laborers for building roads and fortifications, and a vast corps of political and missionary scavengers engaged in tearing from the peasants in the "recovered areas" the fruits of their five years of struggle against the Kuo Min Tang. The campaign has been conducted with the utmost ferocity. Villages and towns have been obliterated by unceasing air raids. Incendiary bombs have been used to lay waste hundreds of miles of forests and fields. Chiang's slogan has been "Exterminate the Reds!" This means—"exterminate the poor peasant population!"—and this has been literally carried out in an ever-increasing area.

Formerly long Kuo Min Tang columns would penetrate deeply into the Red territory only to be cut off and destroyed or disarmed by the mobile peasant bands. They marched into a countryside whose whole population threw its weight against them. The Kuo Min Tang armies broke and faltered under the counter-attack of the Red armies. The invaders were helpless against propaganda and intelligence corps which comprised virtually every man, woman and child of the poor peasantry of Southern Kiangsi. Through five successive Kuo Min Tang campaigns in four years the Reds fought their way successfully and emerged strengthened in arms, numbers, and morale.

During this last campaign, however, Chiang's tactics have undergone radical changes. The government army is advancing approximately abreast along a line which stretches from the Hunan border to Northern Fukien. This steam-roller advances slowly, confining its major activities to mopping up after the air raids have done their work. Advances are made only a few miles at a time. Stockades are punctuated by blockhouses, and small forts erected within rifle range of each other are set up across hills and down valleys. The most rigorous imaginable blockade is maintained to free passage of people, news and supplies into the Red areas. This is accomplished by a series of passes and a network of phone wires connecting all the military posts through which the movements of every traveller are rigidly controlled.

In former campaigns the driving of a Kuo Min Tang spearhead into Red territory was always followed by the seemingly miraculous rise of peasant armies from the hills on all sides, the defeat of the invaders and the almost immediate recovery of lost territory. In this campaign to date the Kuo Min Tang has not lost a single mile once recovered. And the territorial losses of the Reds have been great. At its height the "Chinese Soviet Republic" in Kiangsi could legitimately claim control of more than 60 of the province's 80 *hsien* (counties), not including the socalled "pink fringe" in which the population was under Red influence. Today the Reds have been pressed back into an area certainly not exceeding six *hsien,* some reports stating three, others five. The government troops, according to the most recent and apparently accurate reports, have reoccupied Juichin, the Soviet "capital".

Within this narrowing domain, the sufferings and sacrifices of the peasant armies —which in their best days never exceeded 70-80,000 men (excluding auxiliary forces) —are paralleled only by their magnificent heroism. Disease and hunger, lack of salt, oil and military supplies, cut off by the blockade which seems to be almost 100% effective, have not failed to take their toll. Communist publications in the Soviet districts themselves reveal the degree of demoralization which all these defeats have brought in their wake. They tell their own story of desertions, food rationing, shortage of ammunition and other difficulties. Several leading Red army commanders, like Kung Ho-chung and Chang Yi, have capitulated to Chiang Kai-shek. The hardships and privations are shared alike by the Red soldiers and the peasants who fight by their side. For it is clear that the overwhelming majority of the village poor are fleeing with the Red armies before the air raids and the Kuo Min Tang advance. Chiang's armies, according to a pro-Kuo Min Tang eyewitness, march into devastated village in which sometimes the only living things are the wracked bodies of wounded peasants who have not been able to escape from under the raining bombs. The highly-heralded program of "rural rehabilitation" with which the campaign is supposedly being accompanied, is mainly for the benefit of those refugees from the Reds who return in the wake of the government troops, in other words, the returning landlords and upper middle peasants.

Nevertheless, the Kuo Min Tang victory is by no means complete. Not even the iron lines of soldiery guarding the boundaries of the recovered areas can prevent bands of peasants from swooping down in black of night and destroying bridges which have been built over gulleys, ravines and small streams. It was Chiang's primary purpose to surround and extirpate the Red armies and in this purpose he has failed. The loss of territory, the toll in lives, the disease and sufferings resulting from the blockade, the destruction of the Soviet administrations and the virtual liquidation of the "Soviet Republic" in Kiangsi all constitute a stunning blow to the peasant cause. Of this there can be no question. But the main bodies of the Red armies are still intact, although somewhat reduced. Only a few weeks ago Chiang Kai-shek himself admitted that there were still 60,000 "Red remnants". Nearly half a million men, armed with the latest accoutrements of warfare, the last word in American, British, Japanese and Italian armaments, instructed by German, Italian and American strategists and aviators, have not been able to close in around a miserable, ragged handful. They have won no easy victories and the final victory is not yet theirs. They have not been able to prevent the fleeing Reds from breaking through the lines and shifting the theatre of warfare to Southern Hunan. Government leaders at Nanking and the government-controlled press are by no means disposed to crow over the outcome of the campaign. There is still an anxious edge to their tone.

The reason for this uncertainty in the ranks of the bourgeoisie is not far to seek. They know perfectly well that a temporary success in Kiangsi is certain to be—indeed already is—paralleled by a certain growth of the peasant movement elsewhere. The Kuo Min Tang is incapable of solving a single one of the problems which give rise to the peasant war. Of this they are perfectly aware. "You are fighting Red bandits at the front and creating Red bandits in the rear," complains the *Ta Kung-pao,* a leading bourgeois daily. This process is already clearly taking form in the newly-recovered areas. In these districts a grandiose program of "rural rehabilitation" is launched in the wake of the armies. Attempts are made to coax the peasants to return by offers of loans at low rates of interest, offers of seed and tools. The expenses for this are being carried by the provincial administration which has to drain and squeeze all the more heavily the peasants in the northern part of the province who have never been under Red influence. A system of rural credit is being established but according to one pro-Kuo Min Tang observer, the provincial machine is only temporarily bearing the charges on this money which will in the long run cost the people of Kiangsi more than they have had to pay the usurers in the past when rates up to 40 and 50% have been common.

But the basic problem in Kiangsi as in all of South China is the problem of land tenure. The landlord-tenant relationship overwhelmingly predominates in these regions. In Kiangsi before the days of the Reds it was estimated that more than 70% of the land was held by less than 30% of the population. Wherever the Reds held sway the landlords were driven out, land deeds and leases burned and land boundaries destroyed. Returning now into these areas, Chiang Kai-shek can offer no more to placate the peasantry than a purely temporary lightening of the miscellaneous tax burden and the suspension of rent collections *for one year.* A special decree issued by Chiang's Nanchang headquarters on September 12 proclaimed that from one year of the date of recovery of any district, all owners of land could resume the collection of rent. The Chinese bourgeoisie is itself inextricably compounded with the landlords. Capitalist and feudal forms alike are used in the exploitation of the peasantry. The Kuo Min Tang is the gov-

ernment of the bourgeoisie. It dare not penalize its class to any greater extent than a single year's rent. To the poor peasant this is as one drop of rain where he needs a veritable cloudburst. He has less than ever to lose. He will more than ever continue to struggle.

So while Chiang's hordes are "recovering" Kiangsi, they are not only not destroying the Red armies but they are not and cannot think of destroying the system of exploitation whose continued existence is a warrant for the rise of dozens and scores of Red armies in a dozen other places in the future. Nor are the Red armies of Kiangsi eliminated for they have succeeded in breaking through the iron rim around Kiangsi at several places. The main body of the fleeing Reds is now in Southern Hunan. Last August an army of no less than 10,000 marched into Northern Fukien, took Shuikow and came within attacking distance of Foochow. Imperialist gunboats rushed to the scene and Chiang poured in reinforcements until there were no less than 21 divisions of central government troops in the province. Foochow army headquarters wired to Nanking that "it is like a fierce tiger jumping on a lamb". Yet the tiger, while it was able to drive the lamb from the Foochow area, recover Shuikow and eventually, weeks later, re-occupy the former Red stronghold at Changting, was unable to dislodge it from the mountain district in Northwestern Fukien.

