

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

Barcelona and France

By Felix Morrow

W.P.A. and Armaments

By The Editors

•

**Leon Trotsky on
Karl Kautsky**

**Diego Rivera on
Haya de la Torre**

•

The Paradox of Australian Capitalism

By Stan Bollard

Zionism and the Arab Struggle

•

TWENTY CENTS

FEBRUARY 1939

At Home

THE January issue of the NEW INTERNATIONAL has stirred up, as expected, considerable discussion and controversy, to the mutual benefit, we hope, of all concerned and involved. Certainly it helped NEW INTERNATIONAL sales. Anticipating extra orders, 5,000 copies were printed, and indications are that the entire issue will be disposed of—the best results to date. It is now up to the magazine agents and friends of the NEW INTERNATIONAL to do their utmost to keep as many as possible of the new readers as regular readers. This can be done, or accomplished better, if the comrades and sympathizers will keep in touch steadily with those readers who obtained the magazine the first time with the January number.

* * *

This column has often indicated the great prestige the NEW INTERNATIONAL has in all foreign countries, as well as in the United States. This is reflected in the constantly increasing circulation of the publication in foreign countries. Nearly one thousand (1,000) copies are now sent abroad to the European countries, particularly England, Scotland, South Africa, Australia, Palestine, China, India, the South and Central American countries, Canada, and others. This is more than gratifying and demonstrates, too, the ever more solid basis and growth of the *Fourth International* organization, in which the NEW INTERNATIONAL plays a big and important part. However, problems and difficulties also arise therefrom for the magazine.

1. The NEW INTERNATIONAL is dependent for a good part of its revenue upon the foreign agents. With unstable economic and political conditions prevailing particularly in the foreign countries, these revenues can be cut off at a single moment. The magazine would be affected quite possibly to the point of actual suspension. Already some foreign agents and comrades write us that legal difficulties are arising. In one important instance even now, the magazine has to find its way into the country despite barriers. But in such circumstances, results are uncertain, generally meager, and revenue virtually ceases.

2. To have 1,000 English-reading foreign readers of the NEW INTERNATIONAL is, we repeat, indeed gratifying and important. But again, in several instances, economic circumstances—incredibly low wages, acute mass unemployment, etc.—make it utterly impossible for foreign readers to pay the American price of 20 cents per copy. What shall we do? Refuse to send the NEW INTERNATIONAL abroad because of their inability to pay 20 cents, and thus deprive our comrades and readers aboard of an important instrument of ideo-

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

Volume V February 1939 Number 2 (Whole No. 29)

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: 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c 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.....	35
Barcelona and France's Future, <i>by Felix Morrow</i>	38
Zionism and the Arab Struggle, <i>from The Spark</i>	41
Haya de la Torre and Democracy, <i>by Diego Rivera</i>	45
The German Left and Bolshevism, <i>by Walter Held</i>	46
Behind the Farmers' Vote, <i>by David Cowles</i>	49
Karl Kautsky, <i>by Leon Trotsky</i>	50
Is Austria a Nation? <i>by Charles Crompton</i>	51
A Letter and Some Notes, <i>by Victor Serge and The Editors</i>	53
Reading from Left to Right, <i>by Dwight Macdonald</i>	55
Chronicle of the French General Strike, <i>by C. M.</i>	57
The Paradox of Australian Capitalism, <i>by Stan. Bollard</i>	58
Correspondence	60
Will India Accept Federation? <i>by S. Stanley</i>	61

Inside Front Cover: At Home

logical clarification and development, and in their own struggle against social-democratic, Stalinist, capitalist, fascist movements? Incredible, unthinkable, of course, on our part. The magazines are sent, wherever agents place bundle orders. The NEW INTERNATIONAL bundle rate is reduced in those cases to meet, so far as possible, the economic position of the foreign agents and comrades. For instance: in Scotland, Palestine, India, and other countries. These bundles are sent at a very heavy loss to the NEW INTERNATIONAL. But they must and will be sent, so long as we are able to do so. (But, hark, we now begin to need the assistance of the magazine readers in the United States.)

3. Furthermore, for identical reasons given for sending bundles at heavily reduced rates to several foreign countries, the review is sent free to two hundred (200) individuals in the Latin-American countries (particularly Argentine, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, Mexico, Panama, Porto Rico, Cuba); China, India, Japan, Holland, Belgium, etc., and especially to France and Belgium, where there are large numbers of foreign revolutionary emigres (Germans, Italians, Czechs, Austrians and others) who read English and literally implore us to be sure to send the NEW INTERNATIONAL to them since they must have it for their own knowledge, information and work.

All the foregoing speaks for itself, and we know that our comrades and readers endorse these actions of ours. But, too, sending such quantities of magazines to

foreign countries, represents a very heavy postage cost to the magazine, many times higher than the cost of mailing the magazines throughout the United States. This is because in this country the magazine is sent at second-class rates, whereas publications are sent abroad at the much higher third-class rate of postage. But, hence, our readers are now more clearly aware that several hundred copies of the review are sent abroad which can be said to represent a subsidy or contribution of the NEW INTERNATIONAL to the revolutionary movements abroad. This has meant a heavy financial drain on the magazine, though borne willingly; but now we feel it is our right and duty to call upon our readers to give us aid in order that we can continue to give aid abroad in the manner outlined above, and even to increase our assistance. YOU, S.W.P. branches Y.P.S.L. units, individual comrades, sympathizers and readers, CAN HELP NOW AND REGULARLY. HOW?

1. *Party and Y.P.S.L. Units:* Hold entertainments, affairs, for the benefit of the NEW INTERNATIONAL Sustaining Fund.

2. *Readers and Sympathizers:* SEND A DONATION and make a regular PLEDGE to the NEW INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINING FUND. DO THIS TODAY!

3. *Party and Y.P.S.L. Units:* Pay for your bundle orders promptly. Bundle payments and subscriptions represent almost the entire revenue of the magazine at present. DO NOT DELAY BUNDLE ORDER PAYMENTS.

4. EVERYBODY !!

Party and Y.P.S.L. Units: Organize subscription campaigns. It is easy to obtain subscriptions for the NEW INTERNATIONAL if only the Party and Youth comrades will proceed systematically to call upon and talk to contacts, sympathizers of our movement, and readers of the magazine who today just purchase their copy each month. GET SUBSCRIPTIONS!

Readers of the NEW INTERNATIONAL: SUBSCRIBE! And get your friends to read and subscribe!

Proceed to carry out the foregoing requests, and the Management and Editorial Board promise the continuation of an acknowledged magazine of quality, and, we hope and aim, a bigger one.

* * *

NEW ORDERS

Jersey City, N. J., Mike G., agent, five copies. Johannesburg, South Africa, J. M., agent, 24 copies. (Three agents in Johannesburg—J. M., M. S., and L. S. now dispose of 90 copies among them.) Paterson, N. J., Eddie C., agent, 5 copies. New Brunswick, N. J., 5 copies.

INCREASES IN BUNDLES

Detroit, Mich., E. Panicali, agent, from 40 to 50 copies: a promise and an achievement made good on schedule. "N. I. is selling better and better each month." San Francisco, Cal., from 50 to 60 copies. Relations between Local San Francisco and the NEW INTERNATIONAL now straightened out. New Literature Com. consisting of A.S., Glen Trimble and E. B. Expect to go places! Fresno, Cal., new agent, Eugene Mc., from 5 to 10 copies. "N.I. is good. Keep it up," Fresno writes. O.K.—You keep on increasing too. Toledo, Ohio, Doris Cooper, agent, from 10 to 15 copies. Toledo now in better shape than at any previous period. Houston, Texas, K.H., agent, from 4 to 8 copies; placing magazine also on newsstands. New Haven, Conn., Morris Gandelman, agent, took additional 10 copies of December issue; permanent increase not yet decided upon. Cape Town, South Africa, Paul Koston, agent, from 45 to 55 copies. H.M. van G., Cape Town also disposes of 12 copies. B. Palley, Sydney, Australia, from 20 to 30 copies.

