

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

## America Steers for War

*Albert Gates: The Myth of Isolation*

*Hal Draper: Roosevelt, the War Monger*

*B. J. Widick: World War by Stages*



*Canada and World Politics.. By E. Robertson*



*Harvard, Brookings, and New Deal Magic*

*By Dwight Macdonald*



*The Two Party System .. By George Novack*

TWENTY CENTS

SEPTEMBER 1938

# At Home

THESE past weeks have been what are commonly known as the August "dog days", and so we begin with our troubles. Summer heat, vacations, individual inertia—these have not brought what so many generally expect; namely, a fall in circulation of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Hard work and initiative, we believe, can prevent summer slumps, and the fact is that the magazine's circulation has remained steady throughout the summer and while there were a few small decreases in bundle orders, these were compensated for by some increases and new orders which more than covered the decreases.

The difficulties in past weeks have been in the *slow payment of bundle accounts* by all too many Branches and Agents. *This needless negligence is jeopardizing the prompt and regular issuance of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, not to mention our aimed-for expansion. There is no good excuse for failure to pay promptly on the bundle accounts. First, a reminder to all literature agents: money for the magazine must *not* be mixed with other funds, but must be segregated for payment for THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Since there is a substantial profit to the Branch on each copy of the magazine, more than enough is obtained through sales to cover payment for the bundle order. Branches and agents, therefore, must immediately endeavor to *bring their accounts up-to-date* in accordance with the requirements for literature payments. The magazines are sold, we know; hence there is no excuse for delays in payments. Also, Agents have placed orders close to rock-bottom (too much so, in our opinion), and so, with occasional lapses, the bundles ordered are actually disposed of. Therefore, this serves as *official notice* for the future, that Branches and Agents (United States and Foreign) delinquent in their payments, will **NOT BE SENT** the magazine.

Another concern of the management has been the slowness, with one or two exceptions, with which subscriptions, the bed-rock of any publication, are being secured. Almost entirely this is due to *negligence* or failure of the members to carry out elementary duties: namely, to visit friends, contacts, sympathizers and to endeavor to obtain subscriptions. This applies too much, also, in the matter of general circulation. THE NEW INTERNATIONAL circulation, both general sales and subscriptions, have been steadily mounting, but a sharp increase could be achieved if Branches and Agents will insist that *every member has the obligation to cover one or more meetings each week*—public meetings, outdoor or indoor, trade union halls, concerts, parks, street corner meetings, house to house drives—with THE NEW INTERNATIONAL (and/or other literature). Excellent results, we know, have been achieved in this way; that is, through individual and organized efforts.

Our subscription list could easily

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL	
A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM	
VOLUME IV	SEPTEMBER 1938
NUMBER 9 (Whole No. 24)	
Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles: 1c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 1c for 5 copies and up. Single copy: 20c. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.	
Editorial Board: JAMES BURNHAM, MAX SHACHTMAN, MAURICE SPECTOR. Business Manager: MARTIN ABERN	
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
The Editor's Comments.....	259
Canada and World Politics, by E. Robertson.....	261
The Myth of Isolation, by Albert Gates.....	265
The Making of a War Monger, by Hal Draper.....	268
They, the People, by Dwight Macdonald.....	271
The Two Party System, by George Novack.....	273
(Conclusion of critique of <i>The Politicos</i> , by M. Josephson)	
Ignace Reiss: In Memoriam, by Elsa Reiss.....	276
Labor Party and Progress, by Albert Goldman.....	279
Notes on Contemporary India, by S. Stanley.....	281
Correspondence .....	281
BOOKS:	
Save Capitalism First, by Dwight Macdonald.....	282
World War by Stages, by B. J. Widick.....	285
Inside Front Cover: At Home.	

be doubled within two months if Branches and Circles will undertake such actions. Minneapolis is proportionately far in the lead with subscriptions, and largely because Minneapolis has systematically organized and carried on a subscription drive all the time. Chicago has done the next best in securing and working for subscriptions. St. Louis has done exceptionally well with subscriptions. Greater New York subscriptions could easily be more than doubled if the members will just *try* to get subscriptions by visiting contacts and sympathizers. This has been proved. In Greater New York particularly, and elsewhere, there are many subscribers whose subscriptions have run out. Comrades, go get their *renewals!* Don't leave it just to letters from the office. These four cities make up the larger share of our subscriptions. Other cities, we are sure, can easily secure subscriptions. So, go to it, Boston, Newark, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, San Francisco, Oakland and the rest. Bundle orders—hence, general circulation—are pretty good. If the magazines can be sold each month, subscriptions can be obtained from these readers if the effort is made. Onward!

Some cities do very well, considering size and prospects, with general circulation, but too many cities are still well below what they can easily be. We'll let this go till next time in view of the foregoing requests and proposals.

The past weeks brought new orders, increases in old orders, and a few small decreases. Johannesburg, South Africa increased its orders appreciably once again. The Workers Party, Max Sapire, agent, disposes of 35 copies and the Group for a Fourth International, Leon Sapire, agent, handles 45 copies. Paul Koston, Cape Town, South Africa, averages 40 copies. Good work, South Africa! And good payers, too; comrades take note. A group of Friends

in Palestine have placed a bundle order for both THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and *Socialist Appeal* in Tel-Aviv. Morris Gandelman, New Haven, Conn. agent ordered an extra five copies of the August issue. Berkeley, Calif. Y.P.S.L. is getting ready for the return of the student body and took 20 copies, and, we are confident, will soon be up to 50 copies. Comrades G. Haskell and Barton Abbot are the agents there. Allentown, Pa., where Ruth Querio *organizes* literature drives, now handles 20 copies regularly—having climbed from five copies. Good work! Reading, Pa. is now getting under way a bit better and has increased its order to ten copies. Vincent Pettinato is agent; in the Eastern Pennsylvania region generally, substantial improvement can be expected; for Fanny Seidman, district organizer for the S.W.P., is alert to the need of improving N.I. circulation and literature circulation generally. Philadelphia, which slumped a little for a while, increased its order to 40 copies. Carl J. Hartman is the new agent there.

There were a few small, almost negligible, decreases in orders attributed to summer, but improvement is expected soon again. But new orders also arrived. An order for ten copies regularly from N. Gibson, Melbourne, Australia; for ten copies for Dick Fraser, field organizer, Seattle, Washington; 5 copies for Marysville, Calif., Grover Bethards, agent.

Tom Jarvis of Minneapolis deserves special mention and credit for the fine job he's doing in the subscription campaign Minneapolis and St. Paul are conducting with success. Comrade Jarvis has been raking in subscriptions himself, besides telling others to do so and advising them how. He has brought in as many as ten in a batch, obtained by him by visiting and writing prospects. Other comrades, please notice! And follow suit.

Our criticism of the New York Party and Y.P.S.L. has already brought some improvement, and there will be more, we hope and expect. The Y.P.S.L. took matters a bit more to heart, and thus far have taken 100 copies of the August issue. The new Y.P.S.L. literature agent is Max Mont, and he impresses as one who means to get things done. Sam Portnoy, Y.P.S.L., sold 20 copies in one evening at Lewisohn Stadium. Greater New York Party branches: both good and bad. Upper West Side and Upper West Bronx are doing well in sales. Ben Walker of the U.W.BX. is an agent who sells literature everywhere, and that's what we want. There was a slight increase all around in New York with the August issue, but comrade Abe Miller, director, is confident of much more in the near future.

All things considered, Chicago does the best job with general sales. This is because Karl Shier *works and organizes*, and is more than ably assisted by the ex-New Yorker, Sam Alberts, and some other comrades with initiative and drive. Sam recently took over while Karl vacationed; and everything was in able hands.

There have been some changes in magazine agents. In Sydney, Australia comrade Short is now agent in the united Communist League of Australia, of which comrade Roper is national secretary. Wally Henderson took over in Fresno, Calif., while comrade Cornell was teaching a California Regional School. In Lynn, Lee Colvin is agent now, and Philip Zimmerman in Louisville, Ky. Comrades John Murphy and Ann Charloff are jointly handling THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and literature in Los Angeles, and they promise big forward strides there.

We take the occasion now to mention many comrades, whose names do not appear frequently here (our space is limited), but who have been doing steady and good work for THE NEW INTERNATIONAL: Wm. Ballou, Fargo, North Dakota; John Boulds, Plentywood, Mont.; Robert Birchman, Indiana organizer; Olin Stevens, Rochester, New York; Doris Cooper, Toledo, Ohio; Morris Slavin, Youngstown; Harvey Dawes, Columbus; Dave Herreshoff, San Diego; Eric Lund, Saint Paul; John Bolen, Baltimore, Md.; Howard Stump, Quakertown, Pa.; Al Adler, Salem, Ohio; E. Panecali, Detroit; Chas. Martell, Akron, Ohio; Gerry Arnold, Cleveland; Hildegarde Smith, Hutchinson, Kansas; Morris Krupka, Pittsburgh; Al Russell, Omaha; Victor Harris, Hartford; R. Larson, Kansas City; Tarmo Hannula, Gardner, Mass.; A. C. Doughty, Los Angeles; and of course, those excellent agents, Eloise Booth in San Francisco; Karolyn Kerry, Oakland; Chester Johnson, Minneapolis; T. Leonard, Boston; Dave Burbank, St. Louis; Pauline Thompsan, Worcester, and others. And the *Canadians certainly*, (whose names we purposely omit) in Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Vancouver and other places.

# The Editor's Comments

**WE** HAVE GROWN accustomed to Franklin Roosevelt, and we are likely, therefore, not to notice how unprecedented are his actions during this current Primary campaign. The conservative commentators are justified in their shocked surprise. Imagine Hoover or Coolidge or Harding cracking down publicly, before the masses, on leading members of their own party! Even where, in the past, Presidents have intervened in off-year Primaries, they have usually done so only indirectly, without public fanfare. They have made a quiet deal with the appropriate boss; or have written a "letter to a friend", expressing a dignified opinion which later wandered into the press. But Roosevelt has gone bluntly and dramatically "to the people".

The last occasion in any way comparable was 1918, when Wilson carried out a minor purge. Naturally, the petty and hypocritical weakling did it in a far less spectacular manner. But he was compelled to act, and there is a genuine analogy between 1918 and today. He was under the pressure of mighty issues: in the summer of 1918 the War was being fought, and the Armistice was not even in sight. U.S. capitalism, world imperialism as a whole, trembled in the scale.

So, today, it is the depth of the issues that smashes through precedent. U.S. capitalism, ground in the economic crisis, getting mightily ready for the new War, trembles. Roosevelt is convinced that only his way can achieve the salvation of U.S. capitalism. He believes that the "Tories", with their present blindness to the moods of the people, would send the whole cart toppling over. With his passionate attachment to the great ships of the expanding Navy, he feels in his blood an imperialist destiny for the United States as unchallengeable world leader, resting firmly on control of the two Americas and gradually setting up as supreme arbiter for Asia and Europe. In addition, and by no means minor, he finds himself bound by the claims of the enormous bureaucracy. Government has become by far the most vast of modern industries, the chief employer and the chief consumer. Control of the governmental machinery is the richest of all prizes.

Postmaster-General Farley, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has himself declared that this Summer's Democratic Primaries are a preliminary battle in the struggle for control of the 1940 Democratic National Convention. And in the years immediately following 1940 every serious observer expects the real crisis to come. Small wonder, then, at the bitterness of the preliminary battle. But more than the Democratic Party is involved, for the old party lines are being irregularly but cumulatively blasted.

It was plainly symptomatic that Roosevelt, in his first radio speech last Spring on the Primaries, made his appeal not at all exclusively to Democrats, but to liberals and progressives of all parties. The issues, he stated, cut across party lines; he urged opposition to Tories and reactionaries, in whatever ranks they were to be found. The same disregard of traditional party lines is conspicuous in the current campaign in Maryland. There Representative Lewis, backed by the White House group, is contending for the Senatorial nomination with the incumbent Senator, Millard Tydings. Lewis' main thesis has been that Tydings uses the Democratic Party only as a cover; that Tydings is in actual-

ity a Republican, backed by Republican wealth, and that he would be an honest politician only if he ran frankly on a Republican ticket. In other words, Lewis is fighting for a re-alignment of the parties in Maryland.

## Party Lines in New York

THE PROCESS OF the breaking up of old party lines goes, as might be expected, rapidly in the State of New York, financial center of the country, with its residents the most advanced in political consciousness. After swallowing at the outset the bulk of the Election Day Socialists, the semi-independent American Labor Party last year swung several hundred thousand previously Republican and Democratic voters under its label. There is no reason to expect the A.L.P. to lose many of these in November; indeed, it may increase its voting strength considerably.

The A.L.P. is, moreover, running a much greater number of independent candidates, for local, State and national offices, than at any time in its brief past. Several of these, especially State candidates but in all probability a few national Congressmen as well, will doubtless be elected over both Democratic and Republican opponents.

The A.L.P. coalition policy, shocking as are the deals with Republicans and Democrats to which it has led, and heavy as is the blow which it strikes at the development of genuinely independent working-class political action, is nevertheless in its own way a symptom of this same breakdown in the traditional party lineup. It is particularly striking because the deals have been carried through with sections of both the old parties. This demonstrates that even within the boundaries of the single State of New York, the old party frameworks no longer correspond with any sort of basic social divisions. The up-State Republicans are brothers of the Southern Democrats and cousins of Tammany in Manhattan, a very different breed from the bright young Republicans of New York City who are bringing to the front such men as Tom Dewey and Newbold Morris, President of the City Council.

The fluidity of the party lines has been remarkably indicated at the State Constitutional Convention, just concluded. Thanks to the gerrymandered election districts in New York, Republicans held a majority, and were able to organize the Convention proceedings and Committees. The proposals carried by the Convention, which will be placed on the November ballot, constitute without doubt one of the most reactionary documents of recent years. Every socially progressive bill on any major subject was either voted down or amended to death. Those who preach that the Republican Party is fascist and the Democratic Party the defender of the people might suppose that the explanation for this result is simply the Republican majority. Examination, however, shows that this is not at all the case. The Convention was not controlled by the Republicans on the major issues. It was in the hands of a bloc consisting of an alliance between one section of the Republicans, Al Smith, and Tammany. The minority was likewise a Republican-Democratic bloc (the A.L.P. was not directly represented among the delegates, though it had endorsed many of them). It was the up-State Republican-Smith-Tammany bloc which smashed what socially progressive meas-

ures were proposed, ending up the business sessions with a Constitutional prohibition of proportional representation in the State or in any of its sub-divisions.

## Some Purge Suggestions

THE PRESIDENT, as always, proves himself a skillful demagogue. The "purge", however horrifying to Westbrook Pegler, Hugh Johnson, Walter Lippman and even Arthur Krock, captures the popular imagination. Here, again, is the Knight in Shining Armor, riding out on the highroad to give battle to the treacherous "enemies of the people". He smites them, Tory hip and reactionary thigh; the goodly sword, New Dealism, flashing in the August sunlight. It is brilliant grandstand play. The reformist cheerleaders give the signal to applaud: "You can see that he is our man, brothers and comrades."

But how much removed Roosevelt's purge is from principled politics, how little the whole New Deal means from the point of view of the basic interests of the workers, can be readily enough seen if we take even a short look around.

There should be little dispute that during the past year the politician who has stood out in the entire country as an enemy of labor is Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City. Mayor Hague doesn't bother about making speeches in Congress—he has henchmen in both Senate and House to do that for him; and, by the way, they make 100% New Deal speeches. He carries his attack on labor directly into the factories, into the streets. He smashes unions and runs union organizers out of town. He suspends civil liberties at a nod to his Chief of Police. And when the police department isn't enough, he calls his riff-raff together to finish off his jobs.

But no breath from the purge has touched the doughty Mayor. Hague still continues as Vice-Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the leading committee of Roosevelt's Party. Hague still makes and unmakes Senators and Representatives and State legislators and judges, still distributes the patronage of the Roosevelt Administration. Hague names his own man, Ely, as Democratic nominee in November for the Senate; and the New Deal stands solidly back of him.

This is not a little matter. The sins of George and Tydings and O'Connor against labor are venial compared to the sins of Hague. Roosevelt is responsible, from start to finish, for Hague. And, consequently, those who support Roosevelt are thereby necessarily assuming also their share of the responsibility for Hague and Hagueism. It does not do the slightest good for them to make speeches and write editorials "denouncing" Hague. Their political allegiance to the New Deal of Roosevelt makes them upholders of Hague: because Hague is part and parcel of the New Deal. They cannot genuinely attack Hague and Hagueism without at the same time breaking politically with Roosevelt. That is why their anti-Hague agitation is no more than a showy cover for their profoundly anti-working class politics.

And how about Boss Crump of Tennessee? Or the municipal Democratic machines in Missouri and Illinois? The lofty atmosphere of the purge seems to run well above their heads.

More immediately, how about Jimmy Hines of Manhattan, now on trial before Justice Pecora as political director of the Dutch Schultz policy racket? Hines' name was not nationally known before this trial. He is, of course, a Tammany district leader. But, much more important, he was the leading representative of the national Democratic Party in Manhattan, the chief dispenser of Roosevelt-Farley patronage. It does not matter much whether Hines is convicted or acquitted in the trial; the peculiarities of the law with respect to lotteries and the nature of the policy racket leave the legal position of his activities obscure. Whatever happens, the trial is painting a picture of immeasurable political corruption—which, besides, has been well known for years. And against this corruption not a word,

not a step, not an act by the purgers. For Hines, also, and all that corruption, the supporters of Roosevelt likewise must take their share of responsibility.

## Pensions and the Crisis

IT IS A COMMONPLACE of Marxian analysis to predict that the pressure of economic crisis stimulates vast, unstable, chaotic movements of unrest among the middle classes. Such movements become, when the crisis goes sufficiently deep, a decisive factor in the consolidation of fascism. During the period from 1931 on we witnessed many of them in this country: Share-the-Wealth, Utopian Society, Epic, Townsend, half a hundred others on smaller scales. Economic revival sent them temporarily into the background. During this year they are again springing to life; and some of them are already amazingly extensive.

The most important at the moment are various kinds of old-age pension plans, new editions of Townsend. Large groups are now working for such plans in a dozen of the Middle and Far Western States. In several of these States, which have initiative provisions in their Constitutions, the plans will appear on this autumn's ballot.

The California Pension Plan is perhaps the most remarkable. Around eight hundred thousand names were secured for the initiative petition, three times as many as required by law. It has gathered together most of the remains of Epic, the Utopian Society, and the Townsend movement, all of which had huge followings in California. The Plan proposes that every elderly individual in the State shall be paid thirty dollars each Thursday. Payment is to be made in self-liquidating scrip to which a 2% tax is to be attached each week, thereby allegedly paying it off within a year and ensuring rapid circulation.

With the objectives of such a plan, revolutionary socialists are naturally in complete accord. There are few more pitiful tragedies in contemporary civilization than the old, cast aside by capitalism, living broken lives burdensome alike to themselves and others. A thirty dollar weekly pension is sufficiently modest in the light of this country's mighty resources. Revolutionary socialists of course go much further: the demand for a minimum income of thirty dollars weekly is altogether legitimate for every man and woman in the United States, working full-time or part-time, or unemployed. The Socialist Workers Party supports and advances such a demand.

Unfortunately, the present methods and leaderships of the California Pension Plan and the similar movements in other States not merely dooms the aspirations of the aged to disillusioned failure, but constitutes a dangerous exploitation of the aged and the others who support the Plans. Decent incomes and adequate pensions will not, alas, be won by long petitions and radio programs. Nor is there any magic circulating scrip scheme which will provide the financing by a kind of numerology. If, by some odd chance, the Plan should carry a majority in California, the courts will soon enough embalm it. Even if they should not, its own financial fantasies would effectively complete the burial. The fate of Social Credit in Alberta was not at all an accident.

There are both hopes and grave dangers in these huge sporadic movements. They are signs of the breaches appearing in the bulwarks of existing society, signs of middle-class strivings to find the right way out. In the hands of demagogues and exploiters, they are turned with ease, when the time comes, toward fascism; and the hopes they express are ruthlessly trampled. Those seeking the simple justice of such things as insurance and pensions must be made to understand that only in a powerful and advancing working class can they find a force able to gain and grant them. And labor must, on its side, make its own such aims. The destiny of labor is the emancipation of all mankind. It is not an exclusive or a partisan goal.

# Canada and World Politics

THE AMERICAN PRESS has maintained a picture of Canada as a vague snowy area to the north, sparsely populated by French-Canadian loggers, half-breed trappers, backward farmers, mounties, the Dionne quintuplets, and a few English colonials who, because of an unaccountable allegiance to King George, have not yet emigrated to the United States. So dependent are the Canadians on their neighbor's periodicals that they have come to share some of these illusions about themselves. The economic facts are somewhat different, though by no means less curious or unusual.

In the first place Canada is no longer an agricultural country, strictly speaking. Although she still leads the world in wheat exports, her agricultural production in 1936 was but 26% of the net production value; only one million people were engaged that year in farming, as compared with two and a half million wage- and salary-workers. Almost unnoticed by its self-occupied big brother, Canada has undergone a parallel industrial transformation. In 1871 all but 12% of Canada's population was rural; today 55% is urban.

It is true that most of the Dominion's enormous surface is still wilderness, or thinly settled under semi-frontier conditions, and that the total population of 11 million is fantastically tiny in comparison with America's 130 million in a slightly smaller area. But it is also a fact that five cities scattered along a 3000-mile line alone contain 2½ of those 11 millions. In Canada features of combined development are everywhere. Side by side with a continued primary exploitation of mines, timber, fisheries, and land, there exists an expanding series of highly developed and rationalized industrial centres and a corresponding migration from the soil. In the years between 1923 and 1930 (which include even the beginning of the depression and the virtual freeze-up of immigration) the industrial proletariat multiplied at the rate of 20,000 a year, and half of this increase was taken up by plants employing more than 500 workers.

## Land of Monopolies

Another popular misconception, and here one which the Canadian capitalists do not attempt to dispel, is that, compared with the United States, Canada is less ridden with trusts, combines, and corporations. Actually, and again in line with the laws of combined development, the reverse is true. There is no other country in the world where finance capitalism is so centralized. The land of the maple is also the land of monopoly.

Banking is much more openly and legally concentrated in Canada than in the U.S. No local or even provincial concerns are permitted; the field is staked out by ten national companies whose total combined assets were listed in 1936 as 3¼ billions. Of this highly respectable sum, 81% is cornered by the four leading firms, (Montreal, Royal, Commerce, and Nova Scotia). The natural capitalist process of interlocking directorates within these combines has been both consecrated and stimulated by the creation of a "national" Bank of Canada, that is by a pooling of representative directors from the existing banks.

In sharp contrast to the U.S., Canada has not experienced a single bank failure throughout the depression. This does not indicate a superior healthiness in Canadian capitalism but simply that the banking system is so enmeshed with it that the two must stand or fall together. The Big Four among the banks hog, among other things, 75% of all trust-company and 50% of all insurance-company holdings. The extent of their immediate tie-up with mines and manufacture cannot be accurately estimated, but a study of the names on directors' boards alone would suggest that the banks own about 75% of Canadian industry.

These industrial octopi are in turn individually husky and yet amazingly entangled. Virtually all chemical, rubber, and munition products are the sinecure of one company, Canadian Chemical Industries Limited. Corresponding monopolies are vested in the Bell Telephone, The Steel Co. of Canada, and Canada Packers Ltd. Canadian syndicates of Ford and General Motors have grabbed auto production, while Shell and Imperial (*i.e.*, Standard) Oil divide the gasoline sales.