On the other side of the line in Western Kiangsi later the same month, Hsiao Keh, a Red commander, managed to bring his force of 4,000 men to the border, break through the lines and cross over into Hunan. Confounding the troops of Ho Chien, the Hunan militarist, he was able to make a spectacular march across the southern part of the province, swell his forces to nearly 10,000, swing in a broad arc northward along the Kweichow border and effect a junction with the peasant army of Ho Lung which recently established itself in Northeastern Kweichow. Within the last few weeks the rest of the main body of the Kiangsi Red army, its total number now uncertain, has followed the same trail and despite the most strenuous efforts of the government troops, has succeeded in making its way into Hunan, with the probable objective of an eventual march to Szechwan. The reluctance of provincial militarists to face the Reds and their willingness to live and let live as long as the Red objective is merely a passage through their provinces favor the possibility that the Kiangsi forces will succeed in reaching Szechwan. The impotence of the provincial forces is reflected in the frantic telegrams from the gentry in the affected areas demanding Central Government aid. Typical of such appeals was the wire of a group of Kweichow landlords (published in the press September 18) who complained: "The Kweichow armies certainly cannot suppress Ho Lung . . . there is no hope in asking them to do so. When Ho Lung came . . . he had only 3-4,000 men, many of them sick and wounded . . . he relieved the poor, abolished harsh requisitions. . . . Within two months his army expanded to 10,000 men."

In Szechwan peasant armies operating in the northeastern part of the province in recent months inflicted such heavy defeats on the provincial forces that Liu Hsiang, the chief warlord, withdrew entirely and retired southward to Chungking. The unbelievable lengths to which oppression of the peasantry has been carried, the collection of land taxes eighty years in advance, the forced cultivation of the opium poppy on a vast scale, the divisions and jealousies among the province's many militarists, the disaffection in their swollen armies, all obviously favor the further extension of the agrarian movement in Szechwan. That great western province, where misery under militarist rule has been of the blackest, offers the possibility for a recrudescence of the peasant war on a larger scale than it ever achieved in Kiangsi. Its remoteness behind mountain fastnesses, its natural wealth, its salt mines and its fertile valleys all indicate that a possible new "Central Soviet district" in Szechwan would be far more impregnable and self-sufficient than Kiangsi could ever hope to be. This is a factor to be reckoned with although its realization can not be looked for in the immediate future. But the Szechwanese gentry can look ahead. "If the Reds do eventually occupy Chungking and Wanhsien . . ." they recently wired Nanking, "then a Red Szechwan could not be averted. The Szechwan mountains are steep and it would take long years to recover the province. . . ."

These larger movements are duplicated on a much smaller scale in hundreds of villages throughout the country—right up to the gates of Nanking and on the outskirts of Shanghai itself—where peasants offer armed resistance to tax collectors, where they raid landlords' stores for rice and attack local officials who oppress them.

The cumulative effect of all this evidence indicates that despite the heavy defeat in Kiangsi, the peasant war in China can and will continue for a long time to come. Militarist divisions and jealousies, conflicts within the Kuo Min Tang simultaneously favor the development of the peasant war and are exacerbated by it. The deepening bankruptcy of Chinese rural economy, the inability of the Kuo Min Tang to deal with the smallest of the problems which have impoverished China's peasantry, the vastness of the country and the great remote areas in which peasant armies can operate, all mean that the peasant war will continue, in smaller or larger degree, in this region or that, to be a characteristic feature of the Chinese scene under Kuo Min Tang militarist rule.

But whether it continues in scattered, guerrilla forms (as it probably will during the next lengthy period) or whether it succeeds in establishing a new, more or less permanent base for itself, the peasant war can have no prospect of successful, revolutionary issue so long as the Chinese working class in the industrial centers remains, as it is today, prostrate. So long as the Kuo Min Tang, with the support of native and foreign exploiters, can continue to control the main arteries of the country's economic life, so long can it pit its strength against the peasantry. Only the resuscitation of the working class movement can break through this impasse and strike a new balance of forces in favor of the revolution. The Stalinist hope for the capture of cities by the Red armies is not excluded. But even in such an eventuality, there is no reason to suppose that the inevitable differentiation within the peasantry will not drive its leaders into the laps of the bourgeoisie unless—again—there is a powerful, organized, labor movement and a working class party capable of utilizing such a situation in the interests of the proletarian revolution. Lacking this, the prospect can only be one of mutual exhaustion, deeper economic collapse, death, destruction, chaos in which imperialist intervention would be certain to play its part.

For it is precisely because the working class has been throttled that the Kuo Min Tang could hurl army after army against the peasants without fear of a mortal revolutionary thrust within its own strongholds. The lack of a working class movement is the fundamental cause for today's defeats of the peasant armies. This the Stalinists have either never understood or else cynically ignored. With the same criminal lightmindedness which has characterized their whole catastrophic course in China, the Stalinists assign to the peasantry not only an independent rôle in the revolution but the *leading* rôle. This is not only implicit in the disaster-ridden theory of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" but is explicit in the course of action which they pursue. At the feet of this policy and this course of action must be laid major responsibility for the heavy blows and heavy sacrifices which the peasant armies are today being forced to make.

But a correct evaluation of the rôle and significance of the peasant war is a necessary condition to an effective Bolshevik-Leninist program. The reaction against the Stalinist swing from the proletariat to the peasantry has created in the minds of many comrades a psychological reaction which expresses itself in passivity toward the peasant armies. In peasant defeats they often have the tendency to see not a blow against the revolution but a confirmation of their anti-Stalinist views. The peasant Red armies have actually been slandered as "bandits" by some of these comrades. Such a view can have nothing in common with that of any Marxist revolutionary. It must be decisively repudiated if the banner of Leninism is to be raised again in China.

In the peasant armies the working class and its vanguard must recognize revolutionary allies. But these armies cannot be cloaked in a proletarian garb. On the other hand, the great progressive significance of the peasant war must be fully understood. The slogans of the agrarian revolution and at least their partial application are being carried under revolutionary banners over wide areas. Of all political movements today operating in China it alone is progressive. It alone is an ever-present threat to the rapacious militarists. True, the mere dangling of the episodic victories of the peasant armies before the working classes cannot be substituted, as it has been by the Stalinists, for an independent working class program. But the persistence of the peasant war, in so far as it continues to force Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuo Min Tang to expend most of their resources to suppress it, is a factor of vital importance to the working class. Every peasant advance, every peasant success improves the opportunities which still exist in the cities for the revival of the working class movement. Similarly, every peasant defeat, every Kuo Min Tang victory, reduces those opportunities.

Existing conditions make the fate of the peasant war a matter of the greatest moment to all Bolshevik-Leninists. But this does not mean that they can passively await its outcome. All the more imperative and pressing today is the need for building a

new, independent working class party with an independent working class program which corresponds concretely to the needs of the proletariat. Thus armed, and only thus armed, will the proletariat be able to join and lead a united front of the revolutionary layers of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie and ensure the victory of the Third Chinese Revolution.

Harold R. ISAACS

PEIPING, *November* 15, 1934

Archives of the Revolution

DOCUMENTS OF THE HISTORY AND THEORY OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

The Testament of Lenin

BY THE stability of the Central Committee, of which I spoke before, I mean measures to prevent a split, so far as such measures can be taken. For, of course, the White Guard in *Russkaya Mysl* (I think it was S. E. Oldenburg) was right when, in the first place, in his play against Soviet Russia he banked on the hope of a split in our party, and when, in the second place, he banked for that split on serious disagreements in our party.

Our party rests upon two classes, and for that reason its instability is possible, and if there cannot exist an agreement between such classes its fall is inevitable. In such an event it would be useless to take any measures or in general to discuss the stability of our Central Committee. In such an event no measures would prove capable of preventing a split. But I trust that is too remote a future, and too improbable an event, to talk about.

I have in mind stability as a guarantee against a split n the near future, and I intend to examine here a series of considerations of a purely personal character.

I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability—from this point of view—as such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky. The relation between them constitutes, in my opinion, a big half of the danger of that split, which might be avoided, and the avoidance of which might be promoted in my opinion by raising the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred.

Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand, comrade Trotsky, as was proved by his struggle against the Central Committee in connection with the question of the People's Commissariat of Ways and Communications, is distinguished not only by his exceptional ability—personally, he is, to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee—but also by his too far-reaching self-confidence and a disposition to be far too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs.

These two qualities of the two most able leaders of the present Central Committee might, quite innocently, lead to a split, and if our party does not take measures to prevent it, a split might arise unexpectedly.

I will not further characterize the other members of the Central Committee as to their personal qualities. I will only remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev was not, of course, accidental, but that it ought as little to be used against them as the non-Bolshevism of Trotsky.