In good standing: San Diego, Cal., Portland, Ore.: came through on schedule and agents H.A.B. and H.M. expect steady forward movement. Reading, Pa., also in good standing now; agent, V. Pettinato, has been ill; says at least small bundle will be regularly disposed of. BUT: Some large cities are definitely in danger of having their bundles cut off unless payments are forthcoming by the time this issue goes to press. We withhold names this time, awaiting and meanwhile expecting results—i.e., payments.

THE MANAGER.

The Editor's Comment

THE DRIVE AGAINST THE UNEMPLOYED IS BEGUN BY ROOSEVELT THE WEEK AFTER THE ELECTIONS — HOW ROOSEVELT TRICKS THE MASSES INTO PUTTING THE BLAME SOLELY ON CONGRESS — WHAT THE NEW RELIEF PROGRAM MEANS — THE BUDGET PROPOSES A BILLION MORE FOR WAR AND A BILLION LESS FOR RELIEF — BROWDER LEADS IN THE APPLAUSE

PSYCHOLOGISTS HAVE explained to us how the old explanation for sleight-of-hand, that "the quickness of the hand deceives the eye", is in error. What actually happens is that through misleading words, gestures and actions the magician distracts our attention and is able to carry out his wizardry unobserved. He plays upon the "mental sets", the habitual response patterns of his audience in order to direct mind and eyes away from the coin or card or rabbit. This is why small children and idiots often see through the tricks: their mental sets are not hardened, their responses are not arranged in conventional patterns, and the magician has consequently nothing to exploit. They keep watching the card instead of the wand, and see it dropped into the pocket or shoved up a sleeve.

Perhaps it would be a good thing if we could all be again as little children while watching the smiling magician of the White House. Then we might be stupid enough to understand that the government, at the order of the bankers and the industrialists, is smashing relief and throwing the unemployed on the streets; and that he, Roosevelt in person, is the responsible head of the government and in charge of the act. But, like the intelligent adults that most of us are, we eagerly permit our wizard to capture our attention with a little bombast over Nazi persecutions, some mealy mouthed trash about religion, democracy and international law, and a spot of shadow-boxing with Congressional Committees. Meanwhile the rabbit slips down the trap door.

It doesn't take any complicated "theory of the state" to prove that Roosevelt himself is leading the drive against the unemployed. Facts and figures can in this instance speak for themselves. The W.P.A. rolls, by one of those happy coincidences that make New Dealers so angry when you mention them, reached an all-time high the week of the November elections: between 3,350,000 and 3,400,000. The week following the elections layoffs began, at a rate averaging around 40,000 a week. By the time Congress opened, the rolls stood at just over 3,000,000—a drop of approximately 350,000.

But this decrease was counter-balanced by a corresponding increase of unemployment in private industry? Not at all: in fact, the general employment situation grew distinctly worse during the same period. Industrial employment remained about the same. However, youths in this country reach employable age at the rate of about 50,000 per month. At the same time, unemployed or part-time employed workers who had accumulated a few resources during the years 1934-37 were reaching the end of their economic rope at at least the same rate. The actual cut engineered during November and December against the unemployed as a whole therefore should be figured at well over 500,000.

Still more should be noticed. The W.P.A. outlay during the last period has come to between \$61 and \$62 per worker. Sub-

tracting administrative and material costs leaves an average W.P.A. wage of no more than \$52.50 per month, and probably less. This is the princely sum out of which the unemployed worker and his family are expected to provide for themselves rent, fuel, food, clothing, medical care. The Department of Labor calculates the minimum *subsistence* wage at about \$123 per month.

From November 8th to January 3rd, election day to the opening of Congress, the story is thus one of a slashing drive against the unemployed, a deep cut in the W.P.A. rolls, and the maintenance of those retained on the rolls at a sub-human level of existence.

What vicious Tory clique, what reactionary Democratic-Republican bloc put over this drive? During the period, Congress was not in session. The relief appropriation had been passed by the last Congress in such a way that there was no legal restriction on the rate at which it could be expended at the order of the Executive; the entire amount could legally have been spent by the time that Congress would have opened and been in a position to make a new appropriation. Sole and absolute power and responsibility for this drive against the unemployed belongs to Franklin Roosevelt. His orders brought it about; his orders could have stopped it. That is the plain and literal fact.

Dust in the Eyes of the Unwary

THE DRIVE AGAINST the unemployed begun during the last two months of 1938 was, of course, only a starter. Wall Street, the Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, all the leading capitalist papers, continued howling for far sharper blows. The members of the Government, Executive and Legislative alike, Democrats and Republicans, Old Dealers and New Dealers, faced at the New Year a *common* task, dictated by their Wall Street masters: to batter down further the relief rolls and standards. They have proceeded to carry out this task through a remarkably effective division of labor. Congress is to make the direct frontal attack. Roosevelt, through a series of demagogic flank maneuvers, paralyzes all genuine resistance.

This is how it works. In his annual message and budget message Roosevelt told Congress that under the Constitution it was the responsibility for making appropriations, and Congress would therefore have to make up its own mind about how much should be allotted to relief. By this Pontius Pilate act, Roosevelt aimed to deflect away from himself all popular resentment against the relief cuts which he had *already* inaugurated on a huge scale and those even vaster cuts scheduled for the future. Even more than this, he aimed to jockey himself into a position where he, the main culprit, could seem to assume leadership in the popular movement against the cuts. Any battle is won in advance if one

can put one's own general at the head of the opposing army.

Budgeted relief funds were to be exhausted by the first week of February. In a special relief message, Roosevelt suggested a deficiency appropriation of \$875,000,000 to cover the five last months of the fiscal year. This sum, far from maintaining W.P.A. rolls and wages at their current utterly inadequate level, according to the government's own figures envisaged a progressive reduction of the rolls to a maximum of 2,650,000 by the end of June: that is, a further reduction of 370,000 in addition to the 350,000 reduction achieved in November and December. In point of fact, Roosevelt's plan was to make the cut even deeper, as is proved by his statement in the relief message that \$125,000,000 of the \$875,000,000 could very likely be held over against the new fiscal year, thus leaving only \$750,000,000 for the months up to June 3th.

The House of Representatives, acting on the relief message, simply wrote into law what the relief message suggested. Its lopping off of \$150,000,000, bringing the deficiency appropriation down to \$725,000,000, subtracted only \$25,000,000 from what Roosevelt had himself said would be sufficient. In the typical cowardly manner of the legislative harlots of capitalism, the House acted on the bill while sitting as a "Committee of the Whole": a parliamentary move which dispenses with a roll-call vote and thereby gets the Congressmen out of the awkward need of having their names recorded on the measure. After sustaining the lower figure overwhelmingly, the bill passed the House with a negative vote of exactly 16.

The figure of \$725,000,000 means, when translated, that the W.P.A. rolls will have to be reduced progressively until they reach a maximum of 1,950,000 at the end of June—a drop of more than 1,000,000. The amendments currently being debated in the Senate do not alter the end result. By prohibiting a cut of more than 5% before April 1st they merely require a more rapid rate of cut thereafter.

How Not to Fight

IN SPITE OF THE trivial concessions forced from the Senate by the threat of mass protest and the complaints of Governors and Mayors with deflated treasuries, the Roosevelt maneuver has up to the present succeeded. He has shunted aside the opposition to the relief cuts and smothered any positive movement for a real improvement in the workers' condition. John L. Lewis and the Workers' Alliance had timidly proposed a billion dollar deficiency appropriation; Mayor La Guardia made it 915,000,000. Neither of these miserable sums comes within shooting distance of answering the needs of the unemployed. But, miserable as they were, as soon as the sham battle between Roosevelt and the Congress began, Lewis, Lasser and La Guardia immediately forgot about them. Their plea became only: stand by the President and his \$875,000,000; in other words, support the firing of at least 370,000 men and the maintenance of starvation wages for the rest.

Lewis and Lasser and La Guardia could not do otherwise. They have no *independent* politics. Their serious politics is support of Roosevelt and his New Deal. But since on the issue they now confront the conflict between the New Deal and the Tories is only a conflict over ways and means for putting across the drive against the unemployed, since all sectors of capitalist politics are committed to the drive against the unemployed in one form or another, Lewis and Lasser and La Guardia can in a showdown only go along with Roosevelt. That is, they can only collaborate with Roosevelt in *his* manner of *smashing* the unemployed; their function becomes that of persuading the workers to accept passively the lowering standards.