Most ubiquitous of all is the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; larger of the two transcontinental railroads, it is owner also of fleets of transpacific, transatlantic, coastal and great lakes steamships, and of a national chain of expensive and rococo hotels. Clinging tight to the colossal boodle which it secured in the early railway speculation days, the C.P.R. continues to exploit a string of coal and metal mines throughout the Dominion, giant farms, timber and smelting outfits, and myriads of other concerns. It boasts quite truthfully of being the largest travel corporation in the world. Its only Canadian railroad rival is the government-owned Canadian National, a very sick white elephant whose absorption by the C.P.R. is hourly expected.

The most prosperous of Canadian industries, metal-mining, has also its little nest of trusts. International Nickel not only exports 75% of the world's supply of this basic war material but has corralled also 50% of Canadian copper, zinc, and lead. The enormously profitable and expanding gold-mining industry is not yet so unified, but it is reputed to have created a score of new Canadian millionaires, whose swag has necessarily been secured at the price of hook-ups with the Banking Big Four.

In Canada, as in America, five percent of the population squats on 90% of the wealth. America has its big Sixty Families, Canada its little Fifty.

## Canadian "Imperialism"

Canadian capitalism is in fact so topheavy that its investments now spill over into other countries. Every Englishman is taught that Canada was salvaged from the commercial backwash of feudal France by the British Empire. Most Americans believe that Canada has been salvaged from the backwash of British imperialism by American investments and American culture. Both, in a sense, are right; but what both are being forced to recognize is that the mésalliance of the two imperialisms in Canada has begot there a strange hybrid state which, at the same time that it remains a colony of both, also acts at times as if it were a little "imperial" power in itself. With no battleships and no marines to back its investments, Canadian capitalists nevertheless have been able, under the shadow of Britain and the U.S.A., to build up two billion dollars of investments abroad. Nearly half of this is sunk in the U.S.A. The rest makes its appearance mainly in the West Indies and South America but also in Europe and Asia. Branches of Canadian banks operate in the West Indies; subsidiaries of Canadian power trusts have fingers hooked in the public utilities of Mexico City, of Barcelona, Spain, and of Rio de Janeiro (Brazilian Traction) and other South American centres.

It may be said that such Canadian investments abroad, and such pyramiding of Canadian money-bags at home, are simply a form of book-keeping for British and American capital. This is, however, only a little more than a half truth. Canadian Ford Motors, for example, which not only manufactures Canadian Ford cars and airplanes but is the controlling centre for the company's factories throughout the British Empire, is actually organized with a majority ownership by Canadian investors. Nor is it easy to dismiss such phenomena with the explanation that

Canadian investors are themselves tied to international banking. That is also a half-truth. In 1934 British investments in Canada totalled slightly less than three billion dollars, and American investments four billions; other foreign stakes are negligible; yet the total of investments in the country was in that same year eighteen billion dollars. In other words, well over 60% of the profit-making concerns are owned by capitalists living in the country.

Unalterable geography, as well as the course of history, has predetermined the triumph of America. Each year's trade treaties reduce the preferences Canada gives Britain and increases the imports from the U.S. Yet the transition has been more prolonged and is economically farther from completion than the average American thinks. It was not until after the Great War that the U.S.A. was able to oust Britain as Canada's chief trader. As for investments, even today the United Kingdom has \$2.80 in the Canadian egg-basket for every \$4 American. The august House of Morgan must still scramble with Rothermere for control of the pulp and paper industry, and with Mond for the pre-emption of nickel. Du Pont and the British I.C.I. are battling fists in Canadian munitions; the oil monopoly remains a dispute between Deterding and Rockefeller. British finance continues to stand behind the C.P.R. and much of the country's banking.

## Arrested Development of an Infant Prodigy

The Canadian intellectual may still prudently take flight to New York City for the benefit of his petty-bourgeois soul; but he is an extremely small cipher. A Canadian unemployed, still exposed to the whims of local relief systems, may look with some envy on the salary of W.P.A. workers, but he reads also of W.P.A. cuts and layoffs, and of an American unemployment total that is proportionately as high as in the country of his own capitalists. (Incidentally if he still wanted to take a chance on America there are always enough border officials to spot him and boot him back.) The employed worker sees the long-superior American wage-scale sinking to his own level and the prospects of work virtually nil. The general paralysis of capitalism prevents America from taking full advantage of Britain's failing grasp on her oldest possession. Despite the rich natural resources still to be tapped, the unexplored and metallic mountains in the north, the areas of arable yet unoccupied soil (still estimated at one-fifth of the total cultivable land), world capitalism is unable to complete the industrialization of the Dominion. Consequently Canadian workers, though scarcely intoxicated with the smallish grapes in their own backyard, have little impulse to hop the fence into the weedy marihuana preserves which the Sixty Families have made of the magnificent United States. Canada, the infant prodigy of combined development, is now, thanks to the incurable diseases of capitalism, only an adolescent with arrested development.

The Canadian worker is, of course, being gradually made aware that his struggle is bound up with that of the world proletariat and specifically with that of the American worker but he is learning that mere affiliation with a skate-ridden American trade-union is in itself no more progressive than affiliation to a skate-ridden Canadian one—and less easy to fight against. This is a fact which, however, in no way contradicts the ultimate perspective of American-Canadian organizational solidarity in the trade-union front.

## The Cross-Eyes of Canadian Politics

Political life in Canada also reflects the strange and for the moment unresolvable duality of her dependence. There is no avowed pro-American Party and no open party of British im-

perialism (always excepting the Communist Party). For many years the Liberal Party was roughly representative of those less established interests (particularly industrial) which were backed by Wall Street as opposed to Threadneedle. Its mass basis was the western free-trade farmer, and the anti-British French-Canadian. But restored to federal power, the Liberal machine has walked the same tightrope as the Conservatives, playing off British interests against American in order to gain a *pourboire* from each. Reciprocity has never been anything but a political mirage, while complete freedom from the preferential tariffs of British imperialism is a thought to frighten even the most Americanized Toronto Babbitt.

The "Socialist" C.C.F. has in its five years of existence reflected the same national ambiguity, playing ball both with isolationism and with collective security. Because it is still a loose federation its followers are treated to the spectacle of its seven federal parliamentary representatives alternately supporting pacifism and the hypothetical wars of the League. At its latest national conference in July the pendulum, thanks to the sturdy pushing of a Stalinist fraction, has swung well over to collective security. But the new "policy" is still a typical Canadian (and social democratic) compromise. "We will support no war of British imperialism—but we feel that peace can best be guaranteed through collective security."

The Stalinites have the one virtue of shamelessness in this respect. So long as Moscow intones that Britain is a democratic nation, the Canadian Communist Party will bear aloft the tribal tomahawk with and for Britain. If the Empire should turn up on the opposite side to Russia . . . but enough of such counter-revolutionary "if's".

Nearest in its foreign policy to the Stalinites is the Conservative party, traditionally the manifestation in Canada of the Holy Ghost of the Bank of England. Yet even the Conservatives, though enjoying the irresponsibilities of their present job as the official federal opposition, are now infallibly cautious in their references to Empire wars and scarcely distinguishable from the Liberals in their phraseology. At their recent national shindig, at which the reactionary Manion was chosen leader to replace the doddering R. B. ("Iron-Heel") Bennett, the Conservatives, after much squabbling, approved a foreign policy which offered nothing more than "consultation and cooperation between all the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations". Where is the old automatic military heel-clicking for the Empire? *Où sont les neiges d'antan?* To muffle the tub-thumping still more, the Grand Old Party of Canada tacked on a "Ludlow Amendment", advocating a popular plebiscite before war is declared. Thus the diplomatic mummeries between the Old Parties and the Old Land barely manage to preserve the Imperial proprieties; in the act of crooking the pregnant Commonwealth knee before Chamberlain each Canadian party-leader cocks one eye at the national-sentiment and the other at Roosevelt.

For it is the shadow of the latter's State Department, much more than the annoyance of C.C.F. pacifist resolutions, which puts velvet into the bark of the English bull-pup on this side of the water—and England knows it. Sir Anthony Eden's *Yorkshire Post* editorialized with satisfaction on the spectacle early this summer of the Conservative Bennett and Liberal Premier MacKenzie King competing with each other in protestations of loyalty: "The tie of sentiment remains. The tie of blood grows weaker". But both Eden and Chamberlain know just how inadequate sentiment is to fight Britain's battles if the blood is not only too "weak" to wish to be shed but is connected with a heart located in Wall Street. The ink on the *Yorkshire Post* was scarcely dry when Premier King announced that whereas Canada was willing to increase its production of armaments for Britain (at a price), her own defense was to remain under "autonomous control".



## Canada and Martial Self-Determination

Now for Canada to declare that she will look after her own defense is for a wren to open a threatening beak to a world of buzzards. It is a luxury of utterance only possible when the wren finds herself committed to a perch on the edge of the nest of the biggest and strongest buzzard of them all. That is exactly Canada's position.

For what will happen when Britain is once more at war? Theoretically Canada is "an independent Dominion within the British Commonwealth". Does that mean she has the "right" to label herself neutral if the United Kingdom is not? On that question, which agitates the bosoms of bourgeois nationalists and C.C.F. pacifists alike, both the Canadian and the British Parliaments remain portentously silent. The sister dominion of South Africa has already announced she will determine neutrality or belligerency for herself. There is nothing, of course, to stop the Canadian Parliament from passing a similar and equally vaporous decree—even Mackenzie King has said that she may. Actually, if Downing Street wishes, it can force belligerency upon Canada at the first shot of a British gun, by utilizing the power of the Governor-General-in-Council to recruit, *without the consent of Parliament*, an expeditionary army on Canadian soil. The Governor-General of Canada, nominally a figurehead, still exercises very real emergency powers in cooperation with his "Council" (that is, the Canadian Premier and his Cabinet). It should be remembered that the Governor-General is himself sent over hot from Britain as the symbol of George VI, King-Emperor, in Canada and that the formulations of the last Imperial Conference still laid down the dominions "a common allegiance to the crown". It is on such considerations that foreign military alliances are made with Britain, that is with the understanding they are backed not merely by the 40 million of the British Isles but by the 400 million of the British Empire. Hence legislation of the Canadian Parliament having to do with foreign affairs is subject to veto by the Privy Council of England which has frequently exercised its "Supreme Court" function to check Ottawa (and to reduce the latter's authority over the various and jealous provinces within the Dominion).

Even if the Dominion's somewhat operatic legislature were permitted to make the gesture of declaring neutrality, international law—which exists in any case only in the minds of the bourgeois commentators—has no precedent to determine whether anyone would recognize the little folded hands of Canada. The deciding factor would certainly not be historical precedents, nor the ghostly League of Nations on which Canada has a nice seat all to herself, but the strategic wisdom, for the country at war with Britain, of an attack on Canada. If anti-imperialist sentiment were sufficient in Canada to force through a neutrality declaration (or if Washington's plans desired it) the United Kingdom might find it good policy to bow, but the declaration would not be worth the fabulous hoot in hell if Britain's opponent found that she could strike at the Empire through Canada. If Germany were the antagonist no doubt it would be to her advantage to respect Canada's declarations so long, of course, as she could continue to sink "peaceful" Canadian shipping en route with supplies for England. That such a procedure is totally consonant with neutrality was demonstrated for three years by the United States in the last war and for the past two years along the Spanish coast by the Motherland herself. If Britain were at grips with Japan, the case might be different. Even if Japan were Britain's sole enemy, which is highly improbable not to say impossible, the British navy would find it impossible to line the west coast of Canada whatever she might still do to blockade the Atlantic.

In all such theorizings it is obvious that the power which really barricades Canada is not herself nor Britain but the United States. Such a plain fact is of course never admitted in

the diplomatic pronouncements of any one of these three countries. It is an actuality neither salving to Canada's national pride nor reassuring to her capitalists. In the first place no one knows whether Uncle Sam will line up on the same side as Britain. Kindred "democratic" traditions and Anglo-Saxon heritages are baubles compared with fundamental imperialist rivalries. The Canadian capitalists are fully aware that nothing on earth can prevent their military absorption by the United States once that country is at war with Britain. On the other hand, even if the two powers were allies, the price of Canada's protection might still be annexation, less rapid, less brutal, but yet, in the long run, annexation.

To such a perspective the Canadian working-class is naturally apathetic. There are of course some of the helpless unemployed who would accept any war in order to get steady pay again; and there are some middle-class Canadian limeys who are stupid enough to march off against even the United States at the drop of a general's hat. But the majority of even the Anglo-Saxon elements in Canada are willing to be absorbed any day if such a price is necessary for military protection. And finally there is a fairly solid bloc of French-Canadians, 28% of the total population, and 85% of that of Quebec Province, which resisted conscription in the last war and threatens to set up a separate (and probably fascist) "republic" the moment Canada is involved in another.

The Canadian Plutos can therefore never be free from worry. Small frogs as they are, annexation would plunge them into a very large puddle, populated by the crocodiles of American finance-capital. On the other hand, participation in an Empire War, even supposing the U.S.A. remained benevolently neutral, may lead this time to defeat, the crack-up of the Empire, and working-class revolt at home. But, again, *real* neutrality would mean the loss of the enormous war profits which Britain already holds out as bait. This is a *contretemps* which makes still more sinuous the course of Canadian politics. On one day McKenzie King soothes the pacifists and isolationists and the three million French-Canadians by declarations of military autonomy. On the next day he negotiates with the United States for the building of a \$20,000,000 military highway from the western United States 1800 miles through Canada to Alaska. On the third day he signs agreements with the British air ministry for the development of huge bomber-plants, air-training schools, and munition-factories to supplement the British super-armament program.

## The Armadillo and the Skunk

So much for Canadian "autonomy", which is simply running with the hare and hunting with the hounds—while the Canadian worker pays now in sweat, and later in blood, for the impossible game. Seventy million dollars has already been earmarked, in 1938-39, for the defense of a country which no one will harry who is not prepared also to invade the United States. For the Canadian bosses the expenditure is, of course, highly lucrative. It is not simply a matter of business for the local armament manufacturers. MacKenzie King has publicly reminded the whole boss class that arms are always handy, if for nothing else, to put down "insurrection" at home. Finally, it is no accident that Ottawa confesses it is about to build two mine-sweepers and to erect 130 searchlights with five-foot lenses on the west coast of British Columbia, at a cost of two millions, in the midst of the present trade negotiations between Canada and the U.S.

To be sure the recent agreements are threefold, involving Britain, (with Australia also seeking to slide in) but it is an open secret that Britain has failed in these manœuvres to wangle from Canada the promise of aid in war and even the opening up of Canadian immigration gates to that section of the British unemployed who are too enfeebled for war service and whom the Mother Land would like to dump into her favorite colony. (The

United Kingdom has a standing offer to finance British immigration to Canada; last year Canada allowed the importation of only 1573 Britishers; none of them was listed as unemployed.) It is the U.S. which gains when a fortification is created on the Canadian coast. True Britain is not sorry to see them for it is not excluded that she might conceivably (but not probably) be able to use them in a war against the U.S. *Fundamentally, behind every "protective" war outlay in Canada is Washington.* The projected Alaska Highway was first noted in the press as a little innocent scheme of British Columbia's to attract tourists; then there was gentle talk about financing part of the cost in the United States. This summer however Messrs. Farley, Ickes and Assistant-Secretary-of-War Johnson, all of Washington, made special personal trips to the area of the proposed highway; it is patent that the actual plan is the selling of a permanent military corridor through B.C. from the state of Washington to Alaska, with, as a natural corollary, military commitments of Canada to the U.S.

Among the other "autonomous" plans of Mr. King are the immediate construction of two destroyers, mechanization of the land force, fortifications of both coasts, and of Anticosti Island, strategically placed in the mouth of the St. Lawrence. These are the first layers of the armor plate which Yankee imperialism is forcing around Canada. America has not much need for Canada's Lilliputian army, but she does find it necessary for the Dominion to turn itself into an armadillo, a quiet fortress outlining the real boundaries of the U.S.A. in the coming war.

As a military animal, Canada however is not being permitted to remain merely a naïve young armadillo. Britain too has need of her, in the rôle of a secondary beast of prey, with weapons of offense. True, eleven million disunified colonials of questionable patriotism can never bite like the lion; but they can perhaps develop the claws of a cub and certainly manufacture gases as potent as any in the skunk world of modern militarism. That is why in 1938 we find Canadians again potentially offensive bipeds; *behind every offensive military preparation is Britain.* With the collapse of the Swinton air-armament program in England this spring (followed by cabinet expulsions and the scrapping of the shadow-factory system of bomber-manufacture) the British Air Chiefs have been scuttling around the world in a frantic attempt to conscript the economic resources of their not-so-communal Commonwealth.

It is not a new idea. In 1917 Britain was losing in Europe and perilously short of planes, pilots, and air mechanics at home. Canadian factories and training forces, far from the scene of air-raids, were hurriedly chucked together. The present scheme is much more ambitious. A complete census of Canadian plants adaptable to war production is being made, with the help of the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Commercial Air Transport combines. Both are of course springing with alacrity to the salute, since a quarter of a *billion* dollars has already been forked out from the British war hope-chest to set the wheels rolling. Factories grinding out war machines are springing up like dragon's teeth in the industrial centres. One plant alone, in small Fort William, already shouts that it is ready to produce 1000 bombers annually. The result of all this, and of similar dickers between the U.K., the U.S.A., Australia, etc., is that Downing Street can intimidate or woo Mussolini (according to the momentary Mediterranean weather) with a guaranteed air production of 25,000 planes a year. To learn to operate the new Canadian and American baby-killers, amateur flyers in England are being enrolled in clubs and subsidized at £50 a head.

It is true that the MacKenzie King government is still dodging official British air-training schools on "autonomous" Canadian soil, but it is a patently temporary stall with the well-known cockeye aimed at the wistful isolationist temper of the country; it is a bluff which oozes away as the armament orders pour in

and prosperity enwraps the Canadian Manufacturers Association. And again it must be emphasized that King stalls or moves, in the long run, only as America directs him. The skunk half of Canada's divided military personality is not nurtured by the U.S.—but it does not come about without her consent. It should be remembered that Canada's air assistance in the last war did not operate until 1917 when the U.S. had decided to enter as an ally; the first eleven American air-squads to be sent overseas were trained in just such Canadian schools. Exactly what military understanding exists between the U.K. and the U.S. over the present Canadian scheme is naturally uncommunicated to the mere masses, but the editorializings of the N. Y. *Times* on the subject may, with full allowance for customary idealistic verbiage, be profitably studied:

"Although the question may be raised as to the effect of a strong air force, either British or Canadian, immediately across our northern border, it would seem, in view of the long tradition of peace between the U.S. and the Dominion, and the natural community of interest among the English-speaking people, that *such a force could be regarded as a further bulwark of our defense*" (July 25th, 1938; my emphasis).

In other words, let the un-United Kingdom propose; we, if necessary, will dispose.

## Arsenal for the Coming Slaughter

In the meantime, the Canadian bourgeoisie rolls merrily on. It is true that the second depression which has been setting-in (as usual behind the tail of the American) affects an ever expanding majority of the people. Wage cuts continue while prices rise. Some needle-trade women workers in Montreal have been getting as low as five cents an hour. Probably one worker in every ten is unemployed. There is no federal relief system and single workless wander about the country, alternately striking and, literally, begging. Quebec trades unions and left political organizations are muzzled by the notorious Padlock Law, while Arcand's fascists multiply monthly and drill openly. Four out of every five farmers are in debt, and the average farm income is about \$500 a year. But all this does not prevent International Nickel and Chemical Industries Ltd. from supplying death-food to the world. Canada now ships Japan 97% of that busy murderer's nickel, 90% of her copper, 75% of her aluminum; simultaneously International Nickel points with pride to a *net* profit for the first 6 months of the year of \$16,732,251. (Last year it was even greater—\$25 million.) Japanese gold is flowing in, even, according to recent Chinese claims, for advance purchase of some of the very bombers the flag-flapping Canadian Manufacturers Association is being subsidized to supply Britain. Canadian gold mines are booming; thanks to the smashing of the C.I.O. drive by Ontario's Premier Hepburn, they are virtually unorganized, and therefore daily more profitable for the Fifty Big Shots, their supernumeraries, and their backers in Wall Street and London.

In summary it may be said that Canada, already one of the chief producers of basic war metals, is now to be also one of the muddy fountainheads of the manufactured article, of bombs and bombers, guns, shells, tanks and gas. And her workers and farmers, however remote they feel beneath the Arctic and an ocean away from both immediate war areas, are being inevitably prepared for the job of transporting, using and succumbing to the devices of manslaughter, as well as of manufacturing them for the profit of international capitalism. Precisely where they will be called upon to use them and against whom rests, at present, secondarily with Britain and primarily with the U.S. The Canadian working-class will cease being puppets of both imperialisms only through a proletarian revolution whose victory, also, will depend greatly upon the revolutionary solidarity of their proletarian brothers in the states below the forty-ninth parallel.

E. ROBERTSON



# The Myth of Isolation

THE IMPERIALIST EPOCH of capitalist development is characterized by the immense growth of productive forces through the triumph of large-scale and mass production industries, and relegating agriculture to a secondary economic position; by monopolization and trustification in industry and the establishment of a financial oligarchy; the displacement of the home market by an international economy and the constant search for new fields of capital investment; finally by the growth of international antagonisms in the struggle of the powers for the division and redivision of the immense territories of the earth.

There never has been an hermetically sealed national development of the leading nations under capitalism. In all stages, a nation was compelled to engage in intercourse with other nations, in one form or another. In the pre-imperialist phase, however, the preponderant form of development was national, the determination of frontiers, the construction of industry and the development of the new classes.

Politics is the by-product of economic policy. In the stage of development of a world economy, politics has become international in substance. It is, therefore, false to regard the question of American isolation from the point of view of being for or against such a matter of state policy. One may as well ask: Are you for or against gravity? The answer would have precisely as much point or significance. Isolation is not and cannot be the result of desire. Essentially a relative question at best, it is, in the final analysis, determined by the scope of a nation's economy and its share in the world market.

The United States, with its tremendous and far-flung economic interests, does not pursue a course of deliberate isolation and has not pursued such a political course for many decades. This country is intimately involved in all major international political developments and in many instances is the initiator of these phenomena: the Young Plan, World Court, League of Nations, World Economic Conference, etc.

In spite of that, it is impossible to deny that the subject of isolation is a much debated one in American political life. There is a genuine mass sentiment favoring so-called isolation, *i.e.*, freedom from foreign alliances and entanglements based upon a sincere desire to avoid war which is always associated with "foreign politics". This sentiment was given impetus by the experiences of 1914-18, and is exploited by sectional economic interests (The Middle West). Recently, however, a new force, led by the American Stalinists, has been organized to champion the cause of anti-isolation. They propose active intervention by the United States in world affairs for . . . collective security and the war for democracy against fascism!

The whole manner in which the subject has been posed and discussed is responsible for the great confusion that now prevails. The isolationists, for example, turn with pride to Washington's farewell address as providing the fundamental thought on American foreign policy. Washington had said:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. . . . It is true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; *so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it.*" (Emphasis mine—A.G.)

The statement is clearly a qualified one. Washington did not inveigh against any and all alliances. Mindful of the precarious existence of the republic, he warned against permanent foreign alliances. He understood, however, that "isolation" was intimately bound up with commercial policy. Obviously, he foresaw something of the future development of the United States as an

industrial nation and the concomitant participation by it in the affairs of the world to an ever-increasing degree.

The struggle for independence itself was marked by "interference" from foreign powers interested in the outcome of the conflict between the Crown and the Colonies. No little reason for the victory of the revolutionists was due to the aid rendered it by France and other "foreigners". But the favorable geographical location of the new country in addition to the agricultural character of its economy made unnecessary "foreign entanglements", except those created by the limited American trade and its territorial expansion.

Territorial expansion took on a national character, proceeding from the Atlantic seaboard westward. Lack of communications, separation from the center of civilization and economy in Europe by several thousand miles of water, made geographical isolation possible and enabled the country to concentrate entirely upon national expansion. The absence of industry obviated a vast international activity and the limits of its trade and commerce did not interfere greatly with its insular development.