Lenin wrote what has come to be known as the Testament for transmission to the 12th congress of the Russian Communist party, the first one his illness would not permit him to attend. Hoping for his recovery, Krupskaya withheld the notes and presented them to the 13th congress only after Lenin's death. By a vote of 30 to 10, the leadership refused to have the document read to the congress, for it was just then engaged in a violent struggle to discredit Trotsky and "Trotskyism". The document, so keen and profound a product of Lenin's mature thought and concern about the party situation, was literally suppressed. Its authenticity, widely denied by the supporters of Stalin, was, however, confirmed by the latter, under pressure of the Opposition, in a speech in Moscow, reprinted in the International Press Correspondence *of November* 17, 1927: *"It is said that in the 'Testament' in question Lenin suggested to the party congress that it should deliberate on the question of replacing Stalin and appointing another comrade in his place as General Secretary of the party. This is perfectly true. . . . Yes, comrades, I am rude towards those who are rudely and disloyally destroying and disintegrating the party. I have never made a secret of it and shall not do so now." A detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the Testament is to be found in the July and August* 1934 *issues of* THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.

The allusion in the second clause of the first sentence is to a part of the notes dealing with economic organization.—ED.

Of the younger members of the Central Committee, I want to say a few words about Piatakov and Bukharin. They are, in my opinion, the most able forces (among the youngest) and in regard to them it is necessary to bear in mind the following: Bukharin is not only the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the party, but also may legitimately be considered the favorite of the whole party; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for there is something scholastic in him (he never has learned, and I think never fully understood the dialectic).

And then Piatakov—a man undoubtedly distinguished in will and ability, but too much given over to the administrative side of things to be relied on in a serious political question.

Of course, both these remarks are made by me merely with a view of the present time, or supposing that these two able and loyal workers may not find an occasion to supplement their knowledge and correct their onesidedness.

December 25, 1922.

Postscript: Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us communists, becomes unsupportable in the office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc. This circumstance may seem an insignificant trifle, but I think that from the point of view of preventing a split and from the point of view of the relation between Stalin and Trotsky which I discussed above, it is not a trifle, or it is such a trifle as may acquire a decisive significance.

January 4, 1923. LENIN

Brest-Litovsk

IN THE standard indictment of "anti-Leninism" against Leon Trotsky is contained the charge that he opposed signing the Brest-Litovsk treaty proposed in 1918 by the Germans. The latest volume of Lenin's collected works (German edition) to arrive here enables us for the first time to present also the standpoint of Stalin in the question of signing the treaty following the outrageous conditions put to Russia by the Germans. The minutes of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party on February 23, 1918, record Stalin as saying: *"We do not need to sign, but we can begin peace negotiations."* After Lenin had threatened to withdraw from the government and the Central Committee unless the treaty was signed, he made the following remarks in the course of which he replied to Stalin:

"Reproaches have been made against me because of the Ultimatum. I put it forward only in the extremest case. When our C.C. members talk about an international civil war, that is a mockery. We have the civil war in Russia, but not in Germany. Our agitation is going further, but we are not agitating with words but with the revolution. And that remains. Stalin is wrong when he says that we do not need to sign. We must sign these conditions. If you do not do this, then you will sign the death warrant of the Soviet power in three weeks. These conditions do not infringe upon the Soviet power. I do not waver in the slightest. I do not put the ultimatum in order to withdraw it again. I want no revolutionary phrase. The German revolution has not yet matured. That requires months. The conditions must be accepted. If a new ultimatum then comes, we shall have a new situation." (Lenin, *Sämtliche Werke,* Vol. XXII. p. 297.)

BOOKS

Captive Science

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND SOCIAL NEEDS. By JULIAN HUXLEY. 288 pp. London. Watts & Co. 7-6.

Capitalism was the father of modern science. Without the mighty stimulus of capitalist enterprise the sciences would have grown as slowly in the western world as in China or India. Conversely, capitalism itself could not have developed its productive powers and mastered the world without the aid of scientific theory and technique.

Even in its heroic days, the bourgeoisie was the exploiter as well as the patron of the sciences. But on the whole bourgeois society provided a rich soil for the growth and cultivation of one science after another from astronomy to biology. Today the interests of the capitalist class no longer coincide with the main line of scientific progress. The sciences and capitalist society are travelling in opposite directions. While the sciences advance at double-quick time, capitalism stagnates and declines. At every step the further progress of the various sciences is retarded by insurmountable social obstacles that lie athwart their path.

The pure sciences farthest removed from the pressing concerns and material needs of capitalist society can proceed at an accelerated pace for an indefinite period, as the achievements of Einstein and Rutherford in the fields of mathematical physics and subatomic research bear witness. But all the sciences are subjected to tremendous strains and pressures as soon as any attempt is made to apply the results of their researches to the welfare of the masses on a social scale.

The relations between scientific research and social needs provide the point of departure for this admirable survey of scientific activity in England by Julian Huxley, the noted British biologist. At the behest of the British Boadcasting Company Huxley toured the most important scientific institutions to ascertain what the research workers in various fields were doing and to what extent the results of their researches were being used to serve the needs of the English people. He returned with a wealth of interesting information about the different kinds of research now being undertaken and an increased insight into the nature of science. He also brought back a mass of evidence demonstrating how capitalist society is stunting the growth of science; perverting its accomplishments; restricting the scope of its applications; and withholding its benefits from the majority of the people.

British agronomists and biologists assured Huxley, for example, that they could easily double the amount of food grown in England with the present scientific knowledge at their command. "But why double the number of sheep," they asked, "if sheep prices fall so low as to ruin the farmer? What is the good of inventing new brands of wheat that make it possible to grow more bushels per acre or to push wheat cultivation nearer the pole, if the world's wheat producers already have vast surpluses they cannot dispose of and are clamoring for restriction of output?"

They are also confronted with the spectre of conflicts within the Empire and the problem of the balance between agriculture and industry. "What will happen to New Zealand mutton and Australian beef if we double our own livestock, or Canadian wheat and apples, if we increase our home output? And how will England receive payment for its manufacturing exports and foreign capital investments if England becomes agriculturally self-sufficient?" While the agricultural scientist is beset by these paralyzing economic contradictions, millions of Englishmen must remain without enough food, or the right kind of food, to eat.

Huxley heard the same story wherever he went. In construction much progress was being made in the standardization and testing of materials and in several departments that catered to the comfort of the wealthy and upper middle classes. At the same time, despite the present building boom, over one-fifth of the population live in slums unfit for human habitation. And the technicians lament, "We can build excellent houses for everyone but to let them to working class families at a profitable rent is another story."

Capitalism is compelled to keep the greater part of the treasures of scientific research behind locked doors to which only the wealthy have keys. The scientists have solved the main problems of a healthy diet so that they now know what vitamins and mineral salts are needed for daily bodily fuel and wear-and-tear. Nevertheless, as physical measurements and the prevalence of rickets prove, a large section of the English people suffers from chronic deficiency in one or another of these food factors. "The reason for this," says Huxley, "is partly public ignorance, but it is largely sheer poverty."

Huxley's investigations expose the hollowness of many myths propagated by the idealistic philosophers of science. The tender solicitude that capitalist society is supposed to show for pure research is hardly apparent in England. There, according to Huxley, "most of the money put up by the government for research goes for the practical needs of industry and war." That is, to increase and safeguard the profits of the capitalist class.

The same proportions hold good for the total annual expenditures. Industrial research accounts for nearly half the total amount; research for the fighting services takes one half of what is spent on industry; research connected with agriculture, forestry, and fishing take a fifth or sixth of the total; medical and health research about an eight or less. Research in all other branches, *including basic research*, amounts to less than one-twelfth of the total. Those critics who assert that pure research will be stifled in the noxious utilitarian atmosphere of a socialist society must admit that English capitalism does not set a very high mark to aim at. Less than one-twelfth of its budget on pure research and a paltry five or six million pounds a year on all research.

Scientific activity under capitalism bears all the stigmata of capitalist enterprise. Ideally international, its researches are conscripted to serve the interests of English capital. Even in the universities much scientific work is being carried on in secrecy and the results unpublished. In one government-aided institution, Huxley was told that it would be against the national industrial interests even to let it be known that a lot of research was being carried on, much less to describe any of it! The same secrecy and suppression accorded to patented processes surrounds the results of pure research, which are theoretically the common property of all scientists.