The fuller outcome of such a course already shows on the horizon. Roosevelt's—Roosevelt's, mind you—budget message for the next fiscal year proposes a total relief appropriation of *one billion dollars less* than this year's, immeasurably disastrous as

this year's is proving to be from the point of view of the unemployed.

How can the unemployed stop the drive against them? More generally—for unemployment is a problem for the entire working class employed and unemployed alike—how can the workers fight effectively for jobs at decent wages? This brief survey is enough to make at least one pre-requisite irrefutably clear: they must break away from Roosevelt and New Dealism, and conduct their own independent fight on their own independent program. Today the struggle cannot even get started precisely because the workers permit the Lewises and Greens and Lassers and La Guardias to keep them tied to Roosevelt and the New Deal. But it is Roosevelt who is the cleverest leader in the drive *against* the unemployed. Going along with Roosevelt in any way at all means accepting without a murmur the 350,000 cut of November and December, Roosevelt's 370,000 cut between now and June, the starvation average wage of \$52.50 a month, and the 1,000,000,000 cut for next year. Going along with Roosevelt means putting the enemy commander at the head of our own army.

The workers can struggle against the cuts, and fight for jobs and decent wages, only by conducting labor's own fight with labor's own weapons on both the economic and political fields. As soon as this is realized, it will no longer be a question of pleading tearfully with the White House or Colonel Harrington over a paltry \$25,000,000. Then the workers can stand up and say with their own voice what they need: W.P.A. jobs for *all* unemployed at trade union wages; an over-all weekly minimum wage of \$30 and maximum work week of 30 hours throughout industry and public works and relief work; a \$20,000,000,000 immediate public works program, at least half of it for low rental housing; throwing open of all factories that the owners refuse to operate, to run under workers' control with the aid of government subsidies; expropriation under workers' control of all industries, like the railroads, that can't or won't provide jobs and needed goods and services under private management.

When, and not until when, labor begins to speak in its own voice and its own language, Congress and the President will on their side begin to listen.

The New New Deal

THE PRESENT DRIVE against the unemployed, which will soon be accompanied by the attempt to amend the Wagner Act in the interests of the bosses and to lift the "restrictions on business", marks the fact that the Old New Deal has ended and the New New Deal has begun. But these are only the negative side of the new New Deal. The positive side is the open and large scale preparation for the war. The two sides are inseparably bound together.

The old New Deal, as a set of internal social measures, though it squeezed through a temporary emergency, failed in the long run, as any scheme framed within capitalism had to fail, to provide a solution. The next step, inescapable if the life of United States capitalism is to be preserved, is to try the external measure, to try war. The present phase is that of concentrated preparation—military, economic, political and psychological—for the war.

There is nothing accidental or unforeseen here. Roosevelt seems to have realized himself from the beginning that war would have to be the outcome. His Chicago speech (October, 1937) made the realization public. A year ago ("Roosevelt Faces the Future", NEW INTERNATIONAL, February 1938) we wrote of him: "his course is deliberately and consciously set toward war, and toward the creation of the most favorable circumstances for the conduct of the war. There is no other way to understand his policy." Only a few weeks after that the Vinson naval expansion bill was introduced in Congress, and passed.

Hardly anyone seems to grasp how far Roosevelt's preparations for the war have already advanced. Week by week all last

year they were pushed steadily forward. Hundreds of millions were poured into the military machine. The "census of industry" was completed by the War Department, plans for the coördination of industrial plants drawn up, and the first "practice orders" distributed to key factories. Insolent and provocative notes and speeches continued to issue from the State Department. During the Munich crisis, Roosevelt entered at the zero hour in a manner to make the world feel the weight of the United States' authority.

Month by month the rope of United States imperialism was drawn tighter around Latin America, all of which the government regards as its strategic base in the coming struggle against the rival imperialisms. The routes of Pan American Airways bind together the two continents. New subsidies were given to the shipping lines. In spite of all the scareheads about totalitarian propaganda, radio broadcasts to Latin America from the United States now exceed those of all European countries combined. United States trade with the Latin American nations is more than twice as great as that of its nearest rival. Batista, blood-stained butcher of the Cuban workers, was feted in Washington.

The Lima Conference reached a new high in cynical imperialist diplomacy. The fundamental class identity between the Democratic and Republican parties, the final ironic comment on the Popular Frontist conception of the battle between "progress and reaction", was displayed by the appearance of Alfred Landon as the chief delegate next to the Secretary of State. The Conference "to defend democracy" met in the same hall from which Benevides, dictator of Peru, had two years earlier ousted his Congress after declaring the elections which had unseated him null and void. Hull promised the seventeen Latin American dictators the support of the long arm of the United States in return for acceptance of the United States war policy.

Not a day has passed since Munich without columns of copy being sent to the press from the publicity agents attached to the War and Navy Departments. The horror at the Nazi persecutions was shamelessly twisted into the service of the war ideology, without a single move to aid the refugees. A regular Army officer was appointed head of the W.P.A., and a bill introduced for the full militarization of the C.C.C.—already staffed by the Army. Newspapers and magazines fill their pages with long illustrated articles on "defense needs". Hundreds of movie houses are already ending performances with pictures of the flag while the Star Spangled Banner is played, the audience rising and singing—and woe to the man who remains seated. Hollywood has already launched a new production schedule in line with the war ideology. The fantastic spy trials in New York and Panama are used as forums for chauvinist declamation.

At the last meeting of its Central Committee, the Communist Party came altogether into the open in support of super-armaments and national defense. The *New Leader*, organ of the Social-Democratic Federation does exactly the same, and calls for the holy war against the dictatorships. The Keep America out of War Committee, sponsored by the Socialist Party and the Lovestone group, in its latest public release, likewise accepts armaments—begging merely that they be used "for defense purposes". Even the magazine *Time* found occasion a few weeks ago to comment on how the Stalinists and the pacifist organizations have swung over to the war.

Roosevelt's annual message to Congress was simply a rabid exercise in war-mongering. He, who for five years, in direct and almost flagrant contrast to the time-honored tradition of American presidents and presidential candidates, scarcely even mentioned God or the Bible in any public address, made "religion", along with democracy and international law, one of the three interlocked causes for which the nation is getting ready to fight: in this way aiming to cut off any possible opposition to his program from the churches. He is rewarded by the applause of the ministers and priests of all faiths.

Roosevelt's budget message envisages the staggering total for

the next fiscal year of more than two billion dollars in military and semi-military expenditures, \$1,300,000,000 for the regular budgets of the War and Navy Departments, and the remainder in special appropriations. This is a billion dollars more than the budget for the current year. A billion dollars more for armaments, a billion less for relief! Here is the new New Deal in a nutshell.

Airplanes and W. P. A.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN Roosevelt's drive against the unemployed and his war program, the two sides of the new New Deal, is not obscure. The proposed budget put it blatantly enough: a billion lopped off relief and a billion added to armaments. But more than this is involved.

We are not at this time going to analyze again the nature of Roosevelt's coming war. Enough to recall that it is a war of outright imperialist aggression; far from solving any of the deep economic and social problems of the masses, it will exaggerate those problems at the same time that it massacres its millions. We wish here to make another point: We stated above that resistance to the drive against the unemployed, the fight for jobs and decent wages, can be accomplished only by breaking wholly with Roosevelt and the New Deal, only by the independent labor struggle against Roosevelt and the New Deal as well as against the Republicans and the Old Deal. But this applies with equal force to *both* sides of the new New Deal. To suppose that Roosevelt can be fought on the field of unemployment and at the same time supported in his war program is a fatal illusion. The war program is the crux and heart of the new New Deal.

We confront the same choice here as the workers of England and France. In all the great powers today the question of the war is the axis around which all other questions revolve. In England the Labor Party cannot carry through a program for internal social demands in the interests of the masses because the Labor Party supports the coming war of British imperialism as fully, in its own way, as does the Conservative Party. Similarly in France: the Socialist and Communist parties cannot resist the internal drive against the economic and social position of the French workers because those parties, in their own way, support the war as wholly as does Daladier.