## 2.

Up to the time of the Civil War, this country continued to experience an unfavorable balance of trade, importing largely manufactured goods and exporting agricultural products and raw materials (cotton, furs, lumber, *etc.*). Industrialization proceeded forward slowly. The country was a debtor nation and destined to remain one until the World War.

But the expansion of the United States was vigorous and militant. It purchased territory where it could (Louisiana Purchase); it went to war where purchase was either impossible or disadvantageous (Florida, Texas, California). Whatever means were available, they were employed to add new territories to the country and to push its constantly expanding frontiers to the Pacific Ocean. Precisely this concentration on national territorial expansion altered the form of development of America from other possible directions and forestalled its earlier transformation to an industrial nation. Nevertheless, it made this development more certain by the acquisition of vast new territories rich in raw materials, metal ores, agricultural areas, and gold.

Prior to the Civil War industry was growing by giant strides. In 1850 there were 123,000<sup>1</sup> manufacturing establishments with a total production value of \$1,019,000,000. By the year 1860, manufacturing establishments had grown to 140,000 with a production value of \$1,885,862,000, a growth of 17 thousand establishments and almost a billion dollars in value within ten years. While the country was still predominantly agricultural, the tendency toward industrialization was plain.

The results of the Civil War hastened this. In the next decades the United States plunged headlong into industrial growth. Urbanization of the population accompanied the rise of industry. Whereas in 1790 only 3.3 per cent of the population lived in the urban centers, in 1860 it had grown to 16.1 and in 1930 to 49.1.

The occupational census illustrated the same trend. In 1870 there were 5,920,000 farmers and 6,586,000 otherwise gainfully employed. The 1910 census showed 11,463,000 farmers while there were 25,779,000, otherwise gainfully employed. In the space of forty years industrial workers far outstripped those engaged in agriculture, although both recorded absolute increases. Yet, by 1930, when the United States had entered the

<sup>1</sup>These figures and others quoted are taken from "A Graphic History of the U.S.", by Louis M. Hacker, Rudolph Modley and George R. Taylor.

crisis, there was reported 10,472,000 farmers and 38,000,000 workers, or otherwise gainfully employed. Here one notes for the first time a decline in numbers of those engaged in agricultural and a continued sharp increase of those engaged in industry.

The transformation of the United States from an agricultural to an industrial country is sharply reflected in the growth and character of its foreign trade. In millions of dollars, for the years 1861-65, exports stood at 170.2 and imports at 255.4. Even bearing in mind the economic dislocations brought about by the Civil War, the relations of exports and imports are properly represented. At the time of the World War and the post-war period (1915-1920), exports stood at 6,416.5 and imports at 3,358.4. For the years 1926-30 exports declined to 4,687.8 and imports to 4,033.5. Since the rise of the United States to the most powerful capitalist nation in the world it has enjoyed an uninterrupted favorable balance of trade.

### 3.

At the end of the 19th Century, the United States had become a world power, an imperialist nation. Conscious of its new power, it entered the world arena in struggle to obtain a greater share of the world market, colonies, sources of raw materials, and cheap labor. The growth of the American Empire resulted in struggles with the other imperialist nations of the world and was testimony of its tremendous material resources. Isolation, hitherto the result of the agricultural character of economy became a myth in the imperialist epoch.

The methods pursued in the establishment of the empire differed in no essentials from those of Great Britain, France, or Germany. The United States became a first rate military power and this was necessary for its world expansion. World intervention became the rule of conduct of Republican and Democratic administrations alike in their faithful representation of the interests of the new ruling financial oligarchy.

In review, let us examine some of the methods employed: 1. The establishment of spheres of influence (in China, through the application of the Open Door policy); 2. Political regulation (Hawaii, Panama, Mexico); 3. Armed intervention (Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua); 4. Acquisition without annexation (Cuba), and 5. Conquest and purchase (Philippine Islands, Virgin Islands).

The year 1898 was the most active year for American imperialism. The war with Spain laid the basis for the colonial empire. In that year, Hawaii was annexed, a protectorate was established over Cuba in response to the demands of the American sugar interests, Puerto Rico was annexed, as were the Philippine Islands and Guam. In 1899, Samoa (Tutuila) was annexed by treaty with Great Britain and Germany.

With the turn of the century another period of growth of America's colonial empire was to be observed. In 1903, a general supervision over Panama was established. Supervision of the finances of Santo Domingo was obtained in 1907, and in 1918 a military administration began to dominate all affairs of that country. Haiti came under the control of this country in 1915 through supervision of its finances which was later followed by more direct methods of intervention. In 1913, a protectorate was established over Nicaragua which was strengthened in 1916 through the granting of canal rights and the use of this country's territory as a naval base. The subsequent attempt of the Nicaraguans to free themselves from American domination led to its vigorous suppression by the Marines. In 1917 the Virgin Islands were obtained by purchase.

However small these possessions appear to be when compared to the gigantic British Empire they are extremely important to the United States for military strategic reasons as well as economic. Within a period of only twenty years, American imperial-

ist policy resulted in the addition of over 281,000 square miles of territory and almost 18 million people. These territorial gains were buttressed by the increased intervention of the United States in the affairs of Latin and South America. A series of Pan-American conferences have by and large strengthened its position in the Western Hemisphere and at the present time the Roosevelt administration, quite conscious of its tasks, engages in tremendous promotional work to advance the economic interests of the ruling class in these countries.

The United States is not self-contained in spite of the fact that she is better fortified for self-sustenance than other countries. Her vast industries look to foreign fields for such highly important materials as rubber, jute, sugar, manganese, chrome ore, tungsten, vanadium, nickel, tin, silk, clothing, carpet wool, paper, and minerals. Even more important than that, the export of capital brought about by the rise of industry transformed America's international relations. At the end of the World War, she had become a creditor nation to whom the leading European powers were indebted. In 1930 American investments in foreign properties and long term credits (not including war loans) reached the immense total of \$15,400,000,000. In spite of the severe effects of the world crisis at the end of that year, foreign investments stood at the high figure of \$12,600,000,000. These investments brought in an annual interest of \$521,000,000. Foreign holdings in the United States in the same period were \$5,000,000,000, with an annual interest paid out of \$146,000,000.

While the percentage of American production entering the arena of world trade is not yet preponderant, it is steadily growing. The world market is the fulcrum of a normal and prosperous operation of American economy and that is why it is necessary for this country to involve itself in world affairs for the purpose of improving its position therein.

### 4.

The foreign policy of the United States is based upon its economic interests in the world. The statistical citations above demonstrate why isolation is impossible, notwithstanding the large sentiment in its favor. Different administrations brought about varying emphasis in foreign policy, but the fundamental character of the imperialist policy has not changed since the rise of the American Empire. This is true for all administrations from McKinley to the present Roosevelt.

The financial oligarchy in the United States, intimately bound up with the government and directing the affairs of the State Department, has the decisive word in matter of its foreign policies. This section of the ruling class, the most decisive and conscious capitalist group, is the bitter foe of isolation. It understands that the only way the United States might achieve isolation is to surrender her international economic possessions. Assuming this was done, the whole structure of American capitalism would shatter. As long as this country maintains its dominant world economic position it will pursue a militant international policy, the direct antithesis of isolation.

However, in a declining world capitalism with a contracting world market, the antagonisms between the United States and the other powers will become more severe. The needs of American capitalism will compel it to intensify its international expansion in conflict with and at the expense of England, France, Germany, Japan and others. This is the unavoidable course of capitalist development and is to be observed now in Latin America, Europe and the Far East. The world powers are moving inexorably toward a new world war for the redivision of the earth and a reconquest of the world market. The United States is intimately involved in this process.

America's geographical situation appears to lend favor to the desires of the isolationists. They believe that because this coun-

try is separated from Europe and Asia by great distances, isolation can be achieved through pressure and desire. Fearing war and its effects upon their economic position, the isolationists, already sharply exploited by finance capital and suffering the severe effects of the long-existing crisis, carry on a hopeless agitation to keep America out of foreign entanglements. But they cannot seriously affect the natural and logical foreign policy which emanates from the needs of American imperialism.

Revolutionaries cannot permit themselves to debate the question of isolation in the manner of the isolationists or the Stalinists. If the revolutionary Marxists demand that American imperialism refrain from intervention in Latin and South America, or, to withdraw the marines and navy from China, they do so not because they are advocates of isolation, but because they are enemies of imperialism and capitalism, and because they are opponents of capitalist wars. The policy of the revolutionaries stems from their opposition to capitalism and its economic, political and military policies.

When, however, the Stalinists enter the fold to champion the cause of anti-isolation, or conversely, to demand American intervention in foreign affairs, they do so on the basis of a pro-war policy which is the essence of their demand for collective security—the war of democracy against fascism. Motivated by the exigencies of Soviet diplomacy and urging the alliance between the United States and Soviet Russia, the American Stalinists demand that the government (!) take the initiative in world politics, to join hands with Great Britain and France for the purpose of isolating the fascist powers and securing the world for the beautiful life under “democratic capitalism”.

Where does such a policy lead? It compels one to become an active supporter of the financial ruling class of the nation. The Stalinists assert that isolation will aid the expansion of the fascist powers in Latin America at the expense of the United States. It means that the economic gains achieved by American imperialism through the employment of a brutal military policy by the government acting for the big banks and trusts, will be endangered.

Fred Brown, writing in the *Communist* of March, 1938 said,

“It is now when the aggressors of China are penetrating Latin America, Canada, are nearing the Philippines, that they must be stopped.”

The “aggressors” are attacking the economic interest of the United States. Whose economic interests? The economic interests of the House of Morgan, the Rockefeller domain, and Wall Street. How shall the aggressors be stopped? By a State Department bull? Or, perhaps a conference? They will be stopped by the military might of American imperialism.

The plea to stop the aggressors is a plea for war to determine the right of exploiting backward and colonial countries by the contending powers. This is true not only in the specific areas now controlled by the United States, but it is true for the entire world and for all imperialist nations. Judging from their position, the great fear of the Stalinists is that a redivision of the earth may take place at the expense of the United States. Their attempt to identify the interests of the financial ruling class of this country with that of the working class and other exploited groups is characteristic of social patriots.

“Coöperation (collective security) means peace”, the Stalinists contend. Why should coöperation insure peace? Genuine international coöperation is possible only upon the overthrow of capitalism. Coöperation under capitalism cannot be anything else but a temporary coöperation of one set of imperialist bandits against another. In 1914 you had precisely this kind of coöperation between the Allied powers and the Central powers. It was collective security, a form of international coöperation for both sets of powers. But it was collective security and coöperation for war. The present developments in the diplomatic relations between the powers approximates the pre-war

jockeying for alliances, all aimed to secure the best position for victory.

When Harry Gannes says in the *Daily Worker* of January 29, 1938 that “Playing into the hands of the Japanese fascist-military foreign policy is every brand of isolation advocated in the U.S.”, he is asking for direct intervention by American imperialism in the Far Eastern War. He divides the isolationists into two groups: the shortsighted but honest isolationist peace sentiment, and the out and out fascist intrigues assisted by Trotskyite-Lovestoneite hatred of the Soviet Union and their desire to defeat its collective peace policy.

Unquestionably, should a war between Germany and Italy on one side and Great Britain and France on the other take place, the former would endeavor to strengthen isolationist tendencies to keep America out of such a war; the latter would seek to involve this country on their side, or vice versa. In any case, America’s economic interests would not permit it the luxury of a neutral position. The very presence of the war would be a signal for American war industries to plunge full force into trade with the belligerents. This is assuming that America will not be a participant in such a war, an unlikely prospect.

An active anti-isolationist policy can only lead one into the camp of Wall Street. The ruling financial oligarchy is adamantly opposed to isolation. They are not interested in the slightest in the Soviet collective peace policy. They are interested in the cold proposition of preserving their interests in the world arena by an active policy on the part of the Administration, buttressed by a big navy, the world’s greatest air force, and the best equipped army that modern industry can create. The logic of the Stalinist policy leads them into the camp of the war-mongers, the imperialists. Their present denunciation of Wall Street is so much straw in the wind. In the impending international crisis and the subsequent outbreak of war they will be found on the side of the vested interests.

That is why the war-mongers, Republican and Democratic, the financial oligarchy, and the Stalinists have so loudly applauded the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration. Roosevelt is a blatant imperialist and militarist. Under the direction of Secretary of State Hull, American foreign policy is extremely militant in the defense of its imperialist possessions. Even the bitterest critics of Roosevelt’s domestic policies have come forth publicly to declare their solidarity with the actions of the Department of State.

War will unite the factions of American capitalism in the struggle to advance its economic interests. The plans of the War Department already insure the organization of industry and personnel for the prosecution of such a war. All opponents of the war will be denounced as enemies of the nation in the pay of the adversary. In the front line, advocating the prosecution of the war and the persecution of its opponents will be the Stalinists acting as the bloodhounds for the ruling class and its military machine.

Revolutionary Marxists cannot seriously debate the question of isolation which is answered by the nature of the economy of the nation. They recognize that it is impossible in a capitalism advanced to its imperialist stage, the stage of world economy and world politics. We are opposed to foreign intervention because we are opposed to imperialism. We are against collective security because it means collective organization for war. Safeguarding the imperialist interests of the United States, which is another way of saying, the property rights of the monopolies and trusts, is not the problem of the working class or the revolutionary movement. We are interested only in the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. Any other policy must lead to subservience to the ruling class of the United States.

Albert GATES

# The Making of a War Monger

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT has often been compared to Woodrow Wilson, the object of his first enthusiasm in national politics, as a president who deliberately prepares the country for imperialist war under cover of demagogic phrases about love for peace. As far as their political rôles go, the parallel is exact. But from the angle of the characters of the two men themselves, they are far apart.

Wilson's personal leanings were in the direction of pacifism. To be sure, they counted as nothing under the impact of the forces, which were bigger than Wilson's professorial pacifism, and compelled him to become the leader in involving the United States in the World War. Indeed, they merely served to maintain a certain ring of sincerity in his verbal denunciation of war, while he greased the skids for American entrance.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the other hand, by personal inclination, early training and pre-presidential political experience, is one of the most militarist-minded men who have ever occupied the White House. I say "one of" only in order to be cautious. Only his uncle-in-law Theodore comes to mind as a close competitor for the honors.

## Roosevelt's Background

Insofar as there is an American aristocracy of birth and breeding, Roosevelt belongs to it. His family tree shows that he is related by direct or collateral descent to eleven Presidents of the United States, to the Confederate President Jefferson Davis, to Robert E. Lee and other men distinguished in American public life. His father, James Roosevelt, was president of a railroad and vice-president of the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company; his only recorded distinction, outside of business, was that he bred Gloster, the first horse to trot a mile in less than 2:20. Through his father, F.D.R. is the descendant of a long line of country gentlemen, wealthy patroons of the Hudson Valley.

His mother, Sarah Delano, is a kinswoman of the Astors and was (according to a Roosevelt biographer) one of the most famous of New York's society beauties. At the time of her marriage, she was the owner of coal mines and real estate in Pennsylvania, and on her father's death inherited nearly a million dollars. (Roosevelt's half-brother, another James, also married into the Astor family.) Speaking of inheritance, on his father's death F.D.R. inherited over \$100,000, yielding \$5000 a year; his wife Eleanor Roosevelt also had an inherited income of \$5000 a year, later increased to \$7500.

Franklin was born on his father's 500-acre estate in Hyde Park. "Col. Archibald Rogers, the Standard Oil magnate, was a next-door neighbor, and it was in the Rogers home that Roosevelt had his first day of school. The Rogers boys, four of them, were his playmates, and Edmund, now president of the Fulton Trust Company, was his closest chum. . . . It was the childhood of a rich man's son and a happy one." His mother later mentioned his "comparatively quiet, sequestered life" as a child; private tutors at home, annual trips abroad with his mother, French and German governesses—this was his life until he entered Groton, and after Groton, Harvard.

## His First Love

The preoccupation which was to become the dominant one in Roosevelt's development began very early. According to his mother, one of the first books he read through was Admiral Mahan's *History of the American Navy*. From that time, even as a child, he began collecting books, pictures, trinkets, con-

nected with the Navy. At the age when children are supposed to fancy themselves as firemen or cops, Roosevelt decided he wanted to go to Annapolis and become a midshipman. His father vetoed the idea, and it was given up (the desire cropped up later most unexpectedly, as we shall see) but he fed his passion all the more in reading and collecting. C. Clemens, in the *Literary Education of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, writes that "his real education began with his passion for American naval history."

From that time to this, navalism has been Franklin D. Roosevelt's main preoccupation, outside of politics. He was busy for years compiling biographies of early American naval commanders, especially John Paul Jones. His is one of the largest private naval libraries in the United States. Hendrik Van Loon describes his home in Hyde Park in the *Saturday Review of Literature*: "The library is almost entirely historical [incidentally, Mrs. Roosevelt told Van Loon that novels and poetry mean almost nothing to him—H.D.]. Naval history takes a preponderant place, for naval history is the special hobby of this former assistant secretary of the Navy. This love for nautical lore, however, antedates his career in Washington. . . . There are a great many naval pictures. The War of 1812 is a heavy contributor. . . ." In Roosevelt's private office in the White House, there is a hodge-podge of ship models, naval prints, etc. On his desk is a ship's clock, a barometer, a paperweight fashioned as a miniature helmsman's wheel. In the residential section of the White House, every room has two or three ship models; likewise in the halls. In the study are naval paintings and books again.

Roosevelt's passion (the word is used time and again by his biographers) for the U.S. Navy was satisfied only vicariously in his boyhood and youth. But it was not long before he got his chance for more real satisfaction.

He had entered politics in his county, running for State Senator, as a gentleman and a scholar. In 1912, he was an ardent supporter of that other gentleman and scholar in politics, Woodrow Wilson, contender for the Democratic Presidential nomination. When Wilson was nominated, Roosevelt became an enthusiastic stumper for his chief. And when Wilson was elected, Roosevelt was prominently in line for reward.

Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury, McAdoo, offered him the post of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. He was not interested. McAdoo baited him with the Collectorship of the Port of New York, but Roosevelt turned that down too. Then Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, offered him the post of Assistant Secretary.

Daniels reports that the hair seemed to rise on the top of Roosevelt's head and his blue eyes flashed. "Assistant Secretary of the Navy!" he cried. "Yes! Yes! I'm your man!"

## The Assistant Secretary of the Navy

Josephus Daniels was a North Carolina editor whose job in the cabinet was as political advisor to Wilson. In practice, Roosevelt was the real head of the Navy Department; and since Daniels was frequently away on political missions, he was often the formal head, as Acting Secretary. His assigned rôle in the department was purchase and sale, the entire business system of the department, civilian personnel and navy yards, but he had his hand in all phases of the department work.

Roosevelt was the "admirals' man" in the department. "Few Government men pretended to understand him. One class of men, however, keenly appreciated him, the Navy officers them-

selves." "It was to Roosevelt and not Daniels that the navy men brought their cases. He was the liaison man between the uniform and the swivel chair." Before Congress, in public, in the department, Roosevelt was the mouthpiece of the professional navalists, whose demands he represented to be the voice of the "navy experts" as opposed to the ignorant governmental civilians. And as for those demands—they reminded one of the advice of Lord Salisbury while Prime Minister of England: "Pay no attention to the military experts. If they had their way, they would fortify Mars to prevent an invasion from the moon."

When American interests in Mexico were threatened in 1914, Roosevelt was loudest in the demand that Mexico be put in its place. "If it means war, we are ready," he proclaimed. When the marines intervened in Haiti in 1915, he directed the operations and later visited the island personally to supervise the wiping up. He was instrumental in getting a Congressional Medal of Honor for Smedley D. Butler, then a major in the Marines, whose exploit consisted in wiping out a force of three hundred of the natives who were fighting for their national independence against American imperialism. Roosevelt himself added more light on his rôle in the crushing of Haiti in the course of his 1920 vice-presidential campaign. Speaking at Butte, Montana, to allay the fears that we would be isolated in the League of Nations in a den of European wolves, he sought to prove that the U.S. had the votes of some of the Latin American countries in its pocket. "You know," he told his audience, "I have had something to do with the running of a couple of little republics. The facts are that I wrote Haiti's constitution myself, and, if I do say it, I think it a pretty good constitution." (It is incidentally amusing to note that this frank admission of what everybody knew brought indignant protests from Harding about "the rape of Haiti by the Wilson administration"; thereupon Roosevelt repudiated the statement as a "misquotation" and forty good citizens of Butte, Democrats and Republicans, signed a statement calling him, in effect, a liar.)

From the start, Roosevelt boomed it up for a big navy and war preparedness. "An efficient navy, large and powerful enough to maintain the nation's prestige, is the policy of the new administration as outlined by Franklin D. Roosevelt . . . to members of the Navy League. His statement created enthusiasm." (N. Y. *Times*, April 11, 1913.)

Practically stumping the country for his ultra-preparedness policy, he addressed congressional committees, patriotic societies, old ladies' clubs, etc., by the scores, linking himself with General Leonard Wood and Teddy Roosevelt as one of the most active and vociferous militarists and navalists in the country. Doubling or tripling the building program—18,000 more men—a fleet of dreadnaughts—a quarter billion a year for the navy—a 50,000-man naval reserve drawn especially from the colleges—these were some of his slogans. Not only that, but while the country was officially observing an attitude of neutrality, his public speeches for preparedness were explicitly directed against Germany. For example, in March 1916 he was boasting that "in a naval building race the United States could outbuild Germany", and pointed toward the German naval program as justification for his proposals. (In 1913 it was Japan. The yellow peril was convenient then to back the call for more ships and coast guns. "If I were a Japanese and couldn't land on some spot of that 1,800 miles of unprotected coast line after the fleet has been destroyed, I would commit hari kari," he said.)

In spite of his propagandistic emphasis on coast defense ("FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT TALKS WAR—MUST BE PREPARED TO DEFEND HOMES, HE SAYS" read the *Times* headline on Oct. 30, 1915) Roosevelt was well aware what the navy was for.

"Strictly speaking," he wrote in a newspaper article during the same month as the above headline, "if national defense

applies solely to the prevention of an armed landing on our Atlantic or Pacific coasts, no navy at all is necessary. But if defense means also the protection of the vast interests of the United States as a world nation, its commerce, its increasing population and resources in Alaska and other territory cut off from the United States except by sea, its 'mankind benefiting' enterprises like the Panama Canal, then and then only does a navy become necessary."

Roosevelt was quite frank on these lines. Here is another sample: "We're all peace men, but I don't think some of the opponents of a strong navy would retain their views if they could understand. . . . Without a strong navy we should lose in war time Cuba, Samoa, Porto Rico, the Panama Canal, Hawaii and the Philippines. . . . The people should make up their minds whether they want to defend only the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard or all the territory where the United States has an interest." (*Times*, Jan. 31, 1915.)

In general, Roosevelt's speeches on preparedness were half demagogic agitation about defense of "our homes" and half realistic advice to American imperialism on how to safeguard its investments abroad (its "territorial acquisitions, the trade and wealth of the U.S." as he put it).

His militarist policies went beyond naval-building talk. "War does not mean the mobilization of an army," he said. "It means the mobilization of a nation. Every citizen must take his part. That means we must have universal national service. . . ."

In October 1916, Charles Evans Hughes made a mild suggestion that the navy ought to pay less attention to propaganda for its building program and more to its target practice. With the sensitivity of a fanatic, Roosevelt heatedly replied that Hughes had "insulted" every officer and man in the navy.