Those philosophers who make a sharp disjunction between pure and applied science will derive no support from Huxley. In an interesting discussion with P. M. S. Blackett, the English physicist, he brings out how tenuous and shifting the dividing line between these two sides of scientific activity is. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, one of the most general and abstract of all physical laws, was first formulated by Carnot as the result of his study of that most concrete of all objects, the steam engine. It was no historical accident, then, that the science of thermodynamics was developed in the early 19th century when there was a pressing social-economic need to increase the efficiency of the steam engine rather than in the early 17th century, when neither the steam engine nor the need existed.

Huxley uncovered an equally striking example of the interplay between pure and applied science in the textile industry. Laue's pioneer work in the analysis of the intimate structure of crystals by means of the X-ray had found immediate industrial application in the X-raying of steel, paints, glass, etc. The usual procedure of research from the laboratory of the pure scientist out into industrial practise was then reversed by Astbury. While studying the woolen fibre for the textile manufacturers at Leeds by methods based on Laue's work, he discovered that the wool fibre was an exceptionally favorable object for studying the intimate structure of protein molecules. His findings have not only led to many improvements in woolen manufacture but have actually opened up an important new branch of fundamental biological research.

Huxley touches on many other matters of interest to a Marxist, the dependence of the development of pure science on the state of industrial technique, the decisive influence of social, political, and economic forces in shaping the character and determining the course of science, etc. Like his grandfather, Huxley represents the finest type of bourgeois scientist. He carries over the habits of accurate observation and reliable reporting from the biological to the social field. Unfortunately, he also trails with him a belief in eugenics and population control as the sovereign remedy for curing the ills of capitalist society. An acquaintance with that science of society known as Marxism might have saved him from such puerile conclusions. But those we can attribute, among other reasons, to that backward state of the social sciences about which Huxley himself complains in this volume.

John MARSHALL

Apologetics

FASCISM AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION. By R. PALME DUTT. 289 pp. New York. International Publishers 1934. $1.75.

John Strachey has called Dutt's latest book "incomparably the best book on Fascism that has yet been written". Undoubtedly it is most comprehensive in scope; for it begins with the socio-historical basis for Fascism, enters into an analysis of the

theory and practise of Fascism, its victory in Italy, Germany, and Austria; the tendencies towards Fascism in Western Europe (France) and the United States, the relation between Fascism and social democracy, etc.

It is obvious that Dutt has been assigned the Sisyphus task of systematizing the Stalinist theory in this field in popular fashion and to supply a suave apology for the capitulation of the German Communist party to Fascism. Only an author whose style and reputation as a Legal Marxist—having refrained from active participation in the decade-old struggles which have racked the world revolutionary movement—could make palatable—for some!—that which when served by less skilled hands is entirely indigestible.

Dutt has now more openly come out as an apologist for Stalinism. This is as was to be expected. (See our review of Dutt's *Lenin* in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, August 1934.)

However, his skillful evasiveness and apparent objectivity still remain. To an average reader, his book, which reads interestingly, is almost convincing. Though an active politician he, unlike his higher ups—and even such newcomers as John Strachey—does not even mention the disputes on Fascism within the revolutionary movement. In a word, it is a sort of division of labor within which Dutt—so far?—still assumes the "scholarly" form of Stalinist apologetics.

Dutt summarizes his conception of Fascism as follows:

"Fascism, in short, is a movement of mixed elements, dominantly petty bourgeois, but also slum-proletarian and demoralized working class, financed and directed by finance capital, by the big industrialists and landlords and financiers, to defeat the working class revolution and smash the working class organization" (p. 82).

This sounds fairly good. But a few pages earlier Dutt quotes with approval from the program of the Sixth congress of the Comintern (why does he have to go as far back as 1928 for an official definition of Fascism?) that "the principal aim of Fascism is to destroy the revolutionary labor movement, i.e., the communist sections and leading units of the proletariat." Nothing is said in this definition, or in the program, about Fascism smashing *all* working class organizations, as Dutt definitely implies in the above quotation.

To accept the Sixth congress conception of the aim of Fascism—and the subsequent plenary sessions of the Executive Committee were even cruder—Fascism was impossible, for example, in Austria, for there was no "revolutionary labor movement" in that country! Even more. Wherein lay the *common* basis for a united front with social democracy, so far as the latter was concerned, if Fascism aimed to crush only the revolutionary section of the labor movement?

Later, Dutt designates as Fascist the régimes in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Spain under de Rivera. But do these governments comply with his definition of Fascism? Hardly. Then why the designation? In order to show the compatibility of a Fascist régime and a legal social democratic party, that is, to "prove" the theory of social Fascism.

For a Marxist, the fact that in Hungary, for example, a middle class movement never was the basis for the Horthy régime, that an amputated parliament, reformist trade unions and a loyal opposition in the form of the social democracy are tolerated, is precisely what distinguishes the dictatorship in Hungary from Fascism. But Dutt is not interested in scientific analysis.

He gets around this indiscriminate gathering under one roof of different phenomena by calling the régimes of Mussolini and Hitler "complete Fascist" and the others merely "Fascist". He then gracefully drops the word "complete" from the description of the German and Italian governments (as in his definition); does not define what incomplete "Fascism" is, and presto! he smuggles in a defense of the theory of "social Fascism".

Nor is Dutt any clearer on the question of whether the social democratic party is a working class organization. If it is, then according to Dutt, it follows that it would be smashed by Fascism; but this would contradict the theory of social Fascism. If it is not, then the working class united front with social democracy is impossible; but this would contradict the present united front tactics of the Stalinists!

Dutt was given the impossible task of defending the old theory and the new practise, at a time when one may well speak of the withering away of the theory of social Fascism.

He further states that the theory is substantiated not only by the legality of social democracy in Hungary, etc., but even in a "fully completed Fascist dictatorship", such as Italy or Germany: "Both [Fascism and Social Democracy.—J.C.] exist together; and each performs a distinctive rôle, supplementing one another."

But in these countries the social democratic parties and the trade unions have been smashed. Quite right, replies Dutt, but *only* organizationally! Since Fascism cannot possibly find a mass basis within the working class, and social democratic ideology still dominates the proletariat, social democracy remains the chief social support of the bourgeoisie.

This mystical theory was of course concocted after the destruction of the German social democracy by Hitler! As befits his station, Dutt concludes the discussion of this matter by stating that Stalin was correct when he wrote in 1924: "Social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of Fascism!"

The problem of how Fascism came to power in Germany is solved by Dutt with the formula: Social democracy! To make a credible story of this one-sided conception, he is compelled to omit all references to the strength of the C.P. in 1923; the fact that political power was within its reach in October of that year and that it failed; the policies of the German Communist party in the class struggle which led them to that isolation which Dutt depicts—but which the Stalinists vociferously denied in the pre-Hitler days.

Suffice it for Dutt to repeat the Stalinist fable of their four united front proposals to the social democracy and to state that the Comintern never rejected in principle the "united front from above" (p. 121). The united front is now called the "crucial question", the instrument which would have crushed Fascism. Since the social democracy rejected it, it is responsible for Hitler's victory.

In the first place, none of the four so-called proposals was, according to the available evidence, made directly to the executives of the social democracy and the trade unions. Second, Dutt records that on July 20, 1932 the social democrats stated that they were ready to accept a non-aggression pact with the communist party as a pre-condition for a united front. The C.P. rejected this. Why was it wrong to accept a non-aggression pact in 1932 and good "Bolshevik policy" in 1933-34?

Third, that the united front from above was rejected *in principle* (despite some inconsistencies common to all Stalinist policies) is well known, particularly to Dutt. For he and his colleagues of the Central Committee of the British C.P. were reprimanded in 1932 for forming a united front with the I.L.P. leaders "in spite of numerous decisions of international congresses and conferences [of the Third International—J.C.] on the need of adopting the united front tactic *only* from below. . . ." (*Communist International,* March 15, 1932, p. 161.)

Dutt the "Marxist" sees no connection between an evaluation of the rôle of social democracy—as in the theory of social Fascism—and the united front. The two questions are put into two separate, air-tight compartments. It would indeed be embarrassing for Dutt to inter-relate them.