So too in the United States. We cannot fight for jobs and decent wages without an independent struggle against the new New Deal; and we cannot conduct an independent struggle against the new New Deal without fighting first and foremost against its core, against the armaments and the war program. The perspective summed up briefly in the slogan, "All war funds to the unemployed", is the required first plank in any platform that has any chance of getting anywhere in meeting the needs of the unemployed.

You can't fight at one and the same time on two sides of the same war. The war of the workers, employed and unemployed, is the war *against* Roosevelt's war. To get jobs and decent wages means to take away Roosevelt's airplanes and machine guns. If we don't learn this today, bullets will teach us tomorrow.

Browder Warms Up His Recruiting

WHEN, MANY YEARS AGO, we pointed out that the policies of Stalinism were leading toward social-patriotism, toward support of the next imperialist war, we were, naturally, believed by only a few. The analysis seemed fantastic, incredible. How could even Stalin turn the Communist International, founded in the struggle against imperialist war, into its very opposite, into an instrument to serve imperialist war? How could a movement which was continuing on all occasions to protest its eternal opposition to the war be preparing to go over to the war? But it was not understood that the Communist International was no longer Lenin's revolutionary center but only a docile tool of the Kremlin's foreign

office, nor that the gap between word and deed had become a permanent feature of Stalinism.

In those years we were not believed. Today, however, the truly astounding response of the Communist Party to Roosevelt's war message comes as so natural a sequence of its course during the past years that it passes by hardly noticed. Nevertheless, this response is a new stage in the bottomless degeneration of American Stalinism, and should be marked accordingly.

Until this month, the support given by Browder and his gang to Roosevelt's coming war has always been larded with one particular element of hypocrisy which is now outworn, and dropped. Browder has always allowed his advocacy of "collective security" to be given an ambiguous interpretation: when pressed as to how collective security would be "implemented", Browder has replied that this should be done by "concerted economic actions of the democratic powers"—trade and financial boycotts of "aggressors", economic aid to the persecuted nations. The interpretation was, of course, always a sham; but it served the purpose of enabling the implicit doctrine behind collective security to worm its way into the minds of pacifists, and gave Stalinist speakers an out when they were accused of war-mongering.

Today, in the tightening crisis, that particular ambiguity is too much of a luxury. It has to be discarded here, as it was two years ago in France. Two weeks after Roosevelt's message, Browder participated in a radio debate on the Town Hall of the Air program. His speech, printed in the *Daily Worker* of January 20th, concluded as follows:

When foreign fascist powers cease to menace their neighbors with aggression, when our native fascists cease to undermine all democratic faith and pledge themselves to democracy, then we can say of fascist propaganda that it is no more a menace. But until that happens the American public will recognize the typical fascist foreign propaganda that really menaces America by one sign: it is always excited about a mythical menace of communism and denies those dangers which are forcing our country, *for the first time with such unanimous popular support that even includes the communists*, [our italics] to unprecedented armaments for defense.

Gone, then, is the last trace of tommyrot about "purely economic actions". Collective security, when it has to get down to business, shows itself for what it is and has always been: support for the armaments and the war of American imperialism. By this open advocacy of armaments, the act at which in 1914 Lenin split from the Second International and proclaimed the Third, Stalinism in this country enters a new maturity of social-chauvinism.

When we connect up this declaration with the new Stalinist policy in Latin America, even more is indicated. During the past year, Stalinism in the Latin American nations has become the chief spokesman among the masses for Yankee imperialism, that

is, for the main enemy of the Latin American masses. This is altogether literally the fact. To cite a single example, from the *Daily Worker* report of the convention of the Communist party of Cuba:

After mentioning the sorrowful experiences of Cuba in the past with the "Dollar Diplomacy" of American imperialism, Roca [a leader of the C. P. C.] declared that this policy is no longer followed by the Roosevelt Administration.

"The Roosevelt Administration represents to a great extent the growing democratic and progressive movement and the forward march of the awakening millions of workers who suffered in the past [our italics] from imperialist oppression as did the Cuban workers," Roca said. . . .

"The struggle for liberation cannot be anti-United States." [Daily Worker's emphasis.]

There is a necessary consistency here. Supporting American imperialism and its war program at home means supporting it also externally. Stalinism in the United States is, thus, openly developing into a wing of American imperialism, which has as its main purpose the selling of the war program to the American workers and the Latin American peoples.

The social basis of Stalinism, here as elsewhere, is the Soviet bureaucracy. From the point of view of the Soviet bureaucracy, American Stalinism can function as a wing of American imperialism only on the gamble that in the war the United States and the Soviet Union will be allied and that the interests of the two in the war will coincide. But, even if allied temporarily in the war, their interests will not in fact coincide, since their interests flow from diametrically opposed socio-economic foundations. Thus today's policy of American Stalinism tries to patch together two forces which are actually in conflict, and which at any moment may come into direct and open opposition. The advances of American Stalinism along the road of support of American imperialism in reality signify a shifting of balance in the specific weights of Moscow and Washington in determining the nature of American Stalinism. Washington, which was at first approached only as a manoeuvre, is now starting to exercise an independent pull of its own upon the Stalinist movement, and the strength of this pull can only increase in the months ahead. Smirking patriotism "for the sake of the Soviet Union" is beginning to be transformed into the plain, stinking, ordinary, bloody kind of patriotism. The Kremlin bureaucracy, which has already proved in practise that it cannot defend the revolution outside of the Soviet Union, which the whole world knows cannot defend the Soviet Union from its imperialist enemies, shows clearly now that it cannot even defend itself. It has dug what is turning out to be its own grave.

Barcelona and France's Future

THE SIEGE OF BARCELONA did not last a day. Premier Negrin had of course plastered the city with "*No pasaran*" signs, had issued a proclamation swearing to the people that the government would not desert the city, and had imposed martial law ostensibly to facilitate military defense. But simultaneously, it develops, Negrin had been renting a little villa in Le Perthus which, quite conveniently, has its front door in Spain and its back door in France.

Workers everywhere in the city were still busily engaged in rearing barricades for street-to-street defense when . . . they lifted their heads to find the fascist advance guards rolling unresisted down the principal avenues. The workers themselves had no arms with which to resist: the arms which they had torn from the fascists on July 19, 1936 had been wrested from them, first by the Caballero government and then by the Negrin cabinet, under

the slogan, "All arms to the front."

In concealing its plan to abandon the city without a fight the Loyalist government naturally could not give warning in time to thousands of worker-militants who are marked down in Franco's files for execution. Ominous too is the fate of thousands of imprisoned rank-and-file socialists and anarchists, Poumists and Trotskyists; it is all too likely that they were left in Loyalist dungeons, to come out only to face Franco's firing squads.

The Popular Front ends, "not with a bang but a whimper". This, we were told, was the way to fight fascism. We were told this by the socialists after the revolution of April 14, 1931, when they entered a Popular Front government—the name had not yet been invented then by the Stalinists, it was still called by the old-fashioned name of "coalition cabinet". When "the left-wing bourgeoisie" in that government shot down peasants and broke

strikes by force, we were told that it was the fault of communist provocation. Two years of that coalition paved the way for two years of black reaction under Gil Robles. When reaction had to retreat, it was given time, opportunity and resources to prepare anew, by its successor, the Popular Front government, which took office February, 1936. No one could now talk of communist provocation, for the Stalinists were in the Popular Front; nor could the anarchists provide an alibi, for they had shamefacedly sent their forces to the polls for the Popular Front. But the new coalition repeated the crimes of that of 1931-1933. It could not do otherwise.

The Plot of Reaction

It was known that the monarchists, landowners and capitalists were preparing for a return to power by force. The general staff, the whole officer corps of the army was of course with them. In April 1936, Colonel Julio Mangada published a documented pamphlet which not only exposed the fascist plot but proved conclusively that President Azaña was fully informed of the plot when, on March 18, 1936, upon the demand of the general staff, his government had indignantly repudiated "unjust attacks to which the officers of the army have been subjected". A fawning description of the generals as "remote from all political struggle, faithful servitors of the constituted power and guarantors of obedience to the popular will" was coupled with a threat to imprison any who continued attacks on the officers corps.