This was Roosevelt's *public* activity. But through his control of the operations of the Navy Department he could pass from words to deeds in putting his own ideas into effect, quite independently of Congress or even of the executive. These are the words of a laudatory biographer describing Roosevelt's activities:

"Things began secretly to hum in the Navy Department. . . . Washington was filled with pacifists. . . . Unobtrusively and quietly he began the task of adding to the personnel of the Navy the 18,000 men that were needed. [And so on with his other plans—H.D.] . . . All this had to be done quietly. The pacifists were forever vigilant. . . . Every improvement, every step towards readiness in case of war, was a matter for underground activity. . . . The finishing touches were accomplished with remarkable speed—*sub voce!* . . . everything that could be done *was* done—everything but the authorization of the command: 'Proceed to Brest'—which command unfortunately was beyond Roosevelt's jurisdiction.

## Roosevelt During the War

The command to proceed to Brest came a month after the man who had "kept us out of the war" took office for his second term. Roosevelt swung into action, this time with regard to the actual conduct of the war. He is supposed to have made many contributions to the conduct of the naval war: organization of a coast patrol of yachts, a fleet of 110-foot submarine chasers, the selection of Sims for the supreme naval command, etc. Other plans did not blossom in time for use in the war itself, cut short by the armistice.

One of these was a plan for the development of air bombardments such as are being used now in Spain and China. In a 1919 memorandum on the use of helium—"If the war had lasted until spring," said Mr. Roosevelt, helium-filled dirigibles could have been sent over strategic points in Germany, "each capable of dropping a total of 10 tons or more of high explosives either



in a single tremendous discharge or in a number of smaller ones during its passage over a fortress or city." (*Times*, Mar. 17, 1919.) He also began working out the practical details of a pet scheme, the organization of a 150,000-man Naval Reserve Officers Corps, emphasizing recruitment from "every university and college in the country", which was continued after the war ended.

His propaganda activity remained in full force. In June 1918 he started a series of alarmist articles in the *New York Times*, beginning with "U-Boats Off-Shore!", followed by "England's Air-Force and Ours", "The Condition of the U.S. Navy", etc. He took advantage of the war situation to press for "the principle of universal service", expressing the opinion that "universal service was bound to be a national policy in the future".

What was the war being fought for? Again there was the dual approach—patriotic platitudes for ceremonial occasions, realistic understanding for gatherings that did not object to imperialist realism. Referring back to the war period, in his 1920 acceptance speech as Democratic candidate for vice-president, he said: "Even as the nation entered the war for an idea, so it has emerged from the war with the determination that the ideal shall not die." In 1926, in a lecture at an academy war memorial meeting: "I have felt very deeply the close association of this gathering with the time, not long past, when all the schools of the nation gave the best of their manhood to a great cause. That cause called for the highest ideals and received them."

What was this ideal for which the war was fought? Roosevelt himself knew quite well and was not unwilling to say so. Speaking at a Tammany Hall July 4 celebration in 1917, he translated the ideal into practical terms. "Mr. Roosevelt referred to the present war as 'another American war for independence'. He told how Germans in Venezuela before the war had taken over the railroads which had been built with American enterprise and capital, and how French banks had been transferred to Germans as proof that Germany was reaching out for the trade of western countries." (*Times*, July 5, 1917.)

One would think that all this was enough for a dyed-in-the-wool fire-eater. But it was all being done 3000 miles away from the nearest of the hated Huns. And Roosevelt was not at all lacking in personal courage, as his biographers (including the latest among them, the fatuous Emil Ludwig) have emphasized. It was not enough for Roosevelt.

He wanted to quit his job as Assistant Secretary and ship for active service in the Navy—even as an ordinary seaman.

There were persistent rumors in Washington that he had actually resigned to enlist in the Navy. "But emissaries of President Wilson visited him in a long procession of dissent. . . . At first he was firm in his wish to join the Fleet, but as dissuasion accumulated he weakened."

A compromise was struck, and it was arranged that he go over, but only to supervise the operations of the Navy abroad. He proceeded to Brest himself in July 1918; at a luncheon in England he announced, "I shall spend most of my weeks on this side in actually seeing things done," and visited the fronts to see with his own eyes how it was done. When he returned in September, he told British authorities that he hoped to return in the near future, adding "Perhaps in uniform." The lust of Franklin ("I Hate War") Roosevelt for action could not be satisfied merely by directing the wiping up of the Huns or thinking up new ways of killing the uncivilized barbarians who threatened America's stake in Venezuela.

But the war ended before he could get his gun. He went abroad again in 1919 to direct naval demobilization, returned in March and promptly began another preparedness campaign. More naval budgets submitted and defended before Congress with big-navy and alarmist talk, more speeches (such as that before an American Legion Convention in October 1919 again

advocating universal military training for both the army and navy), etc.

## The 1920 Campaign and the League of Nations

In 1920 Cox was nominated for President by the Democratic Party, with Roosevelt as his running mate for the vice-presidency. The issue they selected to make the fight on was the League of Nations. It turned out that they thereby sealed their doom, being defeated by the largest vote ever. Roosevelt tells the following story on why they chose that issue (as related by MacKaye). Cox and Roosevelt visited Wilson before the campaign started—

"The two men went to the White House and were marched into Wilson's sickroom. There, huddled in a rocking chair, sat the Great Idealist. He was gaunt and cadaverous and broken, and a gray shawl warmed his shoulders. Cox, a bright, cheerful, little man was immensely moved. He tried twice to speak and finally managed:

"Mr. President, I have been a great admirer of your fight for the League."

"Wilson looked at him a moment in silence. Something electrified the sickroom, and a gleam of the old zealot fire lighted his sunken eyes. He leaned forward and plucked Cox by the sleeve.

"Mr. Cox," he said, "the fight can still be won."

"The Presidential nominee was crying when he emerged from the White House and brushed awkwardly at his befogged spectacles. Emotion had put a new misty glow in his face. He turned to Roosevelt and struck him savagely across the shoulders. Something stronger than political wisdom had captured both men. There were still crusades to lead while the Saracen held the Sepulchre.

"Roosevelt," said Cox, "we'll make the fight on the League."

Thus history is made, according to the journalistic interpretation of history. But the misty rose glow must have disappeared when Roosevelt wiped away his tears. The Cox-Roosevelt fight on the League was made by the two musketeers as a hard-headed debate with the Republicans on how best to safeguard the interests of American imperialism.

It is true, of course, that there was no lack of ceremonial phrases about "high ideals", "civilization and humanity", "lasting peace", etc. Indeed, Roosevelt's central slogan was "Progress versus Reaction" (shades of the C.P.!). There was the denunciation of short-sighted isolationism in a complex and interwoven world. But when it came down to arguments rather than phrases, Roosevelt showed that he was not an idealistic babe in the internationalist woods.

We must prevent the League of Nations becoming a European weapon against the U.S., he cried.

"Unless the United States entered the League of Nations," said Mr. Roosevelt, "it would become a new form of the Holy Alliance of Europe. . . ."

"Regarding the allegation that the Covenant was in direct violation of the American Constitution, Mr. Roosevelt averred that the Constitution was a document 'through which a team and horses could be drawn on every page'."

And he assured the audience that the League would not lead to the internationalism of the red flag, among other gruesome things.

America must enter the League to help the fight against Bolshevism, he cried.

"If America had been a member of the League of Nations, the Polish nation would not be today fighting Bolshevism with its back to the wall. If America had been able to throw into the scale the splendid moral force of its hundred millions of people the Bolshevik armies would not be where they are now." (Speech in Milwaukee, August 12, 1920.)

Unless we enter the League, he cried, we will be crushed under the burden of taxation necessitated by armaments. Speaking before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, he pointed out that if international relations are not completely reformed by the League—

“ . . . We would not be content with a navy that was not the equal of any afloat. In that case, he said, we would have to be prepared to spend far greater sums than ever before on the naval branch of the service, as the U.S. would demand more and more control or protection of its commerce, no matter on what sea. Such competitive building, Mr. Roosevelt said, might mean a cost of one billion a year for maintaining the American Navy. ‘That sounds alarming,’ continued the speaker, ‘but it is going to happen . . .’”—unless the U.S. could depend upon the League of Nations to protect its shipping and investments for it.

The drubbing which Cox and Roosevelt received taught Roosevelt a lesson. Not that he changed his views: for example, in the 1926 lecture referred to above, he repeated his attack on isolationism and his support of international collaboration. But he did not tackle foreign-policy politics again for some time. In 1932, he made not a single speech on foreign policy. His collective-security-for-democracy speech of last October 5 at Chicago was one of the first outcroppings of the views on foreign policy which he had suppressed since becoming a presidential contender.

After 1920 Roosevelt became vice-president and eastern manager of a large insurance company at \$25,000 a year, which job he maintained for eight years. And soon thereafter came his battle against the attack of infantile paralysis, which suspended his political career until the curtain opened on it again in 1928.

## The Meaning of Roosevelt

This is not written to prove that Franklin D. Roosevelt is a “bad man”. One conclusion should emerge from this examination of his pre-presidential career: Roosevelt is a conscious, consistent, shrewd, brilliant, and far-sighted representative of the interests of American imperialism. A similar examination of his presidency would go beyond this: Roosevelt is the most capable representative of American imperialism that it has ever had. No American statesman has approached his ability to combine the possession of a *long-range* view of the needs of American imperialism *as a whole* and *today*, with a consummate gift of appealing demagogically to the masses. And to characterize him in these terms is already to call him America’s most dangerous militarist, a “regular, blown-in-the-bottle, antiseptic, non-corroding, self-cocking, dyed-in-the-wool” war-monger, the war-president made to order.

The key to his political philosophy he gave in his last message as Governor in 1932: “We should not seek in any way to destroy or tear down—except to replace unsound materials with new. The American system of economics and government is everlasting. Rather should we seek to eliminate those methods which have proved mistaken. . . .” Unquestioning acceptance of capitalism—experimentalism in methods of preserving it. This has been his characteristic throughout his life: orthodoxy in the essentials, unorthodoxy in the methods. In Harvard, when as college editor he broke all hitherto existing traditions by attacking the administration—on the question of fire-escapes; in the State Senate, when he led a revolt in the Democratic ranks against boss dictation of a Senate appointee—in order to compromise with the bosses on as reactionary a candidate not as directly a part of the machine; as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, when he set officials on their ears with his unorthodox ideas and methods—in order the more efficiently to prepare for imperialist war. And in this unorthodoxy are united and harmonized the two apparently opposite elements of his political course—his pseudo-radicalism as opposed to the hard-shelled conservatism of the old-guarders; the far-sightedness of his defense of capitalism as opposed to the short-sighted vision of other defenders of the system, bound to outworn inadequate methods.

Hal DRAPER

# They, the People

By Dwight Macdonald

THE CHIEF IMPRESSION one gets from this month’s columnists is that it is a complicated world we live in—and getting more so every day. As the crisis of capitalist democracy sharpens, the clash of economic interests, the conflict of social classes and their ideologies become more and more confused. Consider the case of Boake Carter, who has just lost his job as news commentator on the General Foods radio program. The liberal columnist Dorothy Dunbar Bromley thinks there was dirty work involved and asks for an investigation. For this, she is violently abused by her fellow liberal columnist, Heywood Broun. The angles in the Carter affair are enough to give one a headache. Carter is a virulent critic of both the C.I.O. and the New Deal. This pleases Colby M. Chester, president of General Foods and former president of the National Association of Manufacturers. But one of the directors of General Foods and owner of 12% of its common stock is Marjorie Post Hutton Davies, who is also the wife of Joseph Davies, 100% New Dealer and recently ambassador to the Soviet Union. There is evidence that the Davieses brought New Deal pressure to bear on President Chester to let Carter’s contract lapse. So far, a clean-cut victory for righteousness. But Boake Carter, for reasons not clear, is also a critic of collective security, a Big Navy, and the Administration’s imperialistic foreign policy, and the reactionary State Department is supposed to have played a big part in forcing him off the air. The line-up is thus: on one side, the State Department, a large section of liberal and labor opinion, Marjorie Post Hutton Davies, and the Communist Party; on the other, President Chester, the National Association of Manufacturers, and another large section of liberal and labor opinion which opposes a new war to make the world safe for democracy.

\* \* \*

Nowhere has confusion been worse confounded than in the current Democratic primaries. Here the contradictions of the New Deal have emerged with tragic—or comic—effect. Last winter the liberals were hoping—and therefore, as is their custom, predicting—that Roosevelt would create a New Deal party, sloughing off the right wing of the Democratic Party and adding progressive Republicans like Norris and LaFollette. The battle lines between the Forces of Good and the Forces of Evil would thus be clearly drawn, and the New Deal could really get somewhere. The liberals forgot—also as is their custom—that it is the essence of Roosevelt’s strategy that the battle lines *not* be drawn sharply and that the New Deal progress in ever more grandiose circles. The primaries ought to dispel any illusions on the subject. The President’s much-advertised “purge”—except in such cases of pressing political necessity as Senators George and Tydings and Representative O’Connor—has boiled down to a matter of Roosevelt’s punishing his “enemies” within the party by referring to them as “my friend” instead of “my dear friend”. The Battle of Armageddon has turned out to be a routine political manoeuvre. Far from being clarified, this political meaning of the New Deal has been increasingly obscured. In California, the President is backing McAdoo, a Baruch Democrat who opposed his nomination in 1932, against a liberal E.P.I.C. leader who backed his nomination in 1932. In Tennessee, the conservative Senator McKellar and the notorious Ed Crump, immemorial boss of Memphis, successfully defended the New Deal against the onslaught of Senator Berry, head of the printing pressmen’s union and formerly president of Labor’s Non-

Partisan League. In Pennsylvania the C.I.O. fights it out with New Deal Governor Earle, each supported by a group of disreputable old-line politicians. In Idaho a conservative Democrat beats out a New Dealer with the help of votes from the state's Republicans—and from the Townsendites. And in New Jersey, the New Deal has joined hands with Mayor Hague's political machine to nominate for senator the state's W.P.A. administrator, W. H. J. Ely. Battles like these, meaningless except in terms of immediate power politics, have been going on all over the country. It is a discouraging summer for liberals.

The columnists have labored heroically to "interpret" these mighty struggles of Tweedledee versus Tweedledum. Mark Sullivan rejoices over another victory for the forces of sanity in the morning, and Jay Franklin announces another smashing defeat for Bourbonism in the evening. Confusion reached a climax when O'Daniel won the Democratic nomination for Governor of Texas on a platform of hillbilly music, the Ten Commandments, and old age pensions. Sullivan explained that O'Daniel was a big flour manufacturer and a past president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, in a column headed: "O'DANIEL VICTORY LAID NOT TO SHOWMANSHIP BUT TO STRESS ON BUSINESS FUNDAMENTALS." But the same event seemed to Jay Franklin a defeat of the conservative Garner state machine by a candidate who spoke the language of "The People". He suggested it would be well "to put the Roosevelt brand on the O'Daniel candidacy". Franklin, by the way, seems to have a weakness for hillbilly demagogues—*cf.* his often expressed admiration for the late Huey Long.

\* \* \*

As befits the political wisacre of the country's most authoritative newspapers, the *N. Y. Times*, Arthur Krock never forgets his dignity. His tone is dispassionate, urbane, judicial. At most he permits himself such phrases as "the serpentine and furtive course pursued by the Administration politicians in the Democratic primaries". In a dignified way, he has been carrying on a campaign to amend the Wagner Act. He points out that now that the Supreme Court has sustained the Act, "the only corrective lies in the legislative process". Translated into plainer language, this means that in the short space of a year, Congress and the Supreme Court have changed rôles in the melodrama which the press daily sets in motion: Congress is now the wavy-haired hero who is looked to as the rescuer of the lovely Miss American Way from the immoral embraces of a liberalized Supreme Court. So we find Krock urging Senator Wagner to keep his splendid liberal record unsmirched by running for reelection this fall on a platform promising—revision of the Wagner Act.

Sullivan and Kent plume themselves on their profound knowledge of the political game. "Amateur politicians!" is Kent's contemptuous description of Roosevelt's liberal advisers. Not the least cause of these gentlemen's irritation with the New Deal is that, by all their rules, it should have been swept out of office years ago. Yet it persists in flourishing. They view Roosevelt much as the British rowing experts look on Mr. Burk, the New Jersey farmer who recently won the Henley regatta in record time although he violated every principle of rowing form.

\* \* \*

Among the liberal columnists, by far the best job is being done by a newcomer: Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, who several months ago left the *Woman's Page* of the *N. Y. World-Telegram* to do a column of general news comment for the *N. Y. Post*. While Franklin is explaining why Senator Gulch of Arkansas is a staunch New Dealer despite his participation in a recent lynching, and Broun is being whimsical about the class struggle at the Miami race track, Bromley takes up such serious themes as the working conditions of servants, the union-smashing campaign of certain big New York hospitals, the A.M.A. fight on socialized

---

## A THOUGHT FOR THIS MONTH

(or)

### VOX POPULI

"Better wages, better sanitation, and better education will add much to the standard of living of the people as a whole." *Eleanor Roosevelt, July 27.*

"I may be an idealist, but I feel that Mr. Landon belongs far more in the Roosevelt camp than he does in the present G.O.P., and I should like to see the President offer responsible and patriotic employment to the man he defeated in 1936. . . . Perhaps Mr. Landon could serve on the National Labor Relations Board." *Jay Franklin, August 10.*

"President Cardenas is an Indian, and Indian Communism . . . is a very different thing from Marxian Communism. I am reliably informed that Trotsky, who is in Mexico, doesn't regard Mr. Cardenas as a Communist at all." *Hugh Johnson, August 16.*

"Though the moral condition of Europe has become progressively degraded, there is no reason to think that things are yet so bad that the honor of Great Britain, when clearly and decisively engaged, is of no account." *Walter Lippmann, July 28, apropos of the Runciman Mission to sell out the Czechs to Hitler.*

"Excessive migration to the cities is one of the causes of the commotion through which the country is passing." *Mark Sullivan, July 19.*

"No government in our history ever had the degree of cooperation from business that was given Mr. Roosevelt in 1930. He simply asked over the radio one night for a voluntary maximum hours and minimum wages schedule and the abolition of child labor. He got it to the tune of nearly 3,000,000 jobs within the week." *Hugh Johnson, July 26.*

"It is a fact insufficiently perceived that a vote for prosperity is a vote for depression because it concedes the government the power to dictate the economic life of the nation." *Isabel Paterson, July 27.*

---

medicine (pointing out, by the way, that a bigger percentage of mothers die in childbirth in this country than in any other civilized nation), and the *sub rosa* loans which the government's Export-Import Bank has been making to various South American dictatorships. This sort of muckraking should be part of every left-wing columnist's job. Bromley is also distinguished among her liberal colleagues by the possession of both courage and intellectual honesty. She is critical of Stalinism both in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.—and says so. She thinks the American Labor Party has prostituted itself in its deal with the Republicans in New York—and says so. Recently she put comrade Broun and the League for Peace & You-know in a neat hole by asking the simple question: if you are such believers in democracy, why aren't you willing to let the people decide about collective security for themselves through the Ludlow Amendment? To date, both parties have ignored the question.

\* \* \*

When Dorothy Thompson went on vacation early this summer, the editors of the *N. Y. Herald-Tribune* turned her space over to Isabel Paterson. Miss Paterson is a lady book reviewer who used to conduct a literary chitchat department in the book section. On the strength of this background, she is now telling the world her views on price-fixing, monopoly, taxation, wartime conscription, and the "real" nature of capitalism. Her prose is even more exclamatory than her predecessor's, her store of worldly knowledge even slighter. Her stuff, in fact, represents the all-time nadir of the Thompson-Pegler-Johnson "home talent" school of political columnism. The incoherence of her style and viewpoint is only equalled by the dogmatism with which she lays down the law. "INDUSTRY WARNED WAGE SLASHES MUST BE PREVENTED AT ALL COSTS: Isabel Paterson Says Existing Scales Are Certainly Not Too High to Live On, and Can Be Kept Up if 'Waste and Political Grab' Are Ended." And that is that. Miss Paterson has had her Big Moments. The President mentioned her column in a recent press conference. "He laughingly remarked that she seemed to be for

monopoly," the papers reported. The next day, Miss Paterson, obviously thrilled to the marrow, wrote a column explaining to the President that no, indeed, she was *not* for monopoly, but. . . Her train of thought, too involved to follow here, was head-lined: "HOW CAN LAW, ITSELF RESTRAINT, PREVENT RESTRAINT OF TRADE?" The question seems well-nigh unanswerable.

But the really Big Moment came when she refuted both Adam Smith and Karl Marx in a single column. "ALL TALK GLIBLY ABOUT 'CAPITAL' — BUT WHAT DOES IT REALLY MEAN?" ran the head: "Isabel Paterson Says Both Adam Smith and Marx May Be Wrong: Wealth Isn't Just Machinery, but Relationships That Make It Function." It seems that in Marx's time, machinery was more durable both as to wear and obsolescence than it is today. Miss Paterson graphically demonstrates this by referring to an ancient sewing machine she owns—"If I don't set a stitch for a year, it runs well enough when I start it again. I don't know when it was last oiled." On the other hand, "if a motor car of recent make were left in the garage for an equal period, it would be long past use." Therefore: "In Marx's time, it was natural to think of industrial capital as something essentially physical, fairly durable, and capable of being seized and taken over for the benefit of a new political system." Modern capitalism, however, is *dynamic*—imagine!—and its essence lies not in the physical machinery but in the social forms under which production is organized. Hence, revolution is impossible—as simple as that. We may shortly expect Miss Paterson to discover that capitalism produces wars—a fact Marx unfortunately was born too early to understand.

The late Arthur Brisbane's columnar style has been compared

to the conversation of two traveling men, relaxing in a saloon after a hard day on the road. (The asterisks Brisbane used so liberally would correspond to pauses to spit on the sawdust floor.) Miss Paterson reminds one of a schoolmistress, maidenly and severe. She raps backward pupils sharply over the knuckles with her ruler, she scribbles her simple texts vigorously on the blackboard. That dunce, Frankie Roosevelt, gives her much trouble. A recent column bore the blunt headline: "A WASTEFUL WIFE AND ROOSEVELT FOUND TO HAVE MUCH IN COMMON." "The spendthrift cannot be convinced or reformed," concluded Miss Paterson primly. "The only recourse is to avoid him." Sometimes she loses all patience with the class, as when she recently burst out, "What is the matter with Europe, anyhow?" The odd thing about this school is that the teacher seems to be educating herself as she goes along. Miss Paterson's columns are so much thinking-out-loud inflicted on the public. It would be interesting to know—as a rough index of the political sophistication of the big bourgeoisie—how seriously the readers of the *Tribune* take her stuff.

Suggested item for the *Tribune's* "Agony Column": DOROTHY COME HOME. . . CHILDREN NEED YOU. . . ALL IS FORGIVEN.

\* \* \*

The Collective security boys found deep, though conflicting significance in the Hughes round-the-world flight. Heywood Broun pronounced it "a victory for democracy". Jay Franklin, equally delighted, wrote: "It won't be long now before our Atlantic Coast will be as exposed to European raiders as are the coasts of England today."

# The Two Party System

THE POLITICAL SPOKESMEN for the plutocracy foster two ideas which help perpetuate their authority over the minds and lives of the American people. The first, which is the essence of democratic mythology, is that either one or both of the two capitalist parties have a classless character. The second is that the two-party system is the natural, inevitable, and only truly American mode of political struggle. The Democratic and Republican parties are given the same monopoly over political activity as C.B.S. and N.B.C. have acquired over radio broadcasting.

The theoretical underpinning of "The Politicos" is constructed out of these two propositions which Josephson affirms in a special version of his own. The central thesis of his book is that "neither of the two great parties in the United States" was "a class party", such as were common in Europe. They were competitive cartels of professional spoilsmen independent of all classes and primarily concerned with looking out for themselves and their political outfits. Only incidentally, as it were, did they also cater to the plutocracy or to the people.

By 1840, Josephson remarks, "the professional or 'patronage' party had been forged in America, had become part of the fabric of government itself, wholly unlike parties elsewhere which labored primarily for 'class' or 'ideas'." Further, "the historic American parties were not 'credo' parties, as Max Weber has defined them, parties representing definite doctrines and interests or faiths in a church, or a monarchical or traditional aristocratic caste principle, or a rational Liberal Capitalist progress; they now paralleled and competed with each other as purely *patronage parties*."