Dutt's apology for Stalinism is the best available. Yet, what a feeble product!

Joseph CARTER

Gods and Society

THE PASSING OF THE GODS. By V. F. CALVERTON. 320 pp. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

In three hundred pages V. F. Calverton attempts to say a great many things about religion from primitive times to the present. Here, however, I should like to limit myself to one central point: the contrast between the conception of the nature of religion suggested by Marx and that of Calverton.

Calverton's main thesis is that the savage's fear of his natural environment, plus institutional and ideological inertia, accounts for the existence of religion. Religion arose because of primitive man's inability to control his environment, and seemed to give man power to fulfil his economic needs. Then, in the last few centuries, "the agricultural world which had perpetuated the religious mentality began to give way to an industrial world in which that type of mentality was no longer needed. As the discovery of natural laws prepared the way for the mechanical inventions that made possible the Industrial Revolution, man became less dependent upon the gods and more dependent upon science for the power he needed over his environment" (p. 87).

Calverton has obscured this general thesis by also accepting Frazer's. Frazer makes a fundamental distinction between magic and religion; magic is for him primitive science, religion is primitive metaphysics. This distinction—which has been abandoned not only by most anthropologists but also by serious liberal religionists like A. Eustace Haydon, Shirley Jackson Case, etc.—has an apologetic function; it serves to obscure the instrumental character of religion; and is, in fact, logically contradictory to Calverton's general thesis.

As for Calverton's main thesis, it leads him to insist that religion today is disap-

pearing; in line with this notion, he says: "The best proof of that fact [that religion is disappearing] is to be seen in what has happened to Russia. . . . Today the religious, metaphysical mind has evaporated. Why? Because Soviet Russia has become an industrialized state. . . . The result has been that the religious mentality has been driven into irrecoverable retreat within the span of little more than a decade." (P. 89.) In capitalist countries, too, religion is fast disappearing. "Notwithstanding all that may be said to the contrary, notwithstanding all the statistics of membership that the churches may cite, the fact remains that the religious mentality is in a state of disintegration and decay, with no hope left for its recovery. Its social purpose has been superseded by that of science." (P. 89.) In further proof of the death of religion, Calverton produces figures (p. 263) which he has apparently misunderstood; for they show church membership to be growing proportionally with the population, though stationary in percentage; whereas for Calverton's thesis there would have to be a precipitous fall. Then, Calverton (perhaps attempting to overcome this contradiction) says: "But the decline and decay of religion in America is more of a qualitative than a quantitative phenomenon. It is in spirit far more than in numbers that American religion has deteriorated." (P. 267.) Here, of course, Calverton confuses two different meanings of decay: it is one thing to say that religion is decaying, meaning that by present intellectual and moral criteria it is no longer progressive; it is entirely different, and inadmissable, to say that religion is decaying in the sense that the churches are about to disappear.

A Marxist can have little in common with Calverton's position. Throughout, when Calverton speaks of the "environment", it is always clear from the context that he means the *physical* environment. This is particularly obvious in all references to science as giving us control over "the environment". This is the position of bourgeois atheism, which holds that religion is generated as an escape from frustrations imposed on primitive man by uncontrolled nature, but which will not recognize the frustrations imposed on modern man by uncontrolled (bourgeois) forces of production.

What bourgeois atheism fails to recognize is that frustrations imposed by uncontrolled nature were *social* frustrations. The *fetichism* of nature which generated the primitive and ancient religions was the result of the fact that the social process of labor, that is the interaction of society with nature, was not fortified by adequate techniques; this *social* condition has long been supplanted as the main condition for the existence of religion. Calverton and bourgeois atheists fail to understand this too. But the fetichism which today sustains religion is what Marx called the *fetichism of commodities*. This means that the process of producing commodities is not mastered by society but is today the master of society.

Society's labor appears to it in the form of elemental forces beyond its control. Forces so independent of control appear in the realm of experience, inevitably, as non-social forces indistinguishable from natural catastrophes. Business failures and crimes, war and poverty appear as though by the inexorable hand of fate. And to the individual, neither will, nor foresight, nor effort are in any case commensurate with results: the worker toils and yet starves, and is thrown out of work to suffer still more, by forces which cannot but seem mysterious and evil to him; the bourgeois is equally in the hands of fate, for there is no relation between his efforts and rewards; he is superstitious when he plays a hunch on the stockmarket and wins, and equally superstitious when business prospers or fails. Commodities, the products of society's own efforts, rear up like monsters to overwhelm their maker. Men are frustrated at every turn by their own social relations. There is a basic dualism between social ethics and practical activity. Attempts to satisfy our needs or potentialities by the secular techniques fail or are frustrated. It is inevitable under these circumstances that many should turn for satisfaction to the religious techniques.

The bourgeois atheist cannot understand this process because he cannot admit that the bourgeoisie is not the master of society's productive forces. For him historical contradictions ended with feudalism, and thereafter there are only problems for science to solve in the course of its development. Even the liberal bourgeois aware of what he calls the "social problem" proposes its solution by new scientific processes or by the application of "knowledge", i.e., by agreed upon technical methods, and not by social methods—which upon analysis mean class struggle. For the bourgeois atheist, therefore, it is impossible to understand that the roots of religion today are social, that no amount of enlightenment can break up the religious complex until the fetichisms which generate it are done away with by the building of a form of society which will be master of the productive forces. The Yaroslavskys of the Soviet Union may make their vulgar boasts that they are doing away with religion, and many may believe them, but this is merely another perverted derivative of the theory of socialism in one country. Russia is in the grip of world economy, and to the Russian masses, too, in spite of the gigantic industrial developments, the forces of production cannot but still appear as forces with a demonic life of their own: the Protestant sects which have been springing up in the Soviet Union throughout the last ten years are proof of this fact.

Speaking of the fetichism of commodities, Marx says, "Such reflections of the real world will not disappear until the relations between human beings in their practical everyday life have assumed the aspect of perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations as between man and man, and as between man and nature. The life process of society, this meaning the material process of production, will not lose its veil of mystery until it becomes a process carried on by a free association of producers, under their conscious and purposive control."

Calverton's analysis of religion contains not an inkling of the main condition for the existence of religion today! Not a word about the process whereby man's own labors confront him as independent forces. Calverton is, in this book as in much other work, ridden by the genetic fallacy. He thinks the primary origin of religion must still be its basis; and is ready to go so far, in fact, as to make religion a cultural hangover, as it were, from the days when agriculture was the dominant form of production. This is hopelessly undialectical. Religion may have many origins, as may anything else which has a history. No Marxist would thinkingly put himself in the intellectual position that his criticism of religion today depended on its historical origins. What he is interested in is, primarily, the conditions for the existence of religion *today*.

Of these conditions there is no analysis at all in this book. In other words, this is a book designed to attack religion as a capitalist institution but which really cannot do so because it does not reveal the reasons for the existence of religion under capitalism.

Felix MORROW

An Angry Epic

BABOUK. By GUY ENDORE. 297 pp. New York. Vanguard Press. $2.

The quickest way to short-circuit most of the long-winded controversies about Art vs. Propaganda is to bring in a few concrete examples that do organically combine matter and method so that no one can say where the one leaves off and the other begins. *Babouk* is hereby offered in evidence —a red flag to anger the bull, to cheer the red army, and to delight the spectator.

Books about the Negro range from pure propaganda, like *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, to pure art, like *The Emperor Jones*—both highly successful in fulfilling their respective aims. Lest anybody might suspect that *The Emperor Jones* was O'Neill's last word on the Negro, as a childish, egotistical, short-sighted adventurer, he followed this work with *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, in which the Negro intelligentsia are shown to be precisely like the white ditto, with of course an additional handicap. This makes O'Neill a "pure" artist, of the art-for-art's-sake school, a perfect foil and contrast to Uncle Tom, of the art-for-Christ's-sake vintage. If there is an underlying thesis in O'Neill, it is to the effect that people are as they are, and what are you going to do about it? If an artist wishes his work to lead to action as well as pleasure, he has a choice of two questions: "How did they get that way?" or "What are we going to do about it?"

Guy Endore has chosen to put his emphasis on the first, though the second is definitely stated in his use of "Black and white, unite and fight". He takes the cargo of a French slaver in the late eighteenth century, loads it at Goree, takes us through a horrible voyage in which every soul on board is stricken with ophthalmia and the blind are thrown overboard, lands them at San Domingo, and follows one passenger, Babouk, through his slavery, insurrection, and death.