Supporting the government, the socialists, communists and anarchists could not, by that very fact, conduct a systematic campaign for the disintegration of discipline in the army. The government had forbidden it and they supported the government. That meant that the officer corps was enabled, when the uprising came, to carry with them the peasants' sons who constituted the army and who had never been taught to question the authority of the officer corps.

Under capitalism democracy is a luxury permissible, if at all, only in the mother country. One cannot rule colonial slaves by democratic methods. Being worldly-wise men who understood this, the socialist, communist and trade-union leaders supporting the Popular Front government put no obstacles in its way of continuing rule over Spanish Morocco by the Foreign Legion. The Spanish labor press was forbidden distribution in the Moroccan barracks and cities. The labor leadership did *not* reply by raising the slogan of "Freedom for Morocco". That was not in the Popular Front program and one must not go beyond the agreement with "the left wing of the bourgeoisie". In the discreet atmosphere surrounding the military dictatorship in Morocco, Generals Goded and Franco prepared the uprising at leisure; the Moorish peasants who had not been called brothers by the Spanish working-class movement were glad to wreak vengeance on the Spanish mainland for all past humiliation and suffering.

The ways in which the Popular Front government paved the road for the fascist uprising and for its success could be elaborated at great length. Elsewhere I have sought to do so.* What is necessary now, however, is to indicate the meaning for the French working class of the events in Spain during the last seven years.

Since 1935 the socialists and Stalinists have joined in chorus to tell the French workers that their salvation is to be sought in joining with the "progressive" bourgeoisie in a Popular Front which would crush reaction within and without—above all without: Hitler and Mussolini. The fact that the fourth cabinet of the Popular Front, that of Premier Daladier—and Daladier was the Radical leader who was mainly responsible for bringing the bourgeoisie into the Popular Front at its inception—had ended by coming to terms with Hitler at Munich and breaking the general strike at home, has not changed the chorus of socialists and

Stalinists. Daladier's "betrayal" is imputed to him personally, to Chamberlain, *etc.*—to anyone and anything except the class interests of the "progressive bourgeoisie". Tomorrow, if it serves the purpose of the French bourgeoisie, another Radical leader, probably Herriot (who wickedly rejected the Popular Front in 1935) will reach out to the Stalinists and socialists, and they will fawningly greet him as they did Daladier: "The man of the hour." The Blums and Thorezes learn nothing and cannot learn anything.

Not only must the French workers link arms with the "liberal" bourgeoisie, but they are also told that to complete their salvation they must then link arms with the governments of the "great democracies", England and America.

To push the French workers in this direction, they are being told—as are the American workers being told by the Browders and Abe Cahans and James Oneals—that Loyalist Spain is being defeated because no arms were forthcoming from the "great democracies" and that, if only real Popular Front governments reigned in these countries, anti-fascist Spain would be victorious. Even Blum has the effrontery to demand that Daladier do what Blum would not do.

To push the French workers further in this direction, they are being told that the war in Spain is a war for national independence, waged by the fascist powers on the one hand against "the people" on the other hand, and that after Spain it will be the plight of the French people to wage a similar war for independence.

A little truth and a great deal of falsity are so cleverly mixed in this socialist-Stalinist propaganda, that it is no wonder that, backed by enormous funds and armies of functionaries, they are able even today, after seven years of the Spanish events, after five years of the French crisis to delude the majority of the French workers. Yet the French workers are doomed, unless they free themselves from these illusions.

Lessons of Spain Must Be Learned

The stark lessons of Spain must become a manual for the French workers—and for the American workers. The tragedy of Barcelona is an epic which the class-conscious workers must read and re-read tirelessly. As officers are trained in military schools, going over in the minutest detail the story of past military campaigns, so the proletarian cadres must go to school to the Spanish civil war. Let them but listen, and the martyred spirits of five hundred thousand Spanish workers and peasants will teach them how to fight the coming civil war in France!

That the fascists are preparing for war against the French masses is an indisputable fact. But when the Stalinists and socialists interpret this fact to mean only that it is Mussolini and Hitler and their French agents who will be launching a war against the French "people", they spread a lie which, if believed, can prevent the masses from adequately preparing for the struggle.

The fascists who are preparing for war against the French masses are the *French* fascists and those they serve, the capitalist class of *France*. The main enemy is within the gate. Faced by ever-increasing demands from Hitler and Mussolini, the French imperialists prepare for the moment when they will try to cease further concessions and take back previous concessions and more. As an integral part of its preparations for imperialist war for the re-division of the world, the French capitalist class wants class peace at home. To the eternal glory of the French proletariat, the socialist and Stalinist lackeys have proved impotent to provide their capitalist masters with that peace; the workers will not and cannot submit to the wiping out of their past social gains. Driven by the needs of the situation, the French capitalists are moving towards a fascist dictatorship. Daladier's turn to the right is only part of this process. His smashing of the general strike, ending of the forty-hour week, jailing of trade union militants, are not enough. The French capitalist class must be on equal terms of

* *The Civil War in Spain*, Sept. 1936, Pioneer Publishers. *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain*, May 1938, Pioneer Publishers.

competition with Hitler and Mussolini; *i.e.*, it must have no trade unions, labor political parties, free press, mass meetings, or any other democratic rights, to act as obstacles in its preparations for war and prosecution of war against its rival imperialists. It must have fascism in order the better to fight the fascist powers of Hitler and Mussolini.

If the French fascist *coup d'état* proves ineffective, and instead of crushing the masses with swift blows, the workers successfully resist and seize control of the chief cities, there will of course be found "liberal" bourgeois elements who will offer to control the workers in their war against the fascists. They will say, as Azaña, Martínez Barrio, Companys said in July, 1936: "This is not a war of class against class but a war of the whole people against a small clique backed by outside powers." And if the French workers subordinate themselves to such control, these bourgeois "anti-fascists" will play the same treacherous rôle as in Spain.

Not merely did these "liberals" pave the way for the fascists by the various means we have already indicated. When the fascist *coup d'état* actually began, these democrats *tried to surrender the power to Franco's forces*. Enough to recall here that the Popular Front governments in Madrid and Barcelona, when the fascists marched, *refused to arm the workers*. The governments took no steps of their own to organize resistance. On the contrary, Azaña opened negotiations with Franco to come to terms.

And, indeed, could it be otherwise? The camp of Franco was saying: We, the serious masters of capital, the real spokesmen of bourgeois society, tell you that democracy must be finished, if capitalism is to live. Choose, Azaña, between democracy and capitalism. Which was deeper in Azaña and the liberal bourgeoisie? Their democracy or their capitalism? They gave their answer by bowing their heads before the onward-marching ranks of fascism.

In spite of the Azañas, the workers of Barcelona stopped the fascists. Almost barehanded, with only the arms they could seize by raids on sporting-goods stores, with dynamite from construction jobs and some guns found in fascist homes, the workers conquered the revolting garrisons. Only when the workers were masters of Catalonia, the decisive industrial sector of Spain, only then did the government at Madrid declare it would arm the people—only, that is, when it was no longer master of the decision.

As part of the deliberate propaganda to delude the French workers into linking their fate to an alliance with their "own" bourgeoisie, the Stalinists and socialists have connived with the Spanish bourgeoisie in concealing the fact that it refused to arm the workers. A particularly foul example of this propaganda is at hand: André Malraux's "novel", *Man's Hope*. The third sentence of the book reads: "At one o'clock in the morning the Government had decided to arm the people, and from three o'clock the production of a union-card gave every member the right to bear arms." That first page is about Madrid. The "liberties" of the novelist here cover up a political falsification. The first fight with the fascists took place in Barcelona on July 19, and was decisively won by the workers *before* the following day when the Madrid government "agreed" to arm the workers "at one o'clock in the morning".