This is an utterly superficial and one-sided appraisal of the bourgeois parties. While it is true that in the classic land of Big

Business, politics itself became the biggest of Big Businesses, the two great political firms that contended for possession of the enormous privileges and prizes of office were no more independent of capitalist interest and control than are the two mammoth broadcasting corporations. On the contrary, they vied with each other to render superior service to their employers.

The all-important point is that the big business of politics was at one and the same time the politics of Big Business. This applied in petty matters as well as in the most vital affairs, whether it was a question of assigning a local postmastership, fixing tariffs or declaring war. The real relations between the party Bosses and the capitalist moguls were similar to those between an agent and his principal. While executing the orders of their employer and attending to their affairs, the agents, who were powers in their own right, did not hesitate to pocket whatever they could for themselves and their associates. The ruling caste was willing to wink at these practices, even encourage them, so long as they were not too costly or did not create a public scandal.

Josephson's theory, however, not only denies this intimate relationship but even inverts it. According to his conception, it was not the capitalists but the party bosses, not the big bourgeoisie but the party which was politically paramount. Josephson invests this thesis with a semblance of plausibility by drawing a whole series of incorrect conclusions from a number of indisputable but isolated facts of a secondary order. From the relative autonomy of the party organizations, he deduces their absolute independence of the ruling caste; from the episodic antagonisms of particular bourgeois politicians to certain demands, members, or segments of the capitalist oligarchy, he deduces a fundamental opposition between them.

## The Relations Between Party and Class

Throughout his work Josephson displays a very meagre understanding of the interrelations between political parties and the class forces they represent. These relations are not at all simple, uniform, or unvarying but extremely complicated, many-sided, and shifting. In the first place, it is impossible for any bourgeois party to present itself to the electorate as such. The capitalist exploiters constitute only a tiny fragment of the nation; their interests constantly conflict with those of the producing masses, generating class antagonisms at every step. They can conquer power and maintain it only through the exercise of fraud, trickery, and, when necessary, by main force. Their political representatives in a democratic state are therefore constrained to pass themselves off as servants of the people and to mask their real designs behind empty promises and deceitful phrases. The official actions of these agents negate their democratic pretensions time and again. Opportunism, demagoguery, duplicity, and betrayal are the hallmarks of every bourgeois party.

Since the masses sooner or later discover their betrayal and turn against the party they have placed in power, the ruling class must keep another political organization in reserve to throw into the breach. Hence the necessity for the two-party system. The Democratic and Republican Parties share the task of enforcing the domination of big capital over the people. From the social standpoint, the differences between them are negligible.

The apparent impartiality and independence of the twin parties and their leaders is an indispensable element in the mechanics of deception whereby the rich tyrannize over the lesser orders of the people. In affirming the classless character of the capitalist parties, Josephson shows himself to be no less enthralled by this fiction than the most ignorant worker. The worker, however, has had no opportunities to know better.

In the second place, no party can directly, and immediately represent an entire class, however great a majority of suffrage it enjoys at any given moment. Intra-party controversies and splits, no less than inter-party conflicts, reflect the divergences between the component parts of a class as well as the opposing interests of different classes, which constituted the coalition parties of the bourgeoisie.

A new party, made up of the most conscious and advanced members of a class, frequently comes into violent collision with the more backward sections of the same class. This was true of the Republican Party throughout the Second American Revolution. Thus Josephson's contention that "the ruling party often vexed and disappointed the capitalists as in the impeachment action itself, in its 'excesses', or pursuit of its special ends", does not at all demonstrate the supra-class position of the Radical Republicans. It goes to prove that they were more intransigent and clear-sighted defenders of Northern capitalism than many hesitant and conservative capitalists.

Finally, the independence of any party from the social forces it represents is always relative and often restricted within narrow limits. However long or short the tether, however tightly it was drawn at any given moment, the leadership of both parties was tied to the stake of the plutocracy. Whenever important individuals or tendencies began to assert themselves at the expense of the capitalist rulers or in opposition to their interests, counter-movements inevitably arose to bring them to heel, cast them out, or crush them. Josephson reports a hundred instances of this process in his book. Wherever the spoilsmen grabbed too much or too openly, they evoked Civil Service or reform movements, initiated or supported by those bourgeois groups demanding honest, cheap, or more efficient administration of their affairs.

The sovereignty of the capitalists stands out in bold relief in many individual cases described by Josephson. When Johnson dared oppose the Radicals, he was fought, impeached, and then discarded. When his successor Grant endeavored to assert his independence of the Senatorial Cabal, he was quickly humbled and converted into a docile tool of the plutocracy. J. P. Morgan broke Cleveland's resistance to his financial policies after months of struggle and bent the President to his will.

Even more instructive is the example of Altgeld, recently resurrected as a liberal hero. Those who recall his pardon of the Chicago Anarchists conveniently ignore the cause and outcome of his controversy with President Cleveland during the railroad strikes of 1894, led by Debs. The Governor of Illinois wanted to use the State Guard alone to break the strike; the President insisted on sending in Federal troops as well. Their quarrel amounted to a jurisdictional dispute as to which was to have the honor of suppressing the strike. Both state and federal troops were finally used. Thus the radical petty-bourgeois leader view with the conservative commander of the big bourgeoisie in protecting the interests of the possessing classes against the demands of labor.

## The Consolidation of the Two-Party System

After annihilating the slavocracy, the reigning representatives of the big bourgeoisie set about to reënforce their supremacy. While the masters of capital were concentrating the principal means of production in their hands and extending their domination over ever-larger sectors of the national economy, their political agents were seizing the controlling levers of the state apparatus in the towns, cities, states, and federal government. The simultaneous growth of monopolies in the fields of economics and politics was part and parcel of the same process of the consolidation of capitalist rule.

The two major parties became the political counterparts of the capitalist trusts. Functioning as the right and left arms of the big bourgeoisie, the Republican and Democratic Parties exercised a *de facto* monopoly over political life. The masses of the people were more and more excluded from direct participation and control over the administration of public affairs. The capitalist politicians did not attain this happy result at one stroke nor without violent struggle within the two parties and within the nation. Overriding all opposition, outwitting some, crushing others, bribing still a third, they succeeded in thoroughly domesticating both organizations until the crisis of 1896. The two-party system of capitalist rule was the most characteristic product of the political reaction following the great upheaval of the Civil War. This mechanism enabled the plutocracy to maintain its power undisturbed during an epoch of relatively peaceful parliamentary struggle.

The managers of the two parties had two main functions to perform in defense of the bourgeois regime. First of all, they had to safeguard the bourgeois parties against the infiltration of dangerous influences emanating from the demands of the masses. In addition, they had to head off any independent mass movement which jeopardized the two-party system and therewith the domination of the plutocracy.

The monopoly of the two great political corporations was accompanied by the ruthless expropriation of political power from the lower classes, the strangling of their independent political enterprises, their more intensive exploitation in the interests of the commanding clique. This state of political affairs combined with the periodic economic crises generated the series of popular revolts culminating in the campaign of 1896.

We can discern two dominant tendencies in the political turmoil of the times. On one side, the two major parties, despite



their secondary differences, coöperating in promoting the ascendancy and interests of the big bourgeoisie. On the opposite side, various popular movements which welled forth from the lower classes in their attempts to reverse the process of capitalist consolidation and to assert their own demands in opposition. Although these two tendencies were of unequal strength, corresponding to the disparities in the social weight and influence of the farmers and workers as against their oppressors, it was the struggles between these two camps, and not the secondary and largely sham battles between the two capitalist parties, that constitute the socially significant struggles of the epoch.

Bourgeois historians, however, focus their spotlight upon the contests of the monopolist parties which crowd the foreground of the political arena, leaving obscure the popular protest movements which agitated in the background and emerged into national prominence only on critical occasions. Josephson has not freed himself from this preoccupation. While "The Politics" presents an illuminating picture of the top side of American politics revolving around the inner life of the plutocratic parties and their struggles for hegemony, it systematically slights the underside of the political life of the same period.

Josephson devotes attention to the third party movements expressing the aspirations of the plebian orders and embodying their efforts to emancipate themselves from bourgeois tutelage, only as they affected, approach, or merge into the channels of the two-party system. He shows himself to be considerably more enslaved by bourgeois standards of political importance, and a far less independent, critical, and astute historian of post-Civil War political life than the evangelical liberal, V. L. Parrington, who, for all his deficiencies, is keenly conscious of major issues and alignments.

This is not an accidental error on Josephson's part but an offshoot of his theoretical outlook. He draws the same fundamental conclusions from the political experiences of the post-war epoch as other bourgeois historians. American politics moves in a bipartisan orbit; third-party movements are short-lived aberrations from the norm, predestined to disappear or to be absorbed into new two-party alignments; state power oscillates between the Ins and Outs in a process as recurrent and inevitable as the tides.

Josephson even regards the two-party regime as "a distinct and enduring" contribution of American statecraft to "realistic social thought", although the American bourgeoisie borrowed this system from the British ruling class, who fixed the pattern of parliamentary government for the rest of the Western World.

Superficially considered, American politics since the Civil War tends to confirm these conclusions. Despite their promising beginnings, none of the third party movements developed into an independent and durable national organization, let alone succeeding in uncrowning the plutocracy; even the mighty Populist flood, with its millions of voters and followers, was sucked into the channels of the two-party system in 1896 where it ebbed away into nothingness after its defeat; the two-power system has remained intact and triumphant until today.

These third party movements were to be sure chiefly responsible for whatever political progress was accomplished during this period. Their militancy kept alive the spark of revolt against the existing order. They provided the experimental laboratories in which the creative social forces worked out their formulas of reform. These programs of reforms fertilized the otherwise barren soil which their activities furrowed. Some of these minor reforms even found partial fruition through the two major parties. Exerting pressure upon their left flanks, the third party movements pushed the monopolist parties forward step by step, exacting concessions from them. Nevertheless, the fact remains that none of the third-party movements blossomed into a full-

blown national party, on a par with the two big bourgeois organizations.

The situation appears in a different light, however, upon a critical examination of the causes and conditions of their failure. First, the aims, programs, composition, and leadership of these movements were almost wholly middle-class in character. The heterogeneous nature of the middle-classes hindered them from welding together their own class forces in a permanent organization; their interests as small property-owners and commodity producers set them at odds with the industrial workers; a fundamental community of interests deterred them from conducting an intransigent or revolutionary struggle against their blood-brothers, the big property owners. Second, these petty-bourgeois protest movements lacked the stamina, solidity, and stability to weather boom periods. Blazing up during economic crisis, they died down during the subsequent upswing. The upper strata of the middle classes were satisfied with higher prices or petty reforms; the masses sank back into political passivity.

Third, the history of the third party movements is a sorry record of the betrayal of the plebian masses by their leadership. This leadership was largely made up of careerist politicians or representatives of the upper middle-classes, who were usually ready to make unprincipled deals with the managers of the two big parties; to forsake their principles and the interests of their followers for a few formal concessions or promises; to quit the building of an independent movement for the sake of a cheap and easy accession to office. An almost comic example of this was the fiasco of the Liberal Reform movement of 1872, which, originating in revulsion against the degeneracy of the Republican Stalwarts, ended by nominating Horace Greeley as a joint candidate with the Democrats in a presidential convention manipulated by wire-pulling, ruled by secret diplomacy, and consummated in an unprincipled deal that totally demoralized the movement and disheartened its sympathizers. Even more striking was the decision of the Populist Party in 1896 to abandon its identity and support Bryan, the Democratic nominee. Finally, the mesmerizing effect of the two-party system and the activities of the capitalist politicians must be taken into account. They threw their full weight against every sign of independent political action reflecting mass discontent, crushing wherever they could not capture or head off the nascent movement of rebellion.

The sole social force capable of forging and leading a strong, stable, and independent movement against the plutocracy, the proletariat, was too immature to undertake that task. As a rule, the industrial workers remained politically subservient to bourgeois interests and influence; they limited their field of struggle to the economic arena; their trade-union leaders adhered to the policy of begging favors from the two parties as the price of their allegiance; the left wing labor and socialist parties remained insignificant sects.

The two-party system was therefore perfected under certain specific social, economic, and political conditions and its perpetuation depends upon the continuation of these conditions.

## Prospects of the Two-Party System

The two-party regime, however, is no more eternal than the bourgeois democracy it upholds. Its stability is guaranteed only by the relative stability of the social relations within the nation. The two-party system consolidated itself when American capitalism was in the ascendant; when the masters of capital sat securely in the saddle; when the proletariat was weak, disorganized, divided, and unconscious; when the direction of political mass movements fell to the middle-classes. There was plenty of room for class accommodation; ample means for concessions; opportunities and necessities for class reconciliation. Consequently, the political equilibrium was each time restored after it had been upset by severe class conflicts.

These circumstances either no longer prevail or are tending to disappear. American capitalism is on the downgrade; the proletariat is powerful, well-organized, militant; the capitalists are in a quandary; the middle classes are nervous and restless. All the antagonisms that slumber in the depths of American society are being awakened and fanned to a flame by the chronic social crisis. The forces formerly confined within the framework of the two-party system are pounding against its walls, cracking it in a hundred places. The sharpening class conflicts can no longer be regulated inside the old political setup. The vanguard of the contending forces are straining to break the bonds which tie them to the old parties and to forge new instruments of struggle better adapted to the new situation.

While the trend toward new forms of political action and organization are common to all classes, the movement most fraught with significance for the future is the manifest urge of the organized labor to seek the road of independent political action. Skeptics, conservative-minded pedants, Stalinists, interested trade-union bureaucrats, and all those under the spell of traditional bourgeois prejudices point to the futility of third-party movements in the past to discourage the workers from taking this new road and to keep them in the old ruts. Their historical arguments are based entirely upon conditions of a bygone day.

Viewed on an historical scale, American society and therewith American politics is today in a transitional period, emerging out of the old order into a pre-revolutionary crisis. This new period has its historical parallel, not in the post-revolutionary epoch following the Civil War, but in the period preceding it. "The irrepressible conflict" between the reactionary slaveholders and the progressive bourgeoisie has its contemporary analogy in the irrepressible conflict between the capitalist and working classes.

The class conflicts which then shook the social foundations of the Republic shattered all existing political formations. The Whigs and Democrats, which had, like the Republican and Democratic Parties, monopolized the political stage for decades in the service of the slave power, were pulverized by the blows delivered from within and from without by the contending

forces. The turbulent times gave birth to various kinds of intermediate parties and movements: Free-soil, Know-Nothing, Liberty movements. The creators of the Republican Party collected the viable, progressive, and radical forces out of these new mass movements and out of the old parties to form a new national organization.

As the Abolitionists knew and declared, the Republican Party was not revolutionary in its principles, program, or leadership. It was a bourgeois reformist party aiming to alter the existing political system for the benefit of the big and little bourgeoisie, not to overthrow it. This did not prevent the slaveholders from regarding it as a revolutionary menace to their rule. From 1854 to 1860 the political atmosphere within the United States became totally transformed by the deepening social crisis. Six years after the launching of the Republican Party came its formal assumption of power, the rebellion of the slaveholders, civil war, and revolution. All this occurred as the result of objective social conditions, regardless of the will of the majority of the participants and contrary to their plans and intentions.

The national and international conditions of the class struggle are too radically different today for the forthcoming period to reproduce the pattern of pre-civil war days in any slavish manner. It is certain, however, that its revolutionary character and tendencies are considerably closer to the present situation and problems confronting the American people than are the conditions and concepts stemming from the post-Civil War era of capitalist consolidation and reaction.

Matthew Josephson and his school operate almost exclusively with ideas derived from the conditions of the post-revolutionary period and tacitly based upon a continuation of them. Their minds and writings are permeated with the same spirit of adaptation to the reigning order as their politics. A resurgent labor movement struggling to free itself from capitalist control must first cast off the obsolete prejudices inherited from its past enslavement. For a thoroughgoing critical revision of such antiquated ideas, the advanced intellectual representatives of labor among the rising generation will have to look elsewhere than in the pages of "The Politicos".

George E. NOVACK

# Ignace Reiss: In Memoriam

ONE YEAR HAS PASSED since Ignace Reiss (Ludwig) was murdered in Lausanne on the orders of Yezhov. Such a crime no longer comes as news. What is unusual, however, if not altogether new, is that it occurred on territory other than the Soviet Union or Spain, and what is tragic is the fact that Yezhov had this cowardly crime carried out by the hand of a colleague and friend of Reiss's of many years standing.

Politically regarded, this crime was and remains a logical continuation of the Moscow Trials. Just as Stalin could not do otherwise than kill Lenin's coworkers after he had forced them to dishonor themselves, so in the case of the first man who had the courage to break with him, he could not afford to let Reiss live. Reiss was no writer or journalist, who in the last analysis has nothing to fear from his physical annihilation; he had been in Stalin's secret service for many years and knew what fate to expect. He wrote letters to friends in which the sentence recurs: "They will kill me but my mind is made up." Not only was he to be murdered, but Yezhov was in a hurry, for he and his associates, who knew Reiss, knew but too well how great a danger for their organization his break entailed. Not that Yezhov feared that the secrets of the organization (G.P.U.) would be exposed. Absolutely sure of the integrity of Reiss, when Yezhov read

the letter that Reiss sent to the G.P.U. at the time he wrote to the Central Committee (of the C.P.S.U.), he credited the sincerity of every word in the following sentence: "You need not at all be concerned about your secrets, I am not one of your kind." But those who were not as close to Reiss, who in the past few years had scarcely encountered this type of honorable revolutionary would certainly not place the confidence in Reiss's assurances that Yezhov implicitly extended. He was one of the few who were convinced of the absolute integrity of Reiss.

The fear of the organizational secrets of the G.P.U. being revealed, is in itself not sufficient ground for resorting to murder, something which always carries with it the risk of discovery. It was always in the power of Yezhov to reconstruct the apparatus and the secrets can be made out of date in a couple of months. The rush of events in the world and in politics facilitates this. But Yezhov's fears were of a different order and were completely justified, for though he succeeded in murdering Reiss, he could not save the organization and prevent the break of many colleagues, who in their letters to the G.P.U. stated that they were ready to work for the Soviet Union just as long as Reiss was.

Yezhov could not appraise which would involve the greater

harm, to kill Reiss or to let him live. There was no lack of warning voices but these were soon silenced, as in the case of Slutzki who had recourse to suicide. No such considerations were possible to Yezhov. His only consideration was the order of Stalin—to “liquidate”, to punish and make an example of whoever broke with Stalin.

It was on this mission that Spiegelglass, Slutzki's understudy, left for Paris. He was also charged with the carrying out of an additional mission. Anybody else, of course, would have been compelled to do the same but the choice of Spiegelglass was a happy one. Not because he possessed courage but because he hadn't a single idea in his head, and was not averse to the business of murder. He would thus demonstrate that he was indispensable and absolutely devoted to Stalin. And so he performed his mission to the complete satisfaction of Stalin, for the latter had not expected so speedy a consummation; while at the same time the murder was carried out through the agency of the G.P.U. thus removing every possible doubt that Europe may have had on the score of responsibility. Reiss knew exactly with whom he had to deal. He knew that the fury of Yezhov would tolerate no scruples but he thought that a proletarian organization whose protection he invoked, would at least be able to stay the hand of the Moscow authorities. His letter of resignation to the Central Committee of the ruling party was published in the Dutch “Nieuwe Fackel” but Stalin no longer fears public opinion. The venal elements he can buy; as to the others he is indifferent.

Spiegelglass' choice, in turn, fell on Gertrude Schildbach. He was aware of our relations with this woman. Her oppositional sympathies were no secret to him. As Gertrude Schildbach herself confessed to friends in Paris and as I learned after Reiss' death, he tried to persuade her that Reiss was a traitor and that by this deed she would be completely rehabilitated in the confidence of the party. He moreover attempted to plant in her confused head the idea that she would be performing a heroic deed. After breaking down in the presence of some of our friends, Gertrude Schildbach accepted the commission and played with the idea of warning us. She knew that both Reiss and I were doomed, and if it could not be managed otherwise, even our child was not to be spared. For this purpose she bought a box of candy which I noticed at our rendezvous but which she did not present us with.

At the same time Spiegelglass operated another scheme. He introduced Schildbach to a man who tempted her with offers of love. This youthful good-looking careerist is the type of person Stalin nowadays makes use of to wipe out revolutionists. Sometimes they are the declassed sons of white emigres or as, in this case, there is a sister in Moscow who maintains close connections with the G.P.U. It was easy for this adventurer to make an impression on Gertrude Schildbach. For the first time in her life this plain and aging woman found somebody making love to her and holding out the prospect of a stable and happy union. It worked. Gertrude Schildbach sold Reiss out, took over the whole affair in her own hands, and saved me and the child. She did not make use of the box of candy but hurried off, when she learned that Reiss was alone that evening in Lausanne. And this panicky haste gave rise to those fatal mistakes which quickly led to the clearing up of the murder in a few days. This in itself is sufficient reason why she will not obtain the coveted award. She would become fully conscious of the meaning of her deed, probably only at the moment when she found herself alone in the Soviet Embassy's car (her assistants did not make their way to Russia). Her reward must certainly have failed to come through for the idyllic times when such “heroic” deeds were rewarded by being exiled from European Russia to the White Sea where one could spend ones days fishing are over. There is a much shorter and more radical treatment. Gertrude Schildbach will

have received her compensation in the cellars of the Lubianka. Decorations are now awarded for obedient killings in Spain. It is those who distinguish themselves by their zeal in rooting out Trotskyists and the P.O.U.M. who are most honored. In Moscow too one may win a decoration for courageous struggle on behalf of the Spanish proletariat, say somebody who receives the Spanish gold in the harbor of Odessa in return for arms, or the official Resident who negotiates the deal. They will be honored with the same decoration, the Order of the Red Banner, that Reiss won years ago for his services in the Revolution.

No, Gertrude Schildbach will receive no badges of honor. She managed her deed of “heroism” too clumsily. But what is deeply moving in this tragedy is that it was she who should have been the chosen instrument. This is the same woman who after her return from the Soviet Union following the first Moscow Trials (August 1936), wept despairingly and vowed that even if she were forced, she would never return to the Soviet Union, concluding with the sentence I shall never forget, “It is easy for me, I have neither mother nor child to grieve for me. But you . . . your child must not grow up in the shadow of the Lie.”

However horrible it may seem that a friend was made use of for such a purpose, it was not novel. An intimate friend played a similar rôle in the case of Blumkin. There too a woman friend acted the Judas rôle, won Stalin's gratitude and became a very cherished agent of the G.P.U. She earned the admiration of Yagoda and the hate of the comrades. After many years, when she once moved to salute him with the customary embrace, Reiss could not control his feeling of horror and later said to me, “How terrible a thing, to have to work with such as these.”

\* \* \*

Reiss entered the newly formed Communist Party of Poland about 20 years ago. This party is strictly illegal. Even merely belonging is punishable with long terms in prison. The work was difficult, the party was poor, and its members were unemployed. Provocateurs, particularly in the small towns, assured a quick arrest. A whole six months of uninterrupted activity was counted a success. The C.P. united within its ranks all social layers of the young republic, the most advanced elements of the Polish Socialist party, youthful ex-servicemen, proletarians, intellectuals, peasants, Poles who had imagined their liberated Fatherland differently, disappointed Ukrainians, Jews.

In 1922, shortly after the arrest of a number of leading members of the Polish Central Committee, Reiss was also arrested. Despite the physical torment he suffered in prison, he kept his courage high. And when I was allowed to see him in a few weeks, I found that while his prison experiences had changed his physical appearance, his morale was stronger than ever. With few exceptions this was the case of all his comrades who filled the prisons of Poland. All were borne up by the hope and conviction that revolutionary Russia was transforming mankind's age-old dream of liberation into reality.