The book is an infuriated epic of the torment of the blacks, and an unashamed cry to them to endure no more. It is a triumph of oneness with his subject matter that enables the writer to give his point of view without interrupting the course of the story. Dickens did it, in his frequent speeches to the reader, and there is a flavor of Dickens in the indignation of some of the indictments, but it is a stream-lined Dickens, purged of rhetoric and sentimentality. For instance, describing the insurrection of the blacks of San Domingo following the French revolution, he says:

"Our historians, who always shout reign of terror when a few rich people are being killed and see nothing much worthy of

comment when poor are slaughtered by the thousands in the miseries of peace, cry out unanimously: The pen can not describe the cruelty of these savages!

"My pen is not so delicate; it can say, and it will never cease to say: Not over a thousand or so of whites were killed in this reign of terror, while the legal and protected slave trade killed over a hundred thousand Negroes a year. . . .

"One must be exact: the slaves revolted, and the reign of terror that had lasted hundreds of years in Saint-Domingue stopped! Yes, Candy heated his corkscrews to pull out the eyes of former white masters, and Jeannot got ready his planks between wihch he tied his victims to saw them in half, and that was peace compared to the long reign of terror under the whites, from Columbus down."

The most extraordinary *tour de force* is the unity of effect which, in a historical novel, usually implies departure from historical fact and substitution therefor of the artist's imagination. Lurid as this story is, it is always a trifle on the side of understatement. In describing the horrors of the voyage across the Atlantic, salient details are chosen that give a nightmare picture—nothing is invented, something is always held back. So likewise with the treatment of the slaves, and the atrocities on both sides. The most lurid spots in the story—the ship of the blind hailing another ship in mid-Atlantic, to find that one in the same condition; Babouk's banner, a white child impaled on a pike; the burnings and torturings of the Negroes; all these, and more, are to be found in history, and in fact after reading some contemporary works one is impelled to turn back to Babouk for the relief of its comparatively considerate and balanced presentation.

The last chapter, after the death of Babouk, is purely poetic, invoking the last judgment when the blacks will have their turn, and ending:

"You weary folk, go home and sleep in peace. Is not the bed of the world large enough for all? And are there not enough blankets to go around?

"Go home then and rest. And kind dreams to you.

"Oh black man, when your turn comes, will you be so generous to us who do not deserve it?"

The intensity and hideousness of the story are sustained from the beginning, where a "nigger-taster" touches his tongue under the slaves' chins to test their health, and then spits in their faces, to Babouk's courageous and horrible death at the end. There is a courage and lift all through that gives the feeling of only temporary defeat, and as a matter of historical fact, Babouk, or Boukmann, as his protagonist was called, was followed by others—Jean-Francois, Biassou, Dessalines, and especially Toussaint l'Ouverture, who although he died in jail owing to Napoleon's inability to tolerate greatness even three thousand miles away, still laid the foundations of the black Haitian republic, that lasted for a hundred years.

The West Indies have served as a little laboratory to show once more that the race problem is not an isolated one, that "black democracy", no more than white democracy, can solve the issues under capitalism, and Endore never for a minute lapses into the romantic attitude, nor loses sight of the international nature of exploitation nor of the class issues involved. If we take Trotsky's criterion—"All that is necessary is for the poet of the new epoch to re-think in a new way the thoughts of mankind, and to refeel its feelings", then *Babouk* is an important part of the literature of our time. Its only important weakness is perhaps intentional, so consistent is it. In a sense the characters are stylized, rather than flesh and blood—not the worn-out puppets of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* or the cartoons in the *Daily Worker,* but still definitely stylized, like *Everyman* or *Pilgrim's Progress.* Somehow it would be even more stirring if we could feel individual as well as social inevitability moving the characters—a little more Dickens, let us say, and a little less morality play. At the crucial moment when we are asked to believe that Babouk would throw a baby—a white baby, of course—on the ground, run a pike through it and carry it as his banner, we have to swallow a bit. It is quite a dose and we don't quite make it. I confess I was driven to the history books to find out if it was true; it was, but the author's business is to make us believe it even if it wasn't! This however is carping, for we are here presented with a new sort of novel evolving to suit readers who may have to run—or fight—at any moment. At the same time, as a work of art, it has the rhythm and vitality that should keep it on the shelf long after slavery of any sort has become legendary, a book that is of today and tomorrow as well, that gives a direction and that will still have value after we have found our way.

Florence BECKER

Oxford Manner

LITERATURE AND DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM. By JOHN STRACHEY. 54 pp. New York. Covici-Friede. $1.

One of the chief businesses of Oxford University, the training school for English gentlemen, is to teach its students to write well and talk well on subjects with which they have little acquaintance. So important is this task considered, that for their first two years every Oxford student, no matter what field he may be specializing in, is required to write one essay a week on a literary or philosophical theme; and every ambitious student is also a member of the Oxford Union, the famous debating society whose weekly meetings train the future members of the British Parliament. In Parliament itself, the same course is continued. There, too, members are expected to talk well on subjects about which they know little; and to write well in the leading Weeklies.

John Strachey has gone through the full curriculum. His Oxford days were followed shortly by several years as a Labor member of Parliament. He split with the Labor Party along with the group headed by Sir Oswald Mosley. As Sir Oswald moved more openly into the Fascist current, Strachey broke to the Left, and steered toward the revolutionary movement. He marked his passage by the excellently readable *The Coming Struggle for Power;* but shortly after became diverted into the shoals of Stalinism, where, unfortunately, he still flounders. Even an Oxford manner cannot resist Stalinism: *The Menace of Fascism,* which followed *The Coming Struggle for Power,* is a bad book, badly thought and badly written.

I do not minimize the importance of being able to write well and speak well. Strachey can do both. He is perhaps the first contemporary English writer who has been able to make Marxism reasonably intelligible and reasonably persuasive to many individuals from the middle classes, particularly to intellectuals and professionals. This is not a small matter. The movement needs, and must have, supporting sections from the audience he addresses. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that it is Strachey's duty to think somewhat further, and to know more. When Marx spoke of members of the middle classes who attained a perspective of the historical process as a whole, he did not visualize this as leading them to make barnstorming tours for pacifist substitutes for a political party like the American League Against War and Fascism—Strachey's current occupation.

Literature and Dialectical Materialism is not, as its title suggests, a systematic attempt to present a rounded Marxian approach to literature. It is the expansion of a lecture delivered last year to the New York John Reed Club, and is not so much an essay as a series of partly connected reflections on certain literary and social problems. Strachey discusses briefly the incompatibility between Fascism and good literature; the general division between bourgeois and proletarian literature; the decadence of contemporary bourgeois literature; a poem of Archibald MacLeish's as an example of bourgeois literature; a poem of Stephen Spender's as an example of proletarian literature; and Hemingway as a literary Nihilist. In spite of its slightness, this book is not without value. It is easy reading, persuasive, and if it does not answer fundamental problems it at any rate poses a number of them.

The last word has by no means been said about Marxian literary criticism. Indeed, we have got but a short distance beyond the first page. The recognition of the dependence of the ideology and content of works of art upon social conditions, and the analysis of social conditions in Marxian terms is, however indispensable, hardly more than a starting point for criticism. There remain the myriad specific and concrete problems of the analysis of the works and schools and traditions and trends of literature and art; and these alone are what give meaning to tne abstract categories of our starting point. Strachey is aware of the difficulties, as he suggests when, after praising Granville Hicks highly, he says of him nevertheless that "He hardly seems to pay enough attention to the merits of writers as writers". But this is hardly an answer. It is, after all, close to the crux of the issue.

J. W.

THE UNITED FRONT

Que Faire (January 1935), published by an oppositional group of members of the French Communist party, inconveniently reminds the party leadership that the May Day 1933 appeal of the Communist International, printed in *l'Humanité* of April 29, 1933, declared:

"What we need today is the united front from below and not negotiations between leaderships with the Welses and the Renaudels. . . . Only the united front from below will assure success [of the united front of the working class]."