No coalition with the bourgeoisie, left or right! No political support to a Popular Front government! Arming of the workers *before* the outbreak of civil war; arming of the workers *independently* of the government and in spite of the government! These are the elementary lessons of the outbreak of the Spanish civil war.

But these lessons alone are not sufficient for victory.

France and Its Colonies

As Morocco was the military base for the Spanish civil war, so North Africa generally will in all likelihood act as a military

reservoir for French fascism. The native masses have today no feeling of brotherhood for the French workers. That is precluded by the conduct of the Popular Front government since June 1936, which has naturally been identified, in the minds of the native masses, with the French workers whose organizations backed the government.

The natives have not been able to appreciate the blessings of Popular Frontism, as conveyed to them by Albert Sarraut, "Coördinator" for the colonies. The bombing planes and motorized infantry which suppressed the Kurds in Syria (August 1937), the innumerable native meetings routed by the sabres of Mobile Guards, the mass arrests and imprisonments, the displays of force designed to overawe the natives (such as the flight of eighty first-line planes over North Africa in October 1937), the forcible suppressions of nationalist movements in Meknes, Fez, Casablanca, Khemisset, Rabat, Port Lyautey, *etc.*, *etc.*—this is what the Popular Front has meant to the colonies. The very suppressions have paved the way for fascism, for while the Socialists and Stalinists would not support freedom for the colonies, the fascists demagogically promise the natives anything. Their anti-Semitic agitation has caught fire, and as early as 1935, de la Rocque was able to hold an impressive military review near Algiers. The analogy with Spanish Morocco is complete to the last detail: in the honeymoon of the Popular Front government (November 1937), the Stalinists were constrained to complain that their press was banned from Morocco, while the fascist *Action Française* came out in a Moroccan edition, calling for the assassination of the government members.

If the natives of North Africa are not to play in France the rôle of Franco's Moors, the French working class must, now, make clear to the natives that it identifies its cause with theirs. That can only be done by unconditional support of freedom of the colonies from French domination.

In the name of the fight against fascism, the Spanish workers and peasants acceded to the Popular Front government's advice: we must not free Morocco, because that would be bitterly opposed by France and England, whose colonies would be inflamed by the example of Morocco. The result was that the Moors wreaked vengeance on the Spanish mainland . . . under Franco's officers.

Having thwarted the fascist coup in Barcelona, Madrid, Valencia and, indeed, in the major part of the country, the workers prepared to fight fascism by the most efficacious means possible: by their own strength, by their own organization of military and economic means and by distributing land to the land-hungry peasantry, in order to rouse the countryside against Franco. The workers seized and ran the factories and transportation, the peasants took the land. Overnight a network of workers' and peasants' committees sprang up everywhere to organize the civil war and carry on production. The Catalonian and Madrid Popular Front governments had no power: the basis of their power, the army, had gone over to Franco, and now the armed masses were the only other power. There remained only to centralize these committees into a national council which would create a Workers' and Peasants' Government.

At this point, however, the Spanish Blums and Thorezes came forward and said, as they are now saying in France: "We need help and we can get it from the great democracies, and to get it we must do nothing to frighten them. Besides, the left bourgeoisie is also fighting with us against the fascists. We must therefore coalesce with the bourgeoisie in a government of all the people against the fascists. This is not a civil war but a war for national independence against Hitler and Mussolini."

Unfortunately the Spanish workers and peasants listened to them. It is not to be wondered at, when one reflects that not only the socialists and Stalinists talked this way, but also the anarchists and the left wing P.O.U.M. The tiny handful of revolutionists was scarcely to be heard. The Azañas, Companys & Co. were permitted to remain at the helm.

Preparing the Capitulation

Slowly at first, then more and more quickly, the "liberal" bourgeoisie, immeasurably aided by the workers' leaders, rebuilt the shattered bourgeois state. Rebuilt, to take the place of the army which Franco now had, a "unified, disciplined" army subordinated to an officers corps recruited from the bourgeoisie and the Stalinists, primarily. And with this coercive apparatus, they took back the factories and the land, reestablished private property and all that it implies. To what end, we have seen: capitulation to Franco. Blows to the left, conciliation to the right, meant that while revolutionary workers were executed and imprisoned, pro-fascist officers were able to betray city after city, front after front: Malaga (where the Stalinist commandant, Bolivar, went over to the fascists), Bilbao, Gijon, Santander (thanks to the suppression of the C.N.T. and the hegemony of the Basque bourgeoisie); the Aragon front of January 1938—thanks to General (comrade to the Stalinists) Sebastian Pozas; one could go on for pages.

Not to complete the revolution—this the workers acceded to originally because it would bring arms from the "great democracies". But neither "comrade" Blum (Premier from June 5, 1936 to June 21, 1937), nor the succeeding Popular Front governments, nor President Roosevelt, nor Anthony Eden, was moved by this renunciation sufficiently to provide effective arms against Franco. The capitalist democracies—*i.e.*, their governing classes, and their lackeys—understood quite well that the day that Franco was driven into the sea would be the last day of Spanish capitalism. Why should the peasants and workers at that point permit Azaña and Companys to rule them? Precisely for this reason, the capitalists of the world, no matter how democratic, *preferred* a Franco victory to an anti-fascist victory inevitably followed by a workers' and peasants' government.

To help keep the Azañas in power long enough to prevent too speedy a victory, which would have aided their rivals, Italy and Germany, an occasional dribble of arms was permitted by the democratic imperialists. They graciously permitted Stalin to send some. He, for his part, determined to prove his usefulness to the great imperialist powers, did for them what they could not do as well for themselves: his agents strangled the revolutionary forces in Spain by every method which the G.P.U. has developed. In the end, of course, neither the Spanish labor leaders nor Stalin got the alliance from the "great democracies" for which they had

been willing to betray the Spanish revolution.

To repeat this false road in France would be absolutely fatal for the French workers. Accept the help of the "middle classes"? Of course! Fraternity with all who will take arms in hand against the fascists. Give the French peasantry a real stake in the struggle by wiping out their indebtedness to the banks, the corporations and the usurers, and by dividing among them the great estates—it is a myth that all French soil is tilled by small owners. Give the small storekeeper and the white collar worker in the cities a vision of a future in a socialist world, in stirring contrast to the capitalist world of hunger, penury and humiliation in which he now lives. These are the ways to the "middle classes".

And take the power! Above all, take the power, and do not surrender it to the "liberal" traitors, the French Azañas. Put the power in the firm hands of workers who will remain loyal to their own flesh and blood. Keep the power in the hands of those who stand to lose *everything* by fascism.

That, above all, is the lesson of Spain. Had the workers and peasants taken the power into their own hands, there would have been no Bilbaos and no Barcelonas surrendered intact to the fascists. There would have been no crawling pleas to the Blums and Chamberlains for arms, but instead a clarion call to the masses everywhere to organize the shipment of arms and in the process to take the power in their own countries into their own hands, in France first of all. The wave of revolutions inspired by the Russian Revolution of October, 1917 would have risen again, enriched by all the intervening lessons.

Fight or die!—these are the only alternatives. Nothing is impossible for the working class when it follows a revolutionary course! Boycotted by the whole world, fighting the whole world, the Russian workers and peasants threw back the White armies and the Allied armies on twenty-two fronts. The Barcelona of July 19, 1936 is the Barcelona that we shall remember—and also the Barcelona of January 25, 1939. Had the Barcelona proletariat continued to follow in the footsteps of the Petrograd proletariat of October 1917, it would not now be under the heel of Franco.

We have spoken of the lessons for the French working class. Those lessons are also for us, here in America. Soon enough, the same issues will face us. The tragedy of Barcelona will not be fruitless, if we learn from it that it is the only alternative to the road of the Petrograd workers in October 1917.