His imprisonment steered Reiss and all the good and noble elements in his character were confirmed. Penetrated through and through with socialist culture he realized in his own life the doctrine of Marx—unconditional loyalty to the cause; the spirit of true comradeship was deeply anchored in his soul. He remained pure and uncompromising to the end. My testimony about him will one day be confirmed by many who have escaped Stalin's massacres and others who still work in Stalin's apparatus in Paris and Prague when they will regain their freedom.

In the summer of 1923 Reiss was released from prison and, with one of his close friends, and, in circumstances of considerable danger, was able with the help of the party to flee to Germany.

Those were stormy days in the fall of 1923 in Germany, full of feverish activity and great hopes. Countless comrades came and passed through our dwelling-place, and in those days I saw

very little of Reiss. He threw himself hopefully into the movement, was almost continuously on the road, and in the few days that he stayed in Berlin he found very little time for his private life. The days passed hectically and the nights were full of uncertainty. One morning Reiss told me the reason that he had not come home. He had accompanied Piatakov to Chemnitz. At the Dresden station they found that they had confused the time of the arrival and departure of the train and that the last train for Berlin had left. There was nothing else to do but to stay over night. When they discussed what hotel they could stay in, it came out that they both were traveling around with a passport made out for the same name. So they took a room together. A coincidence: the same passport, the same ultimate fate.

The years that followed marked the ebb of the revolutionary movement in Europe, of the opposition struggles in Russia and the repercussions in the Communist parties in Europe. Reiss along with others now buried his hopes for a revolution in Europe for a long time. The task now was to defend the Soviet Union and the achievements of October from the encircling counter-revolution. Disregarding all dangers, he travelled from one country to another, always illegally and making acquaintance with the many prisons of Europe. And with the same courage and devotion he risked his life. He never expected applause.

The destruction of the opposition in Russia was accompanied by the decay of the Comintern and this of course brought with it a demoralization of all the Soviet apparatuses. Reiss stubbornly fought against the incipient bureaucratization of the apparatus; he carefully selected his colleagues. He who himself hoped one day to return to party activity now buried this wish and reconciled his work in the intelligence service more easily with his conscience. Personally, however, he withdrew more and more within his shell and suffered very keenly over the developments in Russia. Trotsky's expulsion from the party hit him very hard and when Trotsky was deported from the country Reiss said: "Now Stalin has done a service by saving the head of the revolution."

Reiss's work abroad was interrupted by a lengthy stay in Moscow from 1930-32. That was the epoch of the five-year plan with all its deprivations, discussions and struggles. Stalin was already pressing so hard on all independent thought that the trip abroad and the resumption of illegality was almost welcome. This was the period in which Reiss entered the service of the G.P.U.

The work abroad in the meantime became much more difficult. One had to abandon the idea of being supported by the party. The apparatus was to be built up only with the help of remote sympathizers. Reiss made use of his old connections. Through his open and cultivated manner of dealing with people he succeeded in the years of disappointment to win for the Soviet Union intellectuals, professors and journalists.

But the question became ever more pressing—how long was one to go along? From time to time Stalin made a gesture (as in Spain 1936) with which one could go along. In the last years Reiss had rejected younger people for the work in the G.P.U., and had tried to convince his friends that the youth should be left free to work within the party. He himself was beginning to see with terrifying clarity the extent of his bondage. All the more stubbornly he clung to what remained by way of justifying his activity—the defense of the Soviet Union. That was enough to continue with the work but not to settle with his conscience. So he became more subdued, more taciturn and ever lonelier.

We could now count on the fingers of our hand those to whom we could speak openly. They were not recognizable, these comrades of yesterday. Those who only shortly before agreed despairingly with us now approved of everything and rejoiced

over some speech of Litvinoff before the League of Nations or they were elated when Poland's anti-semitic generals paid homage to Radek's old mother. They exulted when a government became incited against Trotsky or the wires were cut to prevent him from making an address. They had become conscienceless and brainless. Their thinking was done for them by Stalin.

After the first trial the question of the break became acute. He would wait no longer, he had made up his mind. And now I tried to dissuade him from being over-impulsive, to talk things over with other comrades. I was justifiably afraid for his life. I pleaded with him not to walk out alone, to make the break along with other comrades but he only said: "One can count on nobody. One must act alone and openly. One cannot trick history, there is no point in delay." He was correct—one is alone.

It was a release for him but also a break with everything that had hitherto counted with him, with his youth, his past, his comrades. Now we were completely alone. In those few weeks Reiss aged very rapidly, his hair became snow-white. He who loved nature and cherished life looked about him with empty eyes. He was surrounded by corpses. His soul was in the cellars of the Lubianka. In his sleep-torn nights he saw an execution or a suicide.

He also spoke of the future, of the hard, long struggle for which one must prepare oneself, and of the goal that this thorny path would reach. He dreamed of the party conference which would show the way and continue the program. The Zimmerwaldians were also a handful, he said, and there was war besides to combat.

What did Stalin achieve by this murder? The life of an uncompromising revolutionary was destroyed, his child orphaned, and plunged into inexpressible grief. The voice of the dead will not be stilled but will cry out against the crimes of Stalin. Reiss served the Revolution modestly and with unquestioned loyalty—with his life. And with his death he continues to serve it.

Elsa REISS

## The Fourth International Meets

AS WE GO TO PRESS, we learn from Europe that the long-awaited conference of delegates from the various sections of the Fourth Internationalist movement is shortly to convene. An auspicious omen for the success of the conference is to be found in the just concluded unification of the most important of the revolutionary groups in England, for some years separated by differences of a secondary character.

Since the last conference, in 1935, the mighty events in Spain, China, Austria, and throughout the world, have once again demonstrated with the blood of the working class the frightful collapse of the two existing internationals, and the necessity for the immediate re-constitution of the revolutionary international. The present conference meets to face a stern historic responsibility. It must draw the lessons unflinchingly from the past, and map the new and triumphant road toward the future. It is above all the approach of the new world war that makes the problem of the International paramount. There must and will be a force able to stand against the storm of chauvinism, and to rally all those resolved that the war will precipitate not the end of civilization, but the beginning of a world socialist order.

In forthcoming issues we plan to cover in detail the work of the conference. From the beginning, as our name makes explicit, we have conceived the task of the creation and extension of the Fourth International as the central and integrating aim of our work.

The EDITORS

# Labor Party and Progress

TO say that a change in the situation dictated a change in tactics can be interpreted in two ways. It can be inferred that the tactic previously followed was correct in the light of conditions then existing and that the new tactic, which may be directly contrary to the one previously followed, is also correct because of the change in the situation. Or the inference can be made that a change in conditions made clear the incorrect policy previously applied and that the present policy has corrected the former one.

In the case of the proposed re-orientation of the Socialist Workers' Party on the labor party problem it can be truthfully said that both of the above inferences can be made. Our tactic in rejecting the labor party slogan, at a time when there was practically no movement for a labor party, was correct and because of the radical change in conditions it is now correct to adopt that slogan. Our formulation with reference to the labor party question, however, a formulation which prevented us from shifting our position quickly when circumstances demanded a shift, was too rigid to be correct. It was a case of an incorrect reason for a correct tactic.

Our statement that it is not the business of a revolutionary party to help in the formation of a labor party could result in a correct tactic only in a period when there was no serious movement for the formation of a labor party. But that formulation applies to all times and under all circumstances. Consequently, when a substantial movement for independent political action came into being, the abstract character and incorrectness of that formulation was thrust upon us because it interfered with the adoption of a correct tactic of supporting a labor party movement.

What was most effective in impressing leading members of the party with the necessity for a change both in tactic and formulation was the practical experience of the trade-union activists. With the organization of Labor's Non-Partisan League the political life of the trade unions, especially of the C.I.O. was awakened. Resolutions for and against independent political action, proposals to support Democratic candidates and other political resolutions were being constantly introduced necessitating a definite attitude on the part of our members in the trade unions.

One of two courses could be followed. To oppose the formation of any labor party and to advance the S.W.P. as the party which the workers should follow now and in the immediate future or to propose that the trade unions should organize their own party. It is highly significant that while there was some hesitation on the part of the activists in suggesting the second policy, practically no one thought of advancing the first policy as a practical measure. It appeared to those active in the trade unions as too unrealistic a policy to deserve serious consideration.

Reality came in conflict with theory and when that occurs Marxists do not hesitate to give up theory.

## When Is a Movement Progressive?

It is not enough, however, to support a movement simply because it embraces large numbers within its scope. It is necessary to analyze the nature of the movement and its tendencies and determine whether or not it will aid the labor movement to advance in a revolutionary direction before we decide to support it even critically. In short, before throwing our support to any movement, we must be convinced that it is progressive in character.

At a time when the plague of semantics has descended upon us one must watch his step very carefully in using any word

which has not been defined exactly. What is "progressive" and what is "retrogressive"?

We designated, for instance, the struggle of the Ethiopians against the Italian imperialists as progressive in character and on that basis we supported the former as against the latter. Any number of sectarians of both the right and left variety pooh-pooed the idea that the war on the part of the Ethiopians was progressive in character. Was not Haile Selassie as brutal a taskmaster as Mussolini? Were not the Ethiopian peasants horribly mistreated by the aristocratic Ethiopian landlords? No noticeable difference could result from a victory of either side. Hence no support of the Ethiopians or the Italians. We, however, considered the Ethiopian struggle in its relationship to the whole imperialist system, in the light of the general struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples for freedom from imperialist exploitation and of the effect which a victory of the Ethiopians would have upon the struggle of the working masses throughout the world. Viewing the Ethiopian struggle from that general viewpoint, from the viewpoint of the development of the forces arrayed against capitalist imperialism, we declared that struggle to be progressive and offered whatever support we were capable of giving.

At the very beginning of the fascist revolt against the Loyalist government we came out for material support of the latter on the ground that the war of the Loyalists against the fascists was progressive. We still adhere to the same opinion. To oppose our position, sectarians pointed to the shooting of revolutionary workers by the Negrin-Stalinist regime. We did not permit that to swerve us from our position, though we intensified our political struggle against the Loyalist government. We still consider that a victory of the Loyalist Government is preferable because that will afford the workers a greater opportunity to march forward.

We may not be able to define the term "progressive" with the exactness that will satisfy super-critical semanticists but for the purposes of a political party that is hardly a legitimate requirement. From the point of view of revolutionary Marxism any movement which sets forces into motion against the capitalist system and weakens that system, which serves to heighten the class-consciousness of the workers, and makes possible a further advance is progressive in character.

Would the formation by the trade unions of their own party, separate and apart from the avowed capitalist parties, constitute a progressive step? To determine that we must of course consider conditions as they are and not as we would like them to be. It would be folly to claim that a labor party movement would be progressive under all circumstances. The discussion must necessarily be limited to the present situation. Nor would it be germane to the subject to discuss whether the formation of a labor party is the most probable development. Whether or not a labor party will actually come into existence is immaterial in a discussion on the question whether or not the formation of a labor party would constitute a progressive step.

At the present time the American workers are still tied to the two capitalist parties; they do not conceive of these parties as representing exclusively capitalist interests; they accept without question the idea that a capitalist party can also represent their interests.

## Labor and Political Action

A movement begins which, by and large, is clearly in the direction of separating the working class from the capitalist



parties. (For an analysis of that movement, see the article by Burnham and Shachtman in the August issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.) It is true that Labor's Non-Partisan League supports Democratic candidates; it is also true that the whole movement is exceedingly unclear in its aims; it cannot be denied that the trade union bureaucrats place obstacles in the way. But it is impossible to interpret recent developments in the labor movement in any other way except as an attempt by the workers to find a path which would lead them to their own working-class party.

Reasoning abstractly it is possible to admit the existence of such a movement for independent political action and to contend that it is our duty to turn it towards the revolutionary party, that is, to offer that party as the vehicle for the working masses to express their sentiments for independent political action. We take it for granted that revolutionary Marxists must attempt to channelize a vague and inchoate movement for independent political action such as we are confronted with at present. They must try to give it a definite organizational objective and that objective must be of a character which will appear reasonable and necessary to the workers. Under the circumstances, to present our party to the workers as the instrument which they should use to express their desire for independent political action would be a futile gesture. It would evoke no response from them whatsoever. This statement is made not only on the basis of a general knowledge of the present state of consciousness of the working masses but on the strength of the well-nigh unanimous testimony of all revolutionists active in the trade unions.

The only organizational aim which is understandable to the workers and which has a real chance to set them in motion, is the formation of a labor party. To insist upon counterposing our party to the Democratic and Republican parties means, under present conditions, to fail to use whatever influence we can wield in the labor movement for the purpose of strengthening the tendency towards independent political action. We are justified in asking the question of our opponents: do you prefer the present situation to a situation where the trade unions would have their own party? Of course it will be indignantly denied that a labor party is the only alternative to the present lack of any working-class party; it will be emphatically asserted that the revolutionary party is the logical alternative but emphasis and repetition do not alter the sad reality. It is not what we would like to have but the actual response of the workers that should determine our tactics.

## Scholastic Distinctions

A subtle distinction is made between the labor party movement and the crystallization of that movement into a labor party. The former is progressive, the latter reactionary. It is difficult to see how it is possible to separate the movement from its immediate and logical organizational objective. As I indicated before, without presenting to the workers a serious objective which appears feasible to them, the labor party movement ceases to have any significance. A movement for independent political action which has no organizational objective appearing realizable to the workers is bound to end in nothing at all. To say that the movement for a labor party is progressive while the actual organization of such a party is reactionary is equivalent to saying that the struggle of the Ethiopians is progressive while a victory would be reactionary. Schoolmen might be able to understand such reasoning but not ordinary workers.

Just as subtle a distinction is the one that is made between what is progressive for the workers and for the revolutionary party. It is an elementary principle of Marxism that every advance made by the working masses is an advance for the revolutionary party. Considering the vanguard as part of the class

and not as a group looking down upon the class with a condescending air, no other conclusion is possible. Carried to its logical conclusion such a distinction would mean to consider the proletarian revolution as the sole progressive step for us; everything else may be progressive for the masses but not for us. This would naturally lead us to the position of those sects that are satisfied with issuing an ultimatum to the capitalist class demanding its unconditional surrender and upon the failure of the unsympathetic capitalists to comply with the demand, retire to the class room.

The argument is advanced that a labor party could play a progressive role in the period of capitalist up-swing but not in a period of capitalist decline. And the reason for that is the fact that in the former period a labor party could gain concessions from the capitalist class but not so in the latter period. It is difficult to see why the possible achievements of a labor party should be taken as a criterion for its progressive character. Even a revolutionary movement is unable, in a period of capitalist decline, to gain as much for the workers as in a period when capitalism is making huge profits. This is not to say that a militant movement cannot gain more for the workers than a reformist one. It simply means that in the period of decline the working class must fight harder for less than in the period of capitalist up-swing. Not the possible achievements of a labor party but the mobilization of the workers as a class on the political arena, setting them into motion against the capitalist class, are the factors which should determine our attitude with reference to supporting the labor party movement.

## Formal Logic and Reality

But will not the labor party be reformist in character? Will it not support an imperialist war, and so forth and so on? Would such an argument deter us from actively participating in the organization of trade unions? Will not the bureaucrats of the trade unions be just as reformist, will they not support an imperialist war just as enthusiastically as the bureaucrats of the labor party? Yes, we know that there are differences between trade unions and a political party but any argument based on the future activities of a labor party is equally applicable to the trade unions. It is the general effect which the organization of trade unions has upon the working class that determines our attitude towards them. The same general rule should apply with reference to our attitude to a labor party.

How can we reconcile support of the labor party movement with the necessity of telling the workers that only a revolutionary overthrow of the present system can solve their problems? Must we not tell the workers the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Yes, we must. But those experienced in the field of propaganda for workers understand that it is impossible to go through the whole gamut of revolutionary Marxism on every occasion. What to say, how and when to say it are questions involved in the general problem of effective propaganda. To show that it is necessary for the trade unions to create their independent political party and at same time to guard against the illusion that the problems of the working class can be solved without a revolution led by a revolutionary party, requires great attention and skill. But once we are convinced that the labor party movement is progressive in character and that it is our task to develop and strengthen that movement, the difficulties, whatever they may be, are of secondary importance.

They are not confronted by difficulties who lead a secluded and cloistered existence. Those who want to intervene actively in the actual life of the labor movement must be prepared to face and solve many exceedingly difficult problems.

Albert GOLDMAN

## Notes On Contemporary India

CHARACTERISTIC of the last six months of Indian politics has been the discussions on tactics and methods of struggle carried on in the organ of the Congress Socialist Party, "*The Congress Socialist*". Here followers of M. N. Roy, Stalinist agents working in the I.N.C. and members of the Socialist Party (who enjoy referring to themselves as "revolutionary socialists") have all waged ideological war. Since the beginning of the year a "pause", apparently accompanied by intense intellectual and theoretical evaluating has set in.

In the interim, the I.N.C. (Indian Nationalist Congress—the Peoples' Front of India) has steadily veered to more and more reformist measures. It now has political sway in seven major provinces and its right-wing element, made up of good reformists, has found the fruits of political office much to its liking. Its intentions are clearly to indefinitely "coöperate peacefully" with the British brethren. Already there has grown up the typically bureaucratic machine and apparatus that come as part of the baggage of reformist politicians. "*The Congress Socialist*" significantly asks (July 2nd), "Why are nepotism and power politics so rampant in the Congress today?" And it goes on to point to all types of office corruption, while the C.S.P. executive committee adopts a formal resolution of protest against repressive actions on the part of Congress Ministries in breaking up strikes.

Indian socialists also point to increasing indifference among the masses—an obvious reaction to the "do-nothing" tactics of the I.N.C. leadership. "Why is there an ebb of the popular interest in party work? Why is there growing apathy among Congress workers?" The reason is that parliamentary constitutionalism has already run its course so far as the masses are concerned. Careerists of all types, eagerly seeking office and jobs have even gone so far as to raise communal (racial) issues within the I.N.C. This is particularly noticeable in contests for petty local posts.

The last congress of the I.N.C. was dominated by right-wingers who saw to it that the policy of office-acceptance and pacifism was adhered to. This was summarized by the election of Bose to the congress Presidency, in place of Nehru. The speeches of Bose are those of the petty-bourgeois democrat who skillfully and demagogically adapts himself to the audience at hand. All too often have we heard the same phrasemongery!

What of the working-class political tendencies in India? How has the year and more of democratic liberties affected them? What have they to say about the fast-approaching end of this temporary period of British concessions?

The Stalinists and their newly found

supporters—the followers of M. N. Roy—openly boast of their imperial attachments to "Mother England". In their official paper, "*Krant*" (National Front) they agitate the Indian masses to cling to the protective bosom of England so as not to fall into the clutches of the fascist countries. National unity must be preserved in order to strengthen the British Empire! Their demands are limited to . . . A Charter of Rights! As for Roy, the ex-revolutionist, suffice it to say that he endorses the Moscow Trials!

When the I.N.C. recently rejected a united front with the Muslim League (correctly described by the Congress Socialist Party as a "pro-imperialist, reactionary communal organization—and which, incidentally, has not hesitated to launch murderous fascist attacks upon Congress meetings"), the Indian Stalinists declared, "It is anti-national to attack a Congress-Muslim League Pact." This is the Oriental version of the "out-stretched" hand policy!

The Congress Socialist Party (C.S.P.) is unquestionably the only serious workers' political organization in all of India. Despite its many (and basic!) errors, it is deeply concerned about the task of removing England's throttle-hold on India. Yet what a confused and muddled picture it presents in its press! On the one hand, the editor of its paper, Asoka Mehta, writes simon-pure Stalinist articles which advocate collective-security with all the trimmings. This is contradicted by unsigned editorials which launch bitter attacks on collective-security and Stalinism. For example, "They (the Stalinists) expect us to shoulder bayonets in the defence of the British Empire!" . . . "The greatest blow for peace that we can therefore deliver is to strike for our national freedom, is to destroy the British Empire and not bolster it up in its hour of peril." . . . "The grave danger of the present Communist policy lies in the fact that by seeking to circumscribe and bridle the nationalist movement of the colonial peoples they will be led, step by step, to suppressing the movement." "It (collective security) is an attitude of compromise and capitulation. . . ." We can hardly believe that these editorials are written by the pro-Stalinist editor!

M. R. Masani, an important leader of the C.S.P., has contributed numerous articles indicative of serious thought on basic problems. He has rejected People's Frontism in theory only, unfortunately, for he still advocates remaining in the I.N.C. People's Front. His splendid article on the Moscow Trials which fully accepts the report of the Dewey Commission is worth quoting: He believes in the defense of the Soviet Union despite the fact that the "reign of terror is lowering the very ideal of socialism." "The grim truth is that the Soviet Union is in as great danger from within as without." "The heritage of the October Revolution belongs to the workers of the whole world. Let us not allow the present Soviet government to monopolize and dissipate that precious heritage." (June 18, 1938.)

The C.S.P. is a conglomeration of Stalinists, trade-union and peasant (Kisan) union bureaucrats, utopian socialists and a good proportion of genuine revolutionary socialists. There is as yet no organized, vociferous grouping which advocates the Marxist policy of demonstratively breaking away from the I.N.C. It can be safely predicted, however, that fissures and splits will develop within this Party as England prepares to put into effect its plan for an Indian Federation. In the international field, the C.S.P. is bound by the pacifism of the Congress which expresses itself in its most "racial" form by the demand for a "League of Peoples" instead of an imperialist League of Nations! While having no formal affiliations the C.S.P. is most friendly to the British I.L.P. and often reprints articles of Fenner Brockway, Reynolds, etc., with favorable comment.

\* \* \*

Last year (1937) was one of unparalleled activity for the Indian proletariat. A total of 647,801 workers were on strike, the largest number in India's history. 110,000 Bombay workers alone took part in a great general strike of jute workers while 91,000 textile workers in Ahmedabad, Cawnpore and Coimbatore went out. With a new and aggravated crisis threatening India; with the apparent inability of the present world trade slump to lift, the Indian workingclass is again threatening action. There is much talk of strike in the jute, textile, transportation and mining fields. The peasants are over-riding their leaders in parts of the country and seizing land from the landlords. The present widespread wave of communal rioting is partly a method of agitation against Hindu money-lenders and landlords; partly inspired by reactionary Muslim League bands. Both are expressions of intense class conflict. The masses of India still constitute a seething volcano of revolutionary discontent which needs only Marxist leadership to set off history's greatest revolution.

S. STANLEY

## Correspondence

New York City  
August 5, 1938

Editors,  
New International.  
Sirs,

In your latest number you have three articles whose continuity is very suggestive, so much so that I am minded to offer you my comment.

Two are Max Eastman's reply to James Burnham's criticism, and the latter's rebuttal of that reply; the third is John Dewey's criticism of Trotsky's moral position considered as a philosophic argument.

I think we must accept Dr. Dewey's criticism insofar as it applies specifically to that part of Mr. Trotsky's argument which

(Continued on page 286)

# BOOKS

## Save Capitalism First

**BUSINESS AND MODERN SOCIETY.** Edited by MALCOLM P. McNAIR and HOWARD T. LEWIS. 411 pp. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press. \$5.

**INDUSTRIAL PRICE POLICIES AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS.** By EDWIN G. NOURSE and HORACE B. DRURY. 314 pp. Washington, D. C. The Brookings Institution. \$2.50.