LETTERS

DEAR Comrade Shachtman:

I have read with considerable interest your article, "Right Face in the Socialist Party" in the December issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. I had a good hearty laugh at your reference to me as "the only living joint representative of Jesus Christ and Jay Lovestone". The only unfortunate part of the reference, from the standpoint of accuracy, is that I am not a representative of Christ and I am not a representative of Lovestone. I am a loyal member of the socialist party. My chief concern is that the party accept and work on the basis of a revolutionary socialist position as outlined in the "Appeal to the Members of the Socialist Party" which the R.P.C. issued.

You may be interested in scanning the attached carbon of a letter to Oneal which was sent to him in December. It helps clarify some of the opinions which I am supposed to hold on religion. If Oneal does not publish this letter in the *New Leader,* it will be published in the next—not the last—issue of the *Revolutionary Socialist Review* whch should be out about February 1. We will be very glad to have THE NEW INTERNATIONAL analyze this next and other issues of the *R.S.R.* and the general activities of the R.P.C. Fraternally yours,

Francis HENSON

NEW YORK, *January 7,* 1935.

[The copy of the letter to Oneal points out that our quotation of F. A. Henson's views on religion, originates in an article first written in 1929 and reprinted in a pamphlet published in 1934, but without, declares the author, his permission. "From more recent experiences," he continues, "I am convinced of the irreconcilability philosophically of Marxism and Christianity. . ."

[In addition, the editors have received the following communication from Alice Hanson, of the socialist party in Philadelphia, in the name of a group of nine.]

Dear Comrades:

We note in the December issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL the following statement, in the course of an article on the socialist party:

"The post-Boston Philadelphia city convention of the party urged the N.E.C. not to engage in any united front activity with communists, and called upon the national and state committees to expel members or supporters of the R.P.C. The immediate result of this resolution was that nine local leaders of the R.P.C. including Felix, Hanson, van Gelder, Lee and Rimensnyder, resigned from that body."

The inference from this statement is that these comrades resigned through either fear of or acquiescence in the action of the bare majority of the city convention. That this is not the fact, the accompanying copy of our original letter of resignation from the R.P.C. abundantly shows. You will note from the date on the letter that we took this action, not only before the city convention, but before the Boston meeting of the N.E.C., and that our reasons for doing so were far different from those which your statement infers.

We know that it was only because you were insufficiently informed on this point that you printed the above statement, and we are accordingly enclosing the copy of our original letter of resignation which we hope you will do us the courtesy of printing.

Thanking you for your anticipated courtesy, we remain, With socialist greetings,

Alice HANSON,

PHILADELPHIA, *January 17,* 1935

For: David Felix, Wesley Cook, Elwin Rimensnyder, Julius Huss, John Park Lee, Philip van Gelder, John Green, Newman Jeffrey.

[The enclosure is a copy of a letter sent to Francis A. Henson, secretary of the Revolutionary Policy Committee, on November 24, 1934. The signatories resign from the R.P.C. on the grounds that it has been more and more diverted from its original purpose: an educational force in the S.P. for crystalizing Left wing sentiment. Further, that it fell under the control of a group which, in the first issue of the *Revolutionary Socialist Review,* reprinted the original R.P.C. statement with unauthorized amendments which "are such as to change and distort the original statement". Also, the *Review* "in no wise sets forth our principle differences with the communist party or with the various splinter parties". These, and "innumerable minor differences" impel the resignation.]

REPLIES

Dear Comrade Henson:

While your letter, and the copy of the statement to the *New Leader,* make clear your present views on Marxism and religion, the same can hardly be said about your position towards the Lovestone group. When you say that you are not a representative of Christ and not a representative of Lovestone, it may be entirely possible to accept your assertion in the purely formal sense. It was not my intention, in describing your position, to convey the idea that you were authorized by either of the two to speak in his name. However, just as the philosophical position you put forward in your article reprinted in *Christianity and Marxism* made you an ideological even if equivocal representative of religion, so the position you put forward in the first issue of the magazine for which you assume political responsibility makes you a representative of the Lovestone group, that is, of its ideas. Whether or not the R.P.C. or any part of it is, as is commonly assumed, connected organizationally in one way or another with the Lovestone group is of secondary importance to us, and in the present case, is of no moment. Whatever the *factual* grounds for the assumption may or may not be, there is no doubt that it is due less to malicious invention than to objective conclusions dictated by the position your group has taken.

We are accustomed to judge a political current not by the rumors or insinuations disseminated about it, but by its political documents and deeds. On the same basis we define its relations to other political currents. Therefore, when we compare the principal articles in the *Revolutionary Socialist Review* with the known position of the *Workers Age,* we are driven to the only possible conclusion: the stem is different, but the petals and the odor are startlingly alike.

For example, your basic editorial: "R.P.C. and the Communists". You differ with the Stalinist party only on those four points whereat the Lovestoneites diverge (social Fascism, united front from below, dual unionism, mechanical domination by the Russian party—which, you add in order to drive all lingering doubt from our minds, is all right for Russia). You differ from the Lovestoneites on no principle grounds at all; you only observe that they want to reform the C. P., without success to date (p. 9), whereas you want to work in the S.P. You differ with the Trotskyists on principle grounds; you damn their attitude toward the Soviet Union as "perhaps the most reprehensible in the whole international radical movement"—even forgetting, in your zeal to repeat the stock arguments of the Lovestoneites (read: Stalinists), the exclusive eminence in this field of leading figures of your own party. You differ with the American Workers party on principle grounds; you damn its attitude on the trade union question in the language and spirit of Lovestone; you damn its forthcoming (now realized) merger with the C.L.A. And to make it all perfectly clear even to a dull person, you yourself write elsewhere that the Third International, "attempting to face up more realistically to objective historical conditions expressed in the threat of war and Fascism, is making a major turn in its policy in the direction of the I.C.O. [Lovestone] position and in the light of the *rapprochement* between the two in Germany a complete reunion with the I.C.O. is quite probable" (p. 26)—a movement which you welcome, even if it contradicts what was written on page 9.

It goes without saying that a socialist has a right to his position; you must acknowledge our right not only to oppose it, but first of all to characterize it politically. If I gladly retract the first part of my characterization of your position in view of your letter to Oneal, I must reluctantly insist upon the second, at least until such time as one of the "not the last" issues of the R.S.P. supplies cause for retraction in full. Fraternally yours,

Max SHACHTMAN

Dear Comrade Hanson:

We gladly take the opportunity to make the correction indicated in your letter. The *New Leader* having announced your resignation from the R.P.C. after the Boston meeting of the N.E.C., we concluded that the two events were significantly connected. However, it should be pointed out that the correction relates more to chronology than to politics. Your resignation was listed as one of many "new signs of the times in the S.P.", that is, of the drift to the Right. In essence, your letter to F. A. Henson confirms this view. Its main political divergence with the R.P.C. lies in the socalled unauthorized amendments to the original "Appeal of the R.P.C." The amended portion deals with the question of armed insurrection. The original statement was, in its general political essence, a condensed version of the communist position on fundamental problems, and the Marxian view of the struggle for power was therefore clearly implicit in it. The endorsement of the original involved, it would appear, an endorsement of the amendments, authorized or not. (I can say all this about the "Appeal" the more objectively, I think, because of the serious political differences that my party had and has with a good deal that is said and left unsaid in it.) Though it

The Press

SOVIET DIPLOMACY

Two press dispatches, one from the daily press, the other from a service issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union, are reproduced in the *Neue Front* (December 1934) of Paris:

"The new Soviet ambassador to Rumania, Ostrovsky, gave an interview to the bourgeois papers, from which we extract the following passage: "I believe that I will have an easy task among you, for our peoples have a common goal, peace, and I hope to find a useful support for it in the Rumanian government, in Rumanian public opinion and in Rumanian society, which are nothing else than the triple expression of the same substance: the Rumanian people." Are such expressions also part of the necessities of diplomatic intercourse?

"*And the answer!*

"Kukarest (F.S.U.)—the Rumanian government has just outlawed 32 organizations, because they are "communist organizations". Among the prohibited organizations is also to be found the 'Friends of the Soviet Union", which was first founded in the summer of this year and the legalization of which followed in the courts a few weeks ago."