Felix MORROW

Zionism and the Arab Struggle

FOR OVER TWO AND A HALF years there has been war in Palestine, a war waged by an imperialist oppressor against a colonial people. All the devastating measures employed by British imperialism, the aerial bombardments, the razing of villages to the ground, the imposition of fines, the taking of hostages, the enactment of martial law, the establishment of concentration camps, along with the old-time methods of bribery, intrigue, corruption, all these failed to break the determined will of a united people to attain national liberation. After two and a half years of this oppression imperialism finds the Arab people more united and more determined in the fight than ever before. And all the indications go to show that this time British imperialism will have to give in to the Arab demands, will have to agree to a compromise. It should be kept in mind that the demands of the Arab bourgeoisie were very modest. They did not even ask for complete national and political independence. All they asked was: (a) that immigration should be stopped; (b) that further sale of Arab land should be prohibited; and (c) that there should be estab-

lished a national government responsible to a representative Legislative Assembly.

And yet for more than two and a half years British imperialism waged war against the whole people, refusing to extend to them the principle of self-determination. This is the very principle which Britain the other day so joyfully proclaimed for Czechoslovakia (imperialism has different standards for "colonial" countries) and, what is more, so readily promised to the Arabs in 1915. Two years ago British imperialism tried to frustrate the national aspirations of the Arabs by the partition scheme of the Peel Commission—a most ingenious and deceitful scheme. But it did not succeed, and now another Commission has come to the conclusion that the acceptance of partition by British imperialism and the Zionist leaders is not enough, that the scheme will not work because of its indignant rejection and condemnation by the whole Arab population. In spite of the fact that British imperialism would greatly like to have in Palestine a strong outpost in the form of a Jewish State and has done everything possible to facilitate it during the twenty years of the "Mandate," nevertheless the present war and the determination of the Arabs to fight it to a

finish, the support the Arab cause is receiving from all the Near East, the unwillingness of British imperialism to antagonize these Arabian countries in view of the present precarious world situation, all these considerations have forced British imperialism to drop the old partition plan and through the recommendations of a new Commission (the Woodhead Commission) to arrange a compromise.

From the short summary of the Woodhead Commission Report and from the vague declaration of the new British policy in Palestine and the press comments thereon, it seems that this compromise will not give the Arabs national and political independence, but will retain for British imperialism the military, political and economic grip on the country. It will, however, meet the Arab demands concerning immigration and land. It seems that Britain has definitely had to give up the cherished idea of a Jewish National Home as her safest outpost. The Mandate will be "modified" and the Balfour Declaration will receive a "new interpretation."

This incidentally puts an end to the Zionist dream of a Jewish State in Palestine. Zionism stands or falls by these two conditions: (a) unrestricted Jewish immigration leading to an eventual Jewish majority, and (b) unrestricted Jewish land buying. No duping of the Jewish petty bourgeois masses all over the world, no collection of tribute from them and maintenance of a huge world-wide parasitic bureaucracy would be possible if these two conditions disappeared. And those who have put their faith in the imperialist "solution" of the Jewish question would be bitterly disillusioned to see this part of the Versailles system disappear together with the rest. That the reformists, who have always supported the colonial policy of imperialism and who have now become the most ardent champions of the Versailles Treaty, should use all the arguments of the Zionists against the Arabs, need not surprise us. That Sir Stafford Cripps should employ the imperialistic pleas of the Jewish fascist Jabotinsky is not at all astonishing. But it is very regrettable that some confusion has also crept into the ranks of Marxists. From their casual remarks and even from their articles in the revolutionary press it is evident that the authors have been swept off their feet by the widespread anti-Semitic wave and have fallen victims to nationalism. A clear, unambiguous stand in support of the colonial people in their struggle against imperialism is the first duty of revolutionary socialism. We must not be parties to imperialist machinations, to Versailles, to mandates. We must strongly demarcate ourselves from the Stalinists, who have betrayed the colonial people for the sake of People's Fronts, for the sake of placating imperialism in France and Britain. Let them, if they will, throw spanners into the wheels of the Arab revolt and advocate moderation and a compromise that would leave British imperialism and Zionism masters of Palestine.

So far as we are concerned, we have made quite clear our position in regard to the struggle in Palestine. (See *Spark*,* Nos. 16, 33, 41). Nothing will blind us or distract us from the fundamental issue, namely, the progressive revolutionary struggle of a colonial people against imperialism. We had and we have no illusions concerning this struggle, whatever the outcome of the present political manoeuvres in Palestine may be. Whether British imperialism will succeed by its new move for a round-table conference in breaking the Arab united front (as it succeeded before by a similar move in India) and by corruption succeed in sidetracking the national movement, or whether the present struggle will go on, we are under no illusions, we have no doubt that, so long as the national movement is led and dominated by the Arab national bourgeoisie and clergy, the struggle for liberation cannot be crowned with success. It will terminate in a foul compromise between the national bourgeoisie and imperialism. Time and again this has been proved by history. But, so long as the fight is pro-

gressive, we have to support it, while at the same time warning the Arab workers of their treacherous bourgeoisie.

The struggle of two years has not been in vain. It has weakened British imperialism, it has weakened the imperialist grip upon Palestine. It has also shown to the Orient and to the colonial people that British imperialism is not so all-powerful as they thought. The fact that after twenty years of rule in Palestine British imperialism has to re-conquer the country is of great importance. This vulnerability and weakness must give tremendous encouragement to all the colonial people. Of special importance is this lesson of Palestine to the national liberation movement in India, showing that the way is not in Gandhism and *passive* resistance, but in *active* revolutionary mass struggle. This lesson will not be in vain.

* * *

It was the precarious position of the Jewish masses, the petty bourgeois, the handicraftsmen, the declassed elements, in Eastern Europe during the second half of last century that drove the Jewish intelligentsia to all kinds of Utopias and fantastic schemes. Except for the small section that turned to socialism and Marxism, the favorite dream of the majority was territorialism. Later this found expression in the colonial schemes of Baron Hirsch and of Baron Rothschild, in the Angola and Uganda projects. Zionism eventually amalgamated all the various territorialist tendencies in one political movement.

It was by no means a coincidence that the Zionist movement should appear on the scene at the time when Africa, Polynesia and the Near East were being carved up among the Great Powers and the world was divided into spheres of influence among the great monopoly trusts. Zionism was a direct product of imperialism and logically became a playball in the hands of imperialism. The end of the World War, the redistribution of the colonial world at Versailles gave the opportunity for Zionism to step in and demand its promised share. British imperialism, which had made the promise for financial and military service rendered during the war, would not hesitate a moment to forget this promise, as it forgot so many others, if the fulfilment did not suit her own interests and schemes. British imperialism realized the great strategic value of Palestine for the Empire, beside its economic value for trade and investments. It came in most conveniently for Britain to acquire a strong outpost in the Near East in the form of the Jewish National Home. Such a community or State would always serve as a policeman for British interests, simply because, surrounded by a hostile Arab world, it would always have to look to Britain for protection. British imperialism took up the Zionist cause and Zionism became a servant of British imperialism.

To blame British imperialism now for the present state of affairs in Palestine (as comrade Rock has done in a recent article in *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*), to accuse the British of sinister machinations and of the international sowing of hostility between Arab and Jew, is both futile and incorrect. Firstly, because one does not blame the shark for having the characteristics of a shark. To expect British imperialism to act as a peacemaker, bringing the two peoples together and laying the foundation of coöperation and peace and mutual respect for each other's rights, is more than simple foolishness. It is a complete misunderstanding of imperialism, as well as of the Zionist aim—a Jewish State in Palestine. And, secondly, it is incorrect. For British imperialism did everything it could to bring about a Jewish State. The fact that, in spite of Arab opposition, protest, revolts, Britain fostered and encouraged Jewish immigration, the fact that there are already today 400,000 Jews in Palestine, goes to prove that Britain was just as interested in a Jewish State as Zionism was, even if Britain's interest was for the furtherance of her own ends.