**SAVE AMERICA FIRST.** By JEROME FRANK. 432 pp. New York. Harper & Brothers. \$3.75.

These volumes are the latest brochures of those quacks who guarantee to extract from capitalism its "evils" without causing the slightest pain to the patient. Jerome Frank, once of A.A.A. and now of S.E.C., compounds a shotgun mixture: semantics plus "folklore of capitalism" plus economic isolation plus increasing doses of the New Deal. Brookings presents its famous nostrum, the "Brookings Thesis": bigger production and lower prices. The Harvard scholars make no general recommendation, but seem to think all will be well if the Federal budget is balanced, accounting practices are revised, and more attention paid by business men to "the human factor". Naturally, these doctors don't always agree. But it is remarkable how often they do. Thus Frank, on the left wing of the New Deal, agrees with Professor Slichter of Harvard and with the conservative Brookings Institution on the big-value-at-low-prices panacea. (Frank and Slichter add government spending as a shot in the arm.) All three books present business men as free agents, acting with almost complete liberty of individual choice. All three see the capitalist system as affected as much by psychological as by economic factors. Hence all three are addressed to business men, who are urged to make certain reforms in the system—in order to make bigger profits. This approach is to be expected. Most Americans with access to pen and printing press still believe it is possible to "save" capitalism, and to do it without recourse to anything as unpleasant as fascism. What the considerable body of Americans without access to print think about all this is another, and more difficult, question, the answer to which will be found in none of these weighty volumes.

### 1.

The fourteen members of the faculty of the Harvard Business School who contribute the essays in *Business and Modern Society* speak with the authority of high priests in the innermost temple of Mammon. The pretentious title is hardly justified: most of the articles are on a purely technical level, with only a side-bow to "society". But the point is that such a title was thought desirable, that even side-bows

are made. A few years ago these discussions of currency problems and cost accounting would have been served up without any sociological dressing. The depression has at least made business men—and their economists—aware that they function in a social milieu.

The opening paper, "Material Progress and Social Discontent", supplies the ideological thread on which the other essays are loosely strung. Its author is the Dean of the business school, Wallace B. Donham, who is also "George Fisher Baker Professor of Business Economics". As an intellectual performance, it is on the level of a high school valedictory address. But as an indication of the new strategy of the class Dean Donham speaks to and for, it is of the greatest interest. He strikes the note at once: "Nothing is clearer than that men cannot live by bread alone, still less by gold. There is no necessary or even probable correlation between material wealth and contentment. . . . Happiness for most of us is to be found only in a state of mind." Why does Donham utter these particular platitudes at this particular time? He suggests the answer when he writes: "The year 1929 may be taken as marking conveniently the end of a century of logics and of scientific revolutions dominated by systematic thinking." In 1929 American capitalism began to break down decisively. Since that year, it has become increasingly obvious that it can provide only unemployment and subhuman living standards for an ever-larger proportion of the nation's citizens. It is, of course, impossible for Donham to admit this. Although even in 1929, 42 per cent of American families had incomes below the "health and decency" minimum of \$1,500 a year, Donham insists: "Free income above necessities is in America widespread. . . ." But, since he cannot deny there is increasing social unrest, he is driven to the extraordinary conclusion that *despite material well-being*, "envy, fear, unhappiness, and class hatreds grip vast numbers of people". This paradox he can only explain by vague references to "human nature", a mysterious and perverse force. This belittling of material factors in favor of "psychology" runs all through the volume, which presents the ludicrous spectacle of a group of economists laboriously demonstrating the fallibility and irrelevance of the science they profess. "Economic devices," states Donham, "will not solve our social problems." The nine-year collapse of American capitalism is rationalized away as a moral, a spiritual, a psychological, an anything-but-economic crisis.

Donham's advice to his bourgeois clients is to rely less on material concessions in the future, and more on propaganda. So far, this is no more than a defensive manoeuvre, expressing itself chiefly in adver-

tising campaigns to "sell" business to the public. So far, Donham and his clients really believe their own rationalization: capitalism could still produce plenty for everybody—if only the spiritual crisis can be resolved! "The material opportunities offered by the new frontiers of science and industry are not in question," writes Donham. "These are unlimited. . . . The doubts are on the social side. . . . Can we rebuild social morale in time?" Donham is still vague as to how "social morale" may best be rebuilt. But as the frontiers he counts on turn out one after another to be illusions—first it was radio that was to "save" capitalism . . . then air transport . . . then electrical refrigeration . . . and most recently, air conditioning—it is not difficult to predict a more positive content to the Dean's speculations. "The ways of God will always pass human understanding," we read—and, a few lines down the page: "There is some reason to believe that the long hours and hard living which are the present lot of German workmen are in themselves a source of strength to Nazi Germany, because they have restored self-respect and comfort to great numbers who had lost these essentials." (The restoration of "self respect" via long hours and the "comfort" that grows out of "hard living" are mysteries that had better be left to Him whose ways pass all human understanding.) Later on, he becomes more specific: "A high material standard of living is itself a disorganizing factor. . . . In the problems encountered in establishing effective social morale, there is a clear distinction to be drawn between a well-integrated community, made up largely of people with narrow margins, and the modern industrial community, typical of America, where a large proportion of the people have the freedom of choice offered, for example, by the automobile." That is, the bourgeoisie can more easily maintain its rule ("establish effective social morale") if the masses have not been "spoiled" by too great material concessions. And what is desirable in any case becomes a downright necessity in a declining capitalist order which is unable to make such concessions. This is generally known as "fascism".

Donham and his clients are by no means ready to put it, even to themselves, as bluntly as that. They still boast of the high standard of living American capitalism has given the workers, they still preach the desirability of automobiles and radios for the masses. But there is an evident contradiction between such boasting and the contention that "happiness" and "social morale" don't depend on material goods. In Donham's essay, the bourgeois ideology of the past and of the future appear side by side, for the moment unconscious of their mutual exclusiveness. As American capitalism decays, this cultural lag will be overcome, and the contradiction will be resolved by sloughing off the antiquated ideology of materialism. Rationalism will yield to mysticism, scientific logic to spiritual values. The American standard of living will be soft-pedaled, and the "disor-

ganizing" effects of materialistic plenty will be emphasized. This essay is an attempt to prepare the ground for such a manœuvre. It indicates that the American business class is *beginning* to learn what the European bourgeoisie were forced to discover years ago: that the last line of capitalist defense is to shift the battle to non-materialistic terrain.

This note reappears in the other contributions to *Business and Modern Society*. An article on "Business Cycle Theories", by one of the editors, declares that the "driving force" behind the wild fluctuations of capitalist production is "furnished by mass psychology". . . . In an article entitled "The Effect of Direct Charges to Surplus on the Measurement of Income" we read: "The whole spirit of the business community is influenced by income figures, usually without any . . . realization that they are largely an expression of judgment." Thus even accounting practice, the basic capitalist logic, is viewed with corrosive scepticism. . . . Sumner H. Slichter, the leader of the "left-wing" group in the business school, advocates certain accounting changes because they "would help to stabilize the emotions, and, therefore, the expenditures of business managers". Not content with that, he goes on to suggest that consumption, and hence profits, depend on "the willingness of individuals to spend". In hard times, "business enterprises and their owners are probably less disposed than wage earners to spend their incomes promptly," he writes—as though the superior "willingness" of wage earners to spend were not due entirely to the simple fact that they must eat! . . . "Logics and Emotions in Marketing" analyzes the chain store-vs.-independent struggle as a clash of logic (chains) with emotion (independents). The retailers' fight for economic survival is actually characterized as "emotional social opposition", and the unionization drive of chain store employees is called "another stream of emotional antagonism". A strange and wonderful world is this which the faculty of the Harvard Business School inhabit, quite unlike the humdrum atmosphere of wages and money-making most of us know. . . . An article with the innocuous title, "Modern Price Regulation", turns out to be a plea for what is euphemistically called "national capitalism". "The fundamental trouble with capitalism in its older forms is that the rank and file of people cannot measure up to its requirements." (They are, it seems, "abominable managers" and also "incapable".) Hence the business men must extend their control over the State and bring about "a new expression of social justice".

## 2.

Four years ago the Brookings Institution, which is to bourgeois economics what the French Academy is to bourgeois art, published two exhaustive studies of American capitalism. The first, *America's Capacity to Produce*, established one basic, and,

considering the impeccable respectability of its source, startling fact: that in the boom year 1929, the American industrial plant was operating at less than 80% of capacity. The second, *America's Capacity to Consume*, established a complementary fact: that in 1929 only 20% of America's families had incomes of over \$3,000 a year, while 60% had less than \$2,000 and 40% less than \$1,500. Shocked by its own discoveries, the Institution set out to find a remedy—a respectable one, that is. This was announced in 1935 in a volume entitled *Income and Economic Progress*. Popularized by *Fortune* as "The Brookings Thesis", this is probably the most generally accepted solution for American capitalism's current difficulties. All right-thinking, forward-looking citizens, from the left wing of the New Deal to the "economic royalist", E. T. Weir (who helped finance the Brookings studies) agree on the Brookings Thesis as *The Way Out*. It is a simple enough formula: *Given*, an economy in which profits depend on sales and sales depend on mass purchasing power; and *Given*, huge and costly industrial plants with a high ratio of fixed capital, which make a great deal of money when operated above the "break-even" point (between 40% and 50% of capacity in steel, for example), and lose even larger amounts when operated below that point; *Then*, it is more profitable to sell more goods at lower prices than to sell less goods at higher prices. Twentieth century capitalism, in a word, must abandon the old "scarcity economics" and reorganize itself as an economy of abundance. That this "thesis" should be taken so seriously today is curious considering that it is little more than a restatement of the once-famous "New Era" theory developed by Waddill Catchings and W. T. Foster in the golden twenties. According to Messrs. Foster and Catchings, Coolidgean prosperity was to last forever, because of the increasingly wider distribution of purchasing power made possible by modern mass production. The investment banking house of Goldman, Sachs, which was unfortunate enough to number Mr. Catchings among its partners, all by itself furnished ample disproof of this theory in the 1929-32 collapse. The fatal flaw in the theory is that it assumes the indefinite existence of an economic frontier which will absorb profitably the ever greater profits realized by this ever greater production. How this frontier can be maintained so long as the masses fail to receive back in purchasing power at least as much as they produce as workers—an impossibility by definition under a profit system—this is a problem which neither *Fortune*, nor the New Deal, nor the Economic Royalists, nor the wise men of Brookings have yet been able to solve.\*

\*This is to say nothing of such comparatively minor problems as how to carry mechanization and rationalization much farther without causing a disastrous increase in technological unemployment. It is also worth noting that the best known exponents of the Brookings Thesis in industry have been able to exploit certain peculiar and limited economic "frontiers". Thus Ford was lucky enough to get in on the ground floor of the one remaining major frontier of twentieth century capitalism: the automobile. Now that this is closing, Ford is suffering just like any unenlightened industrialist.

*Industrial Price Policies and Economic Progress* is an attempt at a detailed exposition of the Brookings Thesis. The preceding volumes, the authors explain in their Introduction, were studies of how the economic system actually works—"no attempt was made to draw up a plan for some new kind of economic world". Here at last, then, is *How To Do It*. But something seems to have happened between the inception of the book and its execution. Nourse and Drury may have started out to make a blueprint of "some new kind of economic world", but what they have actually produced is a justification of the kind of economic world we have had for the last twenty years. They are at great pains to show, in a series of deodorized case histories, that since the War, the great monopolistic industries—excepting steel, whose price policies are too rank for even Brookings to whitewash—have reduced prices and increased production just as the Brookings Thesis requires. The question then naturally arises: if the Thesis is *The Way Out*, and if big business has been applying it since 1918, why did the hoops burst in 1929? In order to justify the ways of corporations to man, Nourse and Drury demolish the strongest argument in favor of their theory: that it has never been tried. To make it still more confusing, they have had to falsify the record in order to accomplish this. For it is a fact, despite all their special pleading, that their theory never has been adequately tried.

Their manœuvre, however, is not as insane as it sounds. It is perhaps no coincidence that their book presents a lengthy and detailed defense of the price policies of two monopolistic groups which are currently under indictment on Federal anti-trust charges: the oil companies and the Mellon aluminum trust. The Senate monopoly investigation, furthermore, is expected to concentrate on the price policies of big business. It would seem that the wise men of Brookings have chosen to sabotage their own theory in an effort to protect their patrons against Governmental action. They have made the supreme academic sacrifice. Business is business.\*

## 3.

Jerome Frank's *Save America First* is a showcase of ideas currently fashionable in liberal circles. There is a little of Thurman Arnold's anthropological whimsy, a lot of semantics (the book was originally to be called, *The Dictatorship of the Vocabulary*), and much New Deal philosophizing. Such a book, naturally, has greatly fluttered the liberal doves. "One of those exciting books that can shape the thinking of an epoch," declares John Chamberlain. "The most exciting volume of our day!" echoes Morris Ernst, while Stuart Chase contributes: "Exciting reading! It is the kind of book this age needs." *Save America First*, one gathers, is excit-

\*It is only fair to note that at least one section of this book is excellent: Appendix E, which is a reprint of an article on steel price policy published two years ago in *Fortune*. Of course, I may be prejudiced. I wrote it.



ing. So is a pack of firecrackers in action. But neither is very coherent, and neither gets anywhere in particular.

In nothing is *Save America First* a more typical product of contemporary American liberalism than in its extreme disorganization. Frank is a dilettante of ideas, toying with a number of bright-colored concepts without relating them and without getting below their surface. Insofar as he has a main theme, it is that America is a country big enough and rich enough and democratic enough to create and support within its borders a self-contained capitalist economy of abundance. (The reviewers have failed to mention the interesting similarity of this idea to the "America Self Contained" propaganda which Samuel Crowther has been putting out for years on behalf of the reactionary Chemical Foundation group.) He admits that living standards are still low and that the vast internal market is still largely potential, but he thinks all this may be remedied and the "profit system", as he delicately calls capitalism, may be "saved" if (1) we stop trading in good ideas with the rest of the world, thus freeing ourselves from the ruin now overhanging Europe; (2) business acts on the Brookings Thesis; (3) the New Deal extends its pump priming and business regulating activities still further.

That American capitalism is in any position today to get along without foreign markets would seem to be branded an illusion by the imperialistic Big Navy and Good Neighbor policies of that very New Deal which Frank so much admires. (He says not a word about these policies in his book.) But granting the point for the sake of argument, how is the new order to be brought to pass? Frank has nothing more concrete to offer than "a new spirit of coöperation" which "must be worked out in the form of concrete administrative devices . . . by which the several industries meet, and confer, and work with one another and the government on their price and production schedules. . . . When that is done, a spirit of coöperativeness will be the inevitable result. That spirit is indispensable if our civilization is to remain civilized." This is "the old crap" of N.R.A. all over again, and the sort of coöperation business will once more expect—and get—is the kind the lamb gives to the tiger when it doesn't struggle too violently.

Frank admits—how can he not?—that something went wrong with the N.R.A. experiment. But *this* time, he says hopefully, business must be educated *really* to coöperate. Since he does not recognize any necessary class conflict along economic lines, he can conceive of no reason for what he politely terms "the powerful minority" opposing the interests of The People except either ignorance or sheer perversity. Rejecting perversity as a general explanation, he concludes that capitalism has turned out badly so far because capitalists have never been informed as to their own best interests. His book is an attempt to educate them. Ignoring historical factors, he

naïvely trusts to the power of pure reason to change the world. "We should invite the younger business rulers . . . to throw off the shackles of thought habits which dominate many of their elders." One is reminded of the Utopian socialist, Robert Owen, who wasted so many years trying to persuade dukes and stockbrokers they would be better off in his coöperative commonwealth. But Owen at least had the excuse that he lived before Marx.

"Our business rulers," writes Frank, "for their own sake, must frankly face and help to solve the problems posed by the nature of our profit system as it is now constituted." That their European colleagues frankly faced and solved similar problems with fascism—this is irrelevant. "America," writes Frank, "is not Europe." A statement that is semantically meaningless. "For America, fascism is a lunatic program. . . . Business rulers will write themselves down absurdly stupid if they do not coöperate in finding better contrivances." But from the business man's viewpoint, fascism is by no means a "lunatic program", and if Frank wants to call industrialists like Ford and Weir "absurdly stupid" because they are using semi-fascist strong-arm squads and "citizens' committees" to smash unionism, he must explain how they come to be also the chief exponents of that "Brookings Thesis" he advocates. The same applies to those "evils" of capitalism he would eliminate by educating the bosses: they are "evils" only from the viewpoint of society as a whole; from the bosses' viewpoint, they are virtues. But, rejecting the class struggle, Frank can admit no such contradiction. "We are sacrificing ourselves to superstitions as absurd as witchcraft," he writes. But if unreformed capitalism were so palpably "stupid" and "absurd" *from the viewpoint of the rulers as well as of the ruled*, it would have ceased to exist many years ago. The Frank-Chase-Arnold approach is a frivolous underestimation of the problem.

Frank talks a lot about the necessity for cracking big words open and seeing what is inside them. Such words he calls "wousins". But there is one very small word he uses constantly which he should crack open some day for closer inspection: the word, "we"—as in "We must not let the Old Guard use verbal sleight of hand on us. . . . We must challenge their right. . . ." Who is this "we", precisely? It seems to stand vaguely for "society" or "the American people". But this is the most outrageous "wousin" of them all: there is no such entity as "the American people" or "society in general". There are social classes, occupational and regional groups, employers and employees, *etc.* But it would endanger Frank's whole conception to think concretely in terms of just what economic interests any given "we" represents.

As an ardent New Dealer, Frank is as anxious as any Republican to conceal the economic disintegration of American capitalism. His book contains no statistical data, no analysis of social and economic

forces in concrete terms. It does not even broach the crucial question: is American capitalism still growing or is it entering on a permanent decline? Instead, Frank gives us—psychology. The Dean of the Harvard Business School calls the depression "an emotional sickness", and Frank writes: "A depression in America is a mental, not an economic, phenomenon." Hoover talked about "restoring confidence"; Roosevelt said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself"; and Frank writes, "To stop the progress of the sickening cycle that leads to fascism and civil war, it is necessary that false fears be promptly eradicated." The motor force in capitalism he sees as—vanity: "Some of our business statesmen will never acquiesce in reform because to do so would involve a tacit admission that their predepression ways of running our economy were faulty. They feel that any such admission reflects on their judgment." In conservative thinking, this psychological approach to economic problems leads straight to fascism. In liberals like Frank, it paralyzes what powers of resistance they have.

Although he affects to dismiss Marxism as an exploded theory of no significance to "different" America, Frank nonetheless devotes considerable space to attacking it. His main criticisms are three: (1) it is "fatalistic" in charting the inevitable course of capitalism; (2) it exaggerates the rôle of economic factors in history; (3) Marx generalized about capitalism exclusively on the basis of English experience, and so his conclusions are invalid for America. The first point seems to me to have the most merit, but Frank pushes it to such extremes as to suggest he thinks of Marxism as a variety of religious mysticism. I can see little in his second point: such exaggerations are inescapable in any original theoretical thinking. (Frank also criticises Freud for "over-emphasizing" the rôle of sex.) It is laboring the obvious to point them out, and it is the height of unimaginative Philistinism to "reject" Marxism or Freudism on such grounds. As for (3), if Frank objects to Marx studying capitalism in the land of its classic development, he must also reject a great many medical discoveries made through experiments on guinea pigs: America is not Europe, and guinea pigs are not human beings. I suggest that these "reasons" for rejecting Marxism might more properly be called rationalizations, and that Frank's aversion to Marxism can be referred to nothing more complicated than the fact that Marxism threatens the present economic order, to which the liberal, for all his grumblings, is fundamentally loyal. In a period of crisis such as the present, this basic loyalty comes unmistakably to the surface. *Save America First* would have been a much bolder and more "radical" book had it been written ten years ago.

To Marxist "fatalism", Frank opposes the Accident Theory of History. "The central fact in human history," he writes, "is its unpredictability." Although he seems



unconscious of the fact, the main reason he finds history so unpredictable is that he locates its motive power not in geography, not in economics, not even in Hegelian "ideas", but in the actions of Great Men. If Sir Robert Peel, he argues, for personal reasons "we will never know", had not deserted the Tories and led the fight to repeal the Corn Laws, "England's significant move into free trade would not have been made". As though the rising English bourgeoisie would not have put through its basic program, Peel or no Peel! This childish parlor game of "If Napoleon had won at Waterloo . . .", which reduces history to a meaningless series of accidents, Frank seriously counterposes to the materialistic interpretation of history.

Why this great concern to demonstrate the accidental pattern of history? Why this anxiety to emphasize the fallibility of Marx and other social theorists? Why this insistence that history and economics are "arts" rather than "sciences"? It is possible that Frank has an uneasy consciousness that his panacea will not stand theoretical analysis, that the overwhelming weight of historical experience is against him. Hence he cries, with Henry Ford: "History is bunk!" And indeed, as conceived by such philistines, history *is* bunk.

Dwight MACDONALD

## World War By Stages

IF WAR COMES. By MAJOR R. ERNEST DUPUY and GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT, late Major, U.S. Army Intelligence Reserve. New York. Macmillan Co. 369 pp. \$2.50.

THE CAISSONS ROLL. By HANSON W. BALDWIN. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 323 pp. \$2.50.

EUROPE IN ARMS. By LIDDELL HART. New York. Random House. 287 pp. \$2.50.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC. By SUTHERLAND DENLINGER and LIEUT.-COM. CHARLES B. GARY, U.S.N.R. New York. Robert M. McBride and Co. 328 pp. \$3.00.

THE WORLD is trembling from war jitters. Tensely, it watches Germany where Hitler conducts the greatest peacetime military manœuvres since 1914. Will the Nazis march into Czechoslovakia? Or will Spain, China or the Siberian-Manchukuoan border furnish the "incident" setting aflame another imperialist holocaust? It is only certain that once the spark touches the powder, the whole barrel will explode. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse will ride again. How they will spread death, destruction, disease and famine is outlined in the above four military studies.

Tongue in cheek, Majors Dupuy and Eliot entitle their book, "If War Comes". Yet they present indisputable evidence that war between the Great Powers is only a matter of time and they write of America, "Let us recall that in 1808 we had an Embargo Act which was to keep us out of war; in 1812 we were involved in a major European struggle. In 1916 we elected a President because 'He Kept Us Out of War'; in 1917 we were involved in a major Euro-

pean struggle. On both those occasions, the United States was militarily weak. Today the nation is strong."

## The Totalitarian War Regime

"If War Comes" is an attempt to examine and coordinate the military lessons of the Spanish and Ethiopian campaigns. Since Major Dupuy was official U.S. Army observer in Spain, naturally his views reflect those of the American General Staff and merit attention. One could hardly expect a Marxist analysis, but the book has value in the sense that a Pinkerton report of strike-breaking technique has value to a trade unionist.

To the liberal and Stalinist school of pro-war mongering charlatans hiding under the cloak of "Democracy vs. Fascism", we recommend a careful reading of the U.S. Army views on the nature of the next war, politically speaking. "More stringent control of the civil population than ever conceived of previously—at least by democratic people—is involved," explain the Majors. "This control must reach out not only in commerce, industry and alimentation, but even into the most trivial of personal interests," they add. The press, the school, the church, the radio, the union movement; all of them must be properly used, according to the U.S. Army plans.

If "democratic" America faces this kind of totalitarian regime in war-time, what kind of regime will European workers be forced to accept? An even more detailed picture of America in war time is presented in "War in the Pacific", an outline of the coming Japanese-American War. Ludendorff's concept of a totalitarian war is now universally accepted. Hanson W. Baldwin, N. Y. *Times* military correspondent and author of "Caissons Roll", and Liddell Hart, in his latest military opus, "Europe in Arms", assent to this principle. A "Nation in Arms" or a "Nation at War" the militarists argue, but always it's the *whole* nation.