THE ATTILA OF THE AIR

Discussing the half-muted struggle between the Reichswehr and Hermann Göring, the not badly informed Prague emigrant organ of Dr. Otto Strasser's Black Front, *Die Deutsche Revolution* (January 6, 1935) writes:

"This struggle now finds a highly noteworthy expression in the press: the 'coördinated' press, whose concealed disaffection with the system becomes increasingly visible to the informed reader, is plainly intervening in the struggle in favor of the Reichswehr Ministry (of course, on the prompting of the latter, and certainly not without its backing).

"This alone explains and lends purport to the fact that, for example, the *Berliner Tageblatt* calls Göring the—'Attila of the Air'!!

"Of course, not directly, as its own opinion! But indirectly, as the opinion of England!—This takes place in the form that it publishes an article by its London correspondent, von Suttenheim, in which it says:

"'It is an open secret in England today that German mountains are hollowed out and that in the inside of them thousands of Nibelungen are wearing themselves out to forge weapons for the Third Reich. At night, however, the Attila of the Air, as General Göring has been baptized here, swishes through the air with his noiseless airplanes, and the only thing not clear in this report is whether there are 5,000 or 50,000 airplanes in his fleet.'

"This almost blasphemously graceful insulting of Göring is further emphasized by an indication of the ruinous effect of his air policy on England!

"In a repetition, true to the letter and the spirit of assertions first made here by us, Göring's air armaments of today are compared there with Tirpitz' fleet armaments of yore, of which the *Berliner Tageblatt* writes:

"'And the conclusion of this drum-fire propaganda was that, together with France, disarmed England is also menaced by Germany, which has replaced the Tirpitz invasion by sea by Göring's invasion by air. A new 1914, only a much more dangerous one.'

"Imagine the effect upon the German public of this attack on Göring—and one recognizes the skill with which the Reichswehr Ministry first repulses the aspirations of Göring and prepares to strip him of his power. (Göring, to be sure, is not Darré—and Hitler knows it!)"

UAL-UAL

The London *Daily Herald* (December 21, 1934) prints the following Geneva dispatch concerning the African town which is threatening to provoke a war of aggression by Italy against Abyssinia:

"Italy has unconsciously admitted the justice of the Abyssinian government's charge that Ual-Ual, where fighting occurred recently, is illegally occupied by Italian troops.

"The Italian government declares that the zone is in Italian territory, and that the Anglo-Ethiopian Frontier Commission, which recently visited the district, was working on Italian territory.

"But today the League Secretariat, in accordance with the custom, pinned to the walls of the League Pressroom a map of the territory.

"On this map, Ual-Ual lies some 125 miles within the Abyssinian frontier, as marked according to the Treaty of 1908.

"The map was published in Italy, and clearly shows that after the 1908 Treaty, Italy, at any rate, regarded Ual-Ual as Abyssinian."

---

sorely tries the elasticity of the mental muscles, one may conceivably understand Norman Thomas being "shocked beyond words" at the "new" R.P.C. statement. A capacity for resilience far beyond ours, however, is required in the case of nine of the original forty-five signatories to the document. I should of course be glad if coming events show that I am more mistaken in the political conclusions to be drawn from your present position than I was in the matter of chronology referred to above.

Fraternally yours,
Max SHACHTMAN

At Home

WITH SUCH enthusiasm as the December issue received we will certainly reach our goal of a circulation of 6,000. Each month sees a jump in subscriptions and in the bundles ordered.

We seem to be quite successful in Europe, too. From the German comrades in France we are told: "Our comrades in Germany have received your magazine. They welcome it with great enthusiasm. . . . Though it is very dangerous to bring so voluminous material over the frontier they nevertheless will do that because it is of high value for the propaganda amidst the Stalinists."

And the Socialist Bookshop in London writes: "Pleaseincrease order for N'w INTERNATIONAL to 36 copies monthly." (An increase of 24.) Herbert Straussberg, London, increases his bundle from 4 to 8.

Westland, one of the largest newspapers in the Saar agitating for the *status quo,* informs us that the Nazis have by a ruse taken hold of the paper but asks us to send the magazine to them under a different name and address.

The Boston branch receiving a monthly bundle of 75 writes, "We would like to have twenty more copies of the December issue at once."

The Columbus branch at its first meeting decided to start in with an order of 30 and tells us that "this small order is by way of introduction. We should double, triple and quadruple it in no time." The Allentown branch, too, is beginning to receive the magazine, starts off with 10 and assures us "We will increase that as soon as sales get under way." Oakland, Calif., begins with a bundle of 15. We expect many more new bundles from new branches of the Workers party and branches which have not handled THE NEW INTETNATIONAL previously.

A subscriber from Chicago writes: "I have found the magazine of great interest and full of information. I am enclosing two one year subs."

Comrade S. of the Bronx branch, New York City, is so far our star sub getter. He has brought in 4 subs in the past week.

THE MANAGER

a perfect combination

IF YOU have been uncertain up to now about which of the two publications of the Workers Party of the United States to subscribe to, we now present you with a happy solution of your dilemma.

Many have wanted to make sure of getting THE NEW INTERNATIONAL every month so that they might follow the development of the theoretical position of our movement. Our monthly periodical has already established a considerable popularity for itself among the thinking radical workers in the labor movement, and each month it is read by an increasing number.

Others have been just as anxious to follow the development of the daily work of the new party, its struggles, its reports of the news, its interpretation of the events of the hour. The *New Militant*, our weekly paper, has been the means of satisfying this desire.

Those who are unwilling to trust to chance in getting copies of their favored publication, have become subscribers —the surest way of getting it delivered regularly, and the best way of helping lay a sound basis for greater circulation. The dilemma has been: to which one of the two shall I subscribe?

We want to facilitate the choice—by abolishing it! By special arrangement between the two periodicals, and for a limited period of time, a joint subscription rate is being offered to all readers.

The regular yearly subscription to the *New Militant* is $1.00.

The regular yearly subscription to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is $1.50.

Ordered separately, they would cost you $2.50.

Ordered together, under the special joint arrangement, you can get both the *New Militant* and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for $2.00—a saving of fifty cents—thus guaranteeing yourself the regular receipt of the weekly paper for fifty-two issues and the monthly organ for twelve issues.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is the only theoretical organ in the United States which every month consistently and fearlessly puts forward the position of revolutionary Marxism on all the important issues of the day. It takes from the current news that which is of more lasting significance and illuminates it by a scientific analysis. It discusses problems of the labor and revolutionary movements which other journals either ignore or befuddle. It presents the important events and problems of international politics in the thorough manner of which only a Marxian review is capable. In its *Archives* it restores to light those vitally important documents which make clear episodes and movements that have hitherto been veiled by obscurity or falsehood. Its critical reviews of the significant books of the day are being read with growing interest and profit. The review as a whole gives a complete picture of the fundamental position in principle of the party of revolutionary Marxism in this country, the W.P.

The *New Militant* does in the field of daily struggle what THE NEW INTERNATIONAL does in the field of theory. It reflects the active participation of our party in the class struggle in the United States. It depicts the fight of the workers against the ruling class on the economic and political fields. It gives the views of the party on the burning issues of the day, adhering rigidly to the conception that the working class urgently requires the truth—not exaggerations, not deceptions, not bombast and self-adulation. Uncompromising in its hostility to capitalism and all its practises, militant in its struggle against imperialist war and barbaric Fascism, it stands for the working class *all the time*, for the workers' revolution and for the workers' world.

To get a completely rounded picture of the activity and the opinions of the Workers Party of the United States, you should read both its official publications regularly, every week and every month. Whatever other labor periodicals you may read from time to time, these two will prove themselves to be indispensable.

The special subscription offer to both periodicals holds good only for a limited time. We offer it to facilitate the work of getting our big circulation drive under way with a bang. The *New Militant* is aiming at a circulation of 10,000 copies by the middle of the year. At the same time THE NEW INTERNATIONAL aims to have a circulation of 6,000 copies. The joint subscription drive should put us well on the road towards achieving the quotas which all past indications lead us to believe can be realized.

Our readers and friends can help us by acting immediately. If you are already a subscriber to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, send in $2.00, get the *New Militant* for a year and have us send THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for a year as a gift to a friend. If you are not a subscriber to either publication, take advantage of the special offer now.

Get on our subscription mailing list beginning with the very next issue by filling out the blank below:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
2 West 15th Street
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed please find $2.00 in payment for a one year subscription to both THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *New Militant*. Send them to

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... *State*.....