## Future Military Technics

From this arises a second pertinent question. Will war be waged by small, professional and highly mechanized armies, as Liddell Hart hopes, or by the huge conscript armies of the last world war? No sooner did the tragic experiences of the 1914-18 slaughter explode most pre-war theories than General Staffs began spinning fanciful rationalizations of strategy in wars to come. Crippled by the Versailles treaty, the German Reichswehr became a small, highly-skilled and professional army, developing new and mechanized equipment to displace that taken away in war loot by the Allies. Soon Van Seeckt, chief of staff, made a virtue of necessity, and the cult of a mechanized army with its one swift blow theory developed. Mussolini, dictator of a second-rate economic power, followed suit. The Air Force became the Alpha and Omega of the Italian military science. General Douhet, Italian air chief, obtained international notoriety

by his theory of "one quick blow from the air". Goering never tires of repeating this view, although it has been discredited by the Spanish experiences. Dupuy and Eliot debunk the new schools of military thought prevalent in Europe until Spain and China brought the militarists back down to earth. The majors appear to agree with Leon Trotsky's estimate, "the largest possible number of soldiers equipped in the highest attainable degree", will be the armies of tomorrow. (Trotsky's views on the coming world war are expounded in the summer issue of the "Yale Review". Many of his views on military developments coincide with those expressed in "If War Comes".)

But what of the death rays and other mysterious weapons vividly painted by British General Fuller? Will they not change the character of the next war? Dupuy and Eliot answer succinctly: (1) new explosives developed? There are none; (2) Death Rays? Nothing of the sort has been discovered; (3) New Gases? None; (4) Bacillus warfare? Difficult, many cures, and hurts both sides. The Second World War, militarily speaking, will thus begin where the last one left off. "It will be a nightmare of horror, with the roar of machines—man-controlled and man-devouring—the awful overtones of battle," declares Hanson W. Baldwin. Through the fog of acrimonious debate over the relative role of sea-power, man power, air-power and mechanized forces, it is clear that each country will use whatever military resources are available. The race for naval supremacy continues. Men are trained in legions. Even England plans universal conscription, as Chamberlain recently announced. The French have thousands of slightly used '75's, not the best artillery available, but certainly it should not be wasted, reason the French officers. For a survey of the military resources of the various nations, tables can be found in Hanson W. Baldwin's book, Liddell Hart's study, and the Dupuy-Eliot work.

## Comparative Military Forces

It is easy to understand why all the authors have an almost identical evaluation of the armies of the world. Dupuy-Eliot write frequently, "it can be assumed that the opposing General Staffs have thorough knowledge of the army," whether they speak of U.S.S.R., Germany, France, Britain, or Italy. A summary of the combined views includes: Britain, inadequately prepared, \$15,000,000,000 rearmament program being rushed, air-force and navy chief strength, strongest asset is huge resources of Empire; Germany, Reichswehr commands respect of all militarists, its mechanization not entirely up to date and reliable, as the march into Austria revealed, needs pork, rye, potatoes, gasoline, rubber and 18 other key raw materials including iron ore; Italy, quality of Italian army uncertain, air-force one of the best, needs oil, copper, rubber, nickel, coal, manganese, and tin, and imports 70 per

cent of these now. In both Germany and Italy the cost of the military program is crushing and sapping the entire economy. France is immersed in an internal crisis and a colonial crisis as the Morocco riots of 1937 showed. The French army is recognized as the best on the continent. Its Maginot line is impressive; it needs colonial troops because of lack of man-power. Japan's weaknesses and the gross exaggeration of her military might previous to the Sino-Japanese war are evident to all.

Of the U.S.S.R., Baldwin writes, "She is a colossus, but her transportation and industrial weaknesses, her somewhat shaky finances, and her top-heavy bureaucracy give her feet of clay." Yet he speaks highly of the air and tank corps, the finest in the world with the possible exception of America. And he significantly adds, "Perhaps the greatest of all her weapons is propaganda." Baldwin nowhere indicates belief in Stalin's charges against Marshal Tukhachevsky. Dupuy-Eliot are more specific. They advance the theory, widely-held, that differences of war strategy caused the split, that Tukhachevsky fought to the bitter end against Stalin's emasculation of the Red Army. Of course the Red Army lost "face" because of the purges. Recent border incidents with Japan, however, are again changing world opinion of the Red Army's powers.

Towering head and shoulders above all military machines stands America. "War in the Pacific," in particular, portrays the unparalleled resources of the United States. Under Roosevelt's paternalism the American Navy has seen its dream come true. Virtually unlimited are the finances for its program. American aircraft rates tops in the world. Nothing showed this more clearly than the British order for 400 war planes recently. Spain and China also gave evidence of the superiority of American aircraft used. The United States Army rapidly is obtaining the choicest equipment in the world. Semi-automatic rifles for mechanized divisions, tanks of proven worth, these and a thousand other articles not only give a hint of American power but are manifestations of its greatest source of strength—its gigantic industrial and agricultural empire secured by thousands of miles of ocean on either side. In a war where machines play a larger part, an army and its recruits accustomed to technical work, an army with ample supplies, a nation safe from the threat of destruction of industrial centers by enemy planes, a nation with gold and men and raw materials, this nation because of its dominance in world economy will be decisive in the second world war. And both the American Admiralty and the General Staff are chafing at the bit to perform their task for Roosevelt and Wall Street.

What are the probable line-ups of the war? Baldwin says, "The two great struggles in Europe which shape the destinies of the conflict are the essentially economic and psychological conflict between the 'unsatisfied' nations and the 'satisfied' nations,

and the essentially political fight between Communism and Fascism." It's a toss-up whether Hitler begins his dreaded Drang Nach Osten through Czechoslovakia for Soviet Ukraine, or whether imperialist antagonisms will first find the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis arrayed against London-Paris with Moscow and Washington quickly joining against the "Have Nots". Of course, none of the authors venture, nor does any sensible writer, to predict the exact line-ups. Who trusts Mussolini, or Stalin?

### Imperialism and Revolution

Why war? On this score the military writers see eye to eye. "Have Nots" vs. "Haves" Baldwin puts it. America must establish its hegemony over China if U.S. imperialism is to expand, Denlinger-Gary point out. That is why a Japanese-American war is inevitable, as long as capitalism is to remain the form of economy, they explain. For if war is a continuation of politics by other (*i.e.*, forcible) means, the time is past when diplomacy, trade agreements, League of Nations chicanery, and world conferences can minimize world imperialist antagonisms. Liddell Hart tearfully pleads with Chamberlain to use the Spanish civil war to assure British control of that peninsula. It is indispensable in a war with Italy over the Mediterranean, he argues. One might well call him the intelligent office boy of British imperialism. His book is a guide to defense of the British Empire.

How long can the Second World War last? The terrific cost of armaments and the greater destructive power of the military machines set in a stage of the decline of world imperialism, and the frightful prospect for both civilian and soldier indicate that it cannot be four years again. Mussolini gambles on a quick, annihilating war. Such a theory, he recently said, "corresponds to the conditions of Italy, which is rich in men of intelligence and daring more than in iron, gold and oil." Hitler sits on a powder keg of internal explosives. Even America, giant of world imperialism, totters from the blows of a social crisis. Yes, there undoubtedly will be a few swift blows. Then a return to trench warfare and again the economic forces will decide the fate of nations. All of Liddell Hart's pleas for modern "progressive" military theories ignore one simple fact, so strikingly brought out in the American Civil War. Robert Lee, Stonewall Jackson, *etc.* had the military genius, the better trained soldiers. But inevitably the superior economy of the North, growing capitalism, vanquished the dying slave economy of the South. So tomorrow, only the advanced economy of socialism, with its collective ownership and planning, has the possibility of surviving.

The Second World War will usher in another series of revolutions and colonial wars for independence. This is the nightmare haunting the General Staffs of the world. Baldwin often expresses his fear, and our hope, of that prospect. "It is cer-

tain only that the doctrine of Marx will influence Europe for generations; that the tincture of Communism will color the thought and sway the decisions of the continent for decades," Baldwin declares. He tells of the mutinies of the British fleet at Invergordon, the riots in Morocco, the growth of communism in the French fleet. Denlinger-Gary devote a special section to the problem of communism arising in the American fleet during war with Japan. The memory of the Kronstadt sailors looms in the minds of the Admiralties. Of course, Denlinger-Gary point out that the new Stalinist line removes danger on that point, but the burdens of war might cause "civil disturbances", and these spread to the fleet. Dupuy-Eliot speak of the "horror of civil war" as a possibility, after calmly relating how the butchery in the imperialist war will be carried out!

Czarist Russia was the weakest link in the chain of world imperialism during the first world war. Japan, as Trotsky has pointed out, occupies that position today. Many Balkan states still have remnants of feudalism in their agricultural economy. These can only erupt during a war. Poland faces the unenviable position of being only a battlefield, no matter which side she chooses. The civilian populations have the prospect only of terrible suffering from air-raids, from famines, and disease, while the flower of the proletariat dies on the battlefield. It is these prospects, inevitable today, that will plant the seeds of communism and world revolution among the toilers and the oppressed masses of the world.

B. J. WIDICK

### Correspondence

(Continued from page 281)

discusses the theoretical moral question of the interdependence of means and ends. It seems to me inescapable that the Marxian inflection of Hegelian idealism occupies an absolutist moral position, rather than one lending itself to the method of scientific experimentalism espoused by Dr. Dewey. Not that Mr. Trotsky does not have, it seems to me, a clear defense. The fact that, as Dr. Dewey points out, Mr. Trotsky deduces his means from Marxism is owing to Mr. Trotsky's intuitive faith in these means, corroborated by his intellectual investigations. The "logic" of Mr. Trotsky's position, which Dr. Dewey attacks, is the necessary form of his political and moral activity; for how is it possible for anyone to conceive the "objective consequences" of all possible "means" toward a given end such as "the liberation of mankind"? Even so, any verification of the immediate end would reveal elements tending both *toward* and *away from* the ultimate end. Can Dr. Dewey imagine an "objective" verification of means which is wholly and exclusively a "good", in that in every respect it tends to liberate all people, everywhere? I doubt if such a test of moral program can be invented.

But I have a point more relevant to the special contiguity of the three articles. It

must have occurred to more than one reader of Eastman's reply as well as Dr. Dewey's article that there is a conceivable tie-up between Dewey's criticism of Trotsky and Eastman's reply to Burnham. Let us take this angle in order to determine if Dewey is properly the apologist for such positions as Eastman's. Does not Eastman contend that Marxism is in fact a metaphysic, a mere fortuitous hybrid of materialism and Hegelianism? Of course, we observe Burnham conclusively proving by rebuttal that Eastman, in respect to his technical weapons, is a philosophic amateur, but it seems likely that he agrees in substance with Dewey and would stand behind him as against Trotsky and Burnham.

We must note the particular application of Dewey's criticism. In his penultimate paragraph he says: "I have no wish to go outside the theoretical question of the interdependence of means and ends but it is conceivable that the course actually taken by the revolution in the U.S.S.R. becomes more explicable when it is noted that means were deduced from a supposed scientific law instead of being searched for and adopted on the ground of their relation to the moral end of the liberation of mankind." Dr. Dewey's knowledge of theory entitles him to apply it or not apply it as he sees fit, but Eastman, without sound theoretical knowledge, is prompted to condemn out of an arbitrary intuition, a simple desire to express himself. However, his reply to Burnham is extremely valuable as a document, because in the manner in which he betrays his intellectual bankruptcy, his impotence as to any "means" relevant to the issues, he persuades as fully and irrevocably of the reality of his moral position as did recently the young man who sought the hotel's ledge before committing his own position to the mercies of the sidewalk below.

Did this young man not desire in moral theory precisely what Eastman desires? In effect, this desire is for a place, as the suicide said, "where one may think things out for himself". While, in the suicide's case, his desire for a moral refuge, where one may face his own problems frankly, was saturated with psychopathic intensity, in Eastman's case it is the popular liberalistic paranoia of, as Eastman says, "being in a position to do what comes into *your own head*, to act whether soon or late on *your own impulses*". Note how curiously the exact language suggests the other situation. Both, we feel, are private and not at all theoretical matters.

Of course, there is a social issue involved, for, in some sense, the problem is the problem of Everyman. Each of us may find himself in the same boat but the means of getting out, or even existing while still in, may be vastly differing. Eastman's special attitude has the confusion of a deliberate mental panic, a "healthy"—that is to say, operative—slowing down and retroaction of the moral activity through fear. In his reply, does Eastman do more than serve a sort of neurotic threat to his opponents? Generalized with the threat of the suicide to relatives, friends and passing pedestrians, it would read thus: "I want a place

to consider my own problems without possible fear of interruptions. I've confined my *problems* to thinking about *this problem*. Oppose me, and you are likely to regret it."

How truthful Mr. Eastman is when he says he is "bored"! Mr. Burnham must withdraw his scepticism. No doubt the ledge suicide was bored—and to death—with the extensive history of friends', relatives' and doctors' "interference" with his simple democratic desire "to think things out for himself". Mr. Eastman's attitude toward "interference" goes to prove, I daresay, the amplitude of the means which may be adopted by the individual sincerely desiring to retain his freedom to act for himself.

Yet unmistakably, in the defects of his equipment and in his injured, vaingloriously defiant tone, Eastman points to an abstract "ledge", a ledge over a moral abyss. How remote from the characters and purposes of Dewey, Trotsky and Burnham is the necessity for this little space, this space in which one may remain, it is true, a New Deal democratic liberal—this precious spot of air, sunlight and earth successfully orientated from fascism! I should not like to underrate Mr. Eastman, but I believe the rhetorical means by which he states this very-minimum demand of the advanced intellectual forms a confession from which it is almost impossible to retrieve his dignity.

Allow me to take this opportunity to say how stimulating and valuable I find THE NEW INTERNATIONAL; it is one of the very few magazines in the world consistently contributing in language and ideas to the sense of life.

Yours very truly,

Parker Tyler

Newark, N. J.

August 14, 1938

NEW INTERNATIONAL  
New York City

Gentlemen:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is to be congratulated for its willingness, unique among radical publications, to give space in a single issue to John Dewey and Max Eastman, leading non-Marxian thinkers.

This policy should be continued and expanded. Certainly the Trotskyite view has first claim to a thorough presentation in the only magazine where it can be thoroughly presented. Yet there must always be room for the best opposed philosophies: *first*, because they heighten and add clarity to Trotsky's position by showing what it is not; *second*, because their inclusion furthers an intelligent understanding by Trotskyite readers of these other standpoints, an understanding without which it is futile to hope to win over non-Marxists; *third*, the clash of opposing versions relieves the deadly dullness of sectarian periodicals; and *last*, their presence shows unmistakably that Trotskyites are not afraid to have their views criticized by the best thinkers, nor must they rely ultimately upon sup-

pression of all dissidence for the general acceptance. The only danger—that some followers might be convinced of the truth of these non-Marxian views—is really an advantage to conscientious editors; for it indicates either that Trotsky is mistaken in the question at issue, or that the editors have failed to present their position creditably. In the first case, the program or theory must be revised; in the other, the editors must bestir themselves.

A magazine which followed consistently this plan of presenting the best interpretations of the various philosophical approaches to the vital questions of the day, would surely succeed in making its influence felt far outside the small circle of the faithful.

With a liberal's best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

C. B.

#### Where to Buy THE NEW INTERNATIONAL NEW YORK CITY

MANHATTAN: Fourteenth St. at University Place, S.E.; at Broadway, S.E.; at Fourth Ave., S.W.; at Fourth Ave., N.E.; at Fourth Ave., S.E. (1 and 2); at Third Ave., S.W.; at Third Ave., N.W.; opp. Jefferson Theatre; at Second Ave., N.W.; at Sixth Ave., N.E.; Rand Book Store, 7 E. 15th St.; 12th St. and University Pl., N.E.; Candy Store, 75 Greenwich Ave.  
Forty-second St. at Fifth Ave., S.W.; at Sixth Ave., S.E.; at Sixth Ave., S.W.; at Seventh Ave., S.W.; opposite Sterns; 103 W. 44th St.; 46th St. and Broadway, S.E.; Times Bldg. Newsstand, 42nd St. and Broadway; Columbia University Book Store; Brentano's Book Store; N. Y. U. Book Store, 18 Washington Pl.; Store, 58 West 8th St.  
Essex and Delancey Sts.; Bookstore at Grand and Attorney Sts.; Candy Store, S.E. 9th St. and Second Ave.; Biederman's Book Store, 12th St. and Second Ave.; Wigerson, 146th St. and St. Nicholas Ave.; 110th St. and Columbus Ave.  
BRONX: Jerome Ave. and 170th St.; Jerome Ave. and 167th St. (opp. Loew's Theatre); Seaman, 206th St. and Bainbridge Ave.; Jerome and Burnside Aves.; 160th St. and Prospect Ave.; Allerton Ave. Station; Freeman Ave. and Southern Boulevard; 174th St. and Boston Road.  
BROOKLYN: Grand and Union Aves.; Havemeyer Ave. and South 4th St.; Marcy and Broadway; Pitkin and Douglas Aves.; Sutter and Pitkin Aves.

#### OUT OF TOWN

Modern Book Store, 509½ West 5th St., Los Angeles, Calif.  
S.W.P., 232 So. Broadway, Rm. 312, Music Arts Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.  
McDonald's Book Store, 65—8th St., San Francisco, Calif.  
Post Office News Co., 37 West Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.  
S.W.P., 160 No. Wells St., Rm. 308, Chicago, Ill.  
Ceshinsky's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St., Chicago, Ill.  
Randolph Book Store, 63 W. Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.  
R. Zettlemeier, 637 Hamilton St., Allentown, Pa.  
Andelman's, Tremont St. (opp. Hotel Bradford), Boston, Mass.  
Felix's, Massachusetts Ave. at Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass.  
Friendly Variety, Warren St. (Grove Hall), Roxbury, Mass.  
S.W.P., 54 Central Sq., Rm. 12, Lynn, Mass.  
Sam's Corner, Olympia Sq., Lynn, Mass.  
Labor Book Shop, 919 Marquette Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.  
S.W.P., 147 West 5th St., St. Paul, Minn.  
Shinder's, Sixth and Hennepin, Minneapolis, Minn.  
Kroman's, Fourth and Nicollet, Minneapolis, Minn.  
Foster Book Co., 410 Washington Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.  
The Book Nook, 24A Meremac, Clayton, Mo.  
Reitman's, cor. Broad and William Sts., Newark, N. J.  
Cor. 57th and Blackstone, Chicago, Ill.  
Cor. 12th and Kedzie, Chicago, Ill.  
1806 No. Franklin St., Philadelphia, Pa.  
Cor. 13th and Market Sts. (N.W.), Philadelphia, Pa.  
Cor. 11th and Market Sts. (N.W.), Philadelphia, Pa.  
40th St. and Girard Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.  
8th St. and Arch Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.  
Sam's Corner, Olympia Square, Lynn, Mass.  
Nick's, Wick St. and Commerce, Youngstown, Ohio.  
Universal News Co., 242 Broadway, San Diego, Calif.  
433 No. Clinton St., Rochester, N. Y.  
257 No. Clinton St., Rochester, N. Y.  
Cor. Cumberland and Clinton Sts., Rochester, N. Y.  
Cor. East Ave. and Chestnut St., Rochester, N. Y.  
S.E. cor. Main and Clinton Sts., Rochester, N. Y.  
S.W. cor. Main and South Ave., Rochester, N. Y.  
Nodelman's Newsstand, Church St., bet. Chapel and Center, New Haven, Conn.  
N. M. Jain, 21 Dalal St., Fort, Bombay, 1, India.

#### ABROAD

Modern Books, Ltd., 12 Church St., Cape Town, South Africa.  
Advance Book Shop, 10 Campbell St., Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.  
Mrs. M. Brodney, Bookstall, Trades Hall, Melbourne, Australia.  
Workers Party, Foster Lane, off Foster Street, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.  
Clapham Socialist Book, 79 Bedford, S.W. 4, London, England.  
W.I.N., 14A Chichester Rd., Paddington, W. 2, London, England.  
M. Johns, 7 Southark St., London, S.E. 1, England.  
E. Fitzroy, 45 Afghan Rd., Batters, S.W. 11, London, England.  
H. Cund, Book Shop, 1, St. Hilda St., Liverpool, England.  
T. Mercer, Book Shop, 52 Auldhouse Rd., Glasgow, C. 3 Scotland.  
c/o P.O. Box 2639, Johannesburg, South Africa.  
A. Sinclair, P.O. Box 38, So. Brisbane, Australia.  
N. Gibson, 288 Drummond St., Carlton, Melbourne, Australia.  
Pales. Press Co., 119 Allenby St., Tel-Aviv, Palestine.  
R.S.L., 18 Thistle St., Edinburgh, 2, Scotland.  
Leon Sapire, 33 Strathearn Mansions, Cr. Bree and Wanderers Sts., Johannesburg, South Africa.

# WHY NOT NOW?

Nine issues in the new series of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL have now appeared on the dot. Readers of our journal continue to express the highest regard for the calibre of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. As for instance:

"I should like to say how much I appreciate THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. It is the best theoretical journal I have come across . . . indispensable to anyone who wants to remain a good Marxist and Leninist in these trying times."

London, England.

R. T.

"Reading THE NEW INTERNATIONAL makes me feel that I am still a revolutionist. . . . THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is the greatest piece of revolutionary thinking on the market today. . . . I should like to present yearly subscriptions to many people of the labor movement whom I know and who I think should read it, but I am out of regular employment now for several years. . . ."

— Pennsylvania.

ANTHRACITE MINER.

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is of a very high standard, a journal greatly needed in these days, when so much reactionary political tactics are in the world."

Aberdeen, Scotland.

R. MAC.

"We congratulate you enthusiastically for the excellent material of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and your fine editorial endeavor."

Buenos Aires, Argentine.

N. C.

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is excellent and we have already translated articles therefrom."

Rosario, Argentina.

P. M.

"The July issue is unquestionably the best-balanced and most attractive issue yet. . . . The magazine gets better all the time."

St. Louis, Mo.

D. B.

"Trotsky's article in the June issue, 'Their Morals and Ours', was hailed on all sides as brilliant. Every line . . . punctuated by an extraordinary profundity of content. . . ."

Johannesburg, South Africa.

M. S.

And more, which tell clearly the need and importance of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for the cause of revolutionary socialism. But—we need your help to maintain and expand the magazine. The surest foundation for a labor publication is a large and growing list of subscribers. Our request and proposal is a simple one. **SUBSCRIBE NOW! TODAY!**

Send all checks and domestic and international money orders to

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

### OFF THE PRESS SOON

#### "AMERICA'S PERMANENT DEPRESSION"

A popular analysis of the nature of unemployment and a fighting program for the Unemployed

By Art Preis

Published by

THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 University Place

New York City

3c per single copy

2½c in bundles of 15 or more

ORDER NOW

#### TROTSKY'S ESSAY on "THEIR MORALS AND OURS" STILL AVAILABLE

For those who failed to obtain a copy of L. D. TROTSKY'S brilliant essay, THEIR MORALS AND OURS, published in the June, 1938 number of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, the management announces that copies are still available. The price for a single copy is 20 cents; in allotments of five or more, the rate is 14 cents per copy.

#### RUSSIAN OPPOSITION BULLETIN

featuring the "DEATH AGONY OF CAPITALISM AND THE TASKS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL"

Subscription: \$2.00 per year      Single Copy: 20 cents

Address:

RAE SPIEGEL, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

## FASCISM & BIG BUSINESS

By DANIEL GUERIN

A brilliant and thorough-going analysis of the evolution and strategy of fascism in Italy and Germany from the revolutionary Marxist viewpoint. The author stresses that it is not enough to understand fascism, but that appropriate means must be taken to combat it.

The volume will be edited by Dwight Macdonald who will supply special notes relating the emergence of fascism in Europe to events now taking place in America.

300 pages—Publication Date: About October 15th

Price on publication \$2.00—Advance orders \$1.25

ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

100 Fifth Avenue, New York

Abonniere "UNSER WORT", Organ der I.K.D.

(Deutsche Sektion der 4. Internationale).

12 Nummern—60 Amer. Cents Schreibe an

LABOR BOOK SHOP, 28 East 12th St., New York City,  
oder L. de Lee, Postbus 296, Antwerpen, Belgium.