From the day of the Zionist rejoicing over San Remo, the day of proclamation of a Jewish National Home, revolutionary

* *The Spark* is the official organ of the Workers Party of South Africa (Fourth International), from which we take this article.

socialists all over the world have declared open hostility towards this scheme as an imperialist venture. We have warned the Jewish workers against the great Zionist bluff of the solution of the Jewish problem, against their unity with capitalism and imperialism, and have warned them of the bitter disillusionment that is in store for them. From the beginning it was clear to us that Zionism meant not a National Home in Palestine, not a place of refuge, not an outlet for emigration on a small scale, not the building up of some agricultural communes, but that it meant a Jewish capitalist State as a part of British imperialism. It was clear to us that *any such scheme must be at the expense of the native Arab population*. For there are no empty spaces in the world today, and any colonial development under imperialism means the enslavement, oppression and exploitation of the native population. No camouflage, no ingenious device on the part of the Jewish bourgeoisie and their chauvinistic petty bourgeois supporters can suppress this basic fact. The imperialist invaders everywhere find hundreds of good excuses for plunder and robbery and then cover up this with the most "noble" ideals and motives imaginable. The Jewish bourgeoisie moreover was not slow to find such ideals and motives.

We need not waste time and space in refuting the commonplace argument of the historic "right" of the Jews to Palestine by reference to the similar "historic" right of the Roman Empire to the British Isles. We turn rather to the "moral" right of the suffering Jews to a State. This has been one of the main planks of Zionist propaganda all along, but since Hitler has let loose his bestial, sadistic persecution of the Jews in Germany and Mussolini has followed suit, this argument has taken the dominant place. Zionism is trying to cash in on the sufferings of the persecuted Jews in Europe. Zionism is endeavouring to exploit the natural and world-wide sympathy of every decent man for the oppressed German and Italian Jews, in order to further its own predatory aims in Palestine. But these two things have no connection whatsoever. Sympathy for an oppressed minority has nothing to do with the cravings of a bourgeoisie for a State wherein they themselves shall be able to exploit their own workers and still more the Arabs, the cheap native labour and the land. The sufferings of oppressed and exploited Jewish minorities stand in no connection with the Jewish bourgeoisie, with Zionism in Palestine, with the oppressors, exploiters, plunderers.

Zionist writers and journalists, apologists for imperialism, have been telling the world for the last twenty-five years that a Jewish State will be something different, that it will be a model to the world. No classes, all for the welfare of the community, for the "Jewish" ideal of righteousness and justice. What Jewish petty-bourgeois heart did not throb before this picture of "hope and beauty?" Now for eighteen years these fools have had the chance of seeing this hope and beauty at work. Indeed, the paws and claws of the Jewish bourgeoisie were not in any way inferior to the same weapons wielded by any greedy bourgeoisie. There was the same policy of grabbing, of squeezing out the native population from the land, and so the production of a landless peasantry as a reservoir of cheap labor. The same speculation in land, the same over-capitalization, polarization of wealth and poverty, pauperization. The same greed for more territory—Transjordan. The same chauvinism in language and persecution of the language of the bulk of the Jewish workers—Yiddish. And the same arguments: The Arabs are inherently lazy; the Arabs can go somewhere else; the Arabs are on a lower level of civilization. The same arrogance on the part of the invaders: We have brought you culture, social services; we, of a higher civilization, have made the waste land fertile; we must have a higher standard of living. And even the same white, civilized labor policy as in South Africa! Oh, no! The Jewish bourgeoisie has not produced anything different from what any other bourgeoisie produces. Even in producing a Jewish fascism in Palestine they

were not original; they were only imitating the bourgeoisie in other parts of the world.

Yet this is quite natural and logical. But the whole hideousness and real harm of Zionism is revealed when we hear the arguments, claims and apologies of the Socialist-Zionists in and out of Palestine. The Poale-Zion (at one time the main Zionist-Socialist party) were going to build socialism in Palestine, "in spite of British imperialism and Jewish capitalism". "We," they said, "are going to build a socialist core in this capitalist shell. The main thing is the *Kvutzah*, the agricultural communes, the *kolhozes*. This is the real thing." With this idea of building communism in Palestine they seduced and misled thousands upon thousands of boys and girls. This was the mainspring of the *Halutzim* movement, the pioneers for Palestine. With the sweat and bones of these young idealists the agricultural colonization has been accomplished—for capitalism, to be sure, not for communism. The cemeteries of Palestine are filled with these *Halutzim*, these pioneers. But where are the communist colonies, the socialist core of Palestine? They have shared the fate of all the other schemes for building socialism on islands or on chosen spots in South America—all the Utopian schemes of the last hundred years, beginning with Robert Owen. But even if some *Kvutzahs* had been nurtured and preserved like a plant in a conservatory, how could this be today a factor in the life of Palestine? So much for the empty talk of the Poale-Zion outside Palestine.

Within Palestine all the Jewish labor and trade union organizations accepted the political programme of Zionism, that is, Palestine as the Jewish National Home and eventually a Jewish State relying on British imperialism with its bayonets and power, uncompromising hostility to the national aspiration of the Arabs and their struggle for national independence. Also in the economic sphere an out-and-out imperialist and chauvinistic policy. Laws providing for the eviction of Arab tenants from their land-holdings, and then the barring of these landless peasants from the labor-market in the towns in accordance with the policy of "100% Jewish labor in Jewish enterprises". The speeches of these labor and trade union leaders of the *Histadrut*, of the *Hashomir Hazoir*, etc., the speeches of Ben-Gurion and Burgin, make the most shameless reading even in the annals of chauvinistic labor parties. Their actions correspond with their speeches. During the present ruthless war waged by British imperialism during two and a half years, in the course of which innocent people are bombed, villages are razed to the ground, families are left destitute and homeless, not a word of protest has been forthcoming from these labor and "socialist" organizations. Just the opposite: Support and spurring on of the imperialist oppressors by word and action. Open scabbing and strike-breaking in every political strike declared by the Arabs in protest against British brutality, martial law, cruel humiliations. This is the record of the Jewish labor and trade unions, the *Histadrut*, who barred Arabs from membership.

And then the apologetic critics of Zionism from the "left," so-called socialists and communists, who are fond of *talking* about Marx and dialectics, but whose socialism goes no deeper than their skin, are shocked that the wrath of the Arabs is directed not only against British imperialism, but also against the Jews in Palestine. These liberals are unable to understand why, on meeting with a united Zionist front of bourgeoisie and labor, a hostile united front, siding with their enemy, British imperialism, and supporting it, the Arabs should come to the conclusion that all Jews in Palestine are Zionists and therefore their enemies. This conclusion is, to be sure, a wrong one, but where are the signs that would make this clear to the Arabs?

The other argument employed by these apologetic critics of Zionism is that the Arabs make use of weapons supplied by fascist countries. The "moral feelings" of socialists like Sir Stafford Cripps are shocked by the Arab disregard for their

democratic sensibilities and therefore they cannot support the Arab cause. These philistines would like to prescribe special laws and special weapons by means of which the slaves might break their chains! Trotsky has answered these philistines in his article, "Learn to Think" (NEW INTERNATIONAL, July 1938).

But their main and most dangerous argument is that the Jewish immigration into Palestine is in the interests of the Arabs and therefore should be supported. Such a Marxist writes: "If many Jews have benefited from Zionism, a large number of Arabs have benefited equally and at no expense to themselves. Such momentum as the Jewish revival of Palestine has given renaissance of its Arab population must inevitably continue to re-vitalize and repopulate this section of the community." (*The Intelligent Man's Guide to Jew-Baiting*, p. 103), and further: "Palestine has served to absorb refugees from countries unable to absorb them. It will continue to do so, and in this it has justified itself." (*Ibid.*, p. 115.) Here the usual argument of imperialism concerning its beneficent work, an argument used by imperialism in China, India, South Africa and any colonial or semi-colonial country, is cleverly connected with the immigration question. Unfortunately the same sort of argument is used by comrade Rock in his article in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL (Oct. 1938), where he says: "From all this it is evident that the British know full well how to exploit the elementary needs of the Jewish workers, namely, immigration and colonization, neither of which contradicts the real necessities of the Arab masses." Indeed! Mr. Weitzman could not say better. It is the immigration question which is the main cause of the Arab struggle. This point requires careful examination.

International socialists, beginning with Marx and Engels, were always for free, unrestricted immigration and for complete freedom of movement as a part of our democratic rights. It was the reformist labor leaders and the trade union bureaucrats who opposed the rights of free immigration for the sake of their narrow craft interests and to the detriment of the interests of the working class as a whole. Now it is capitalism in decay that is doing away with all the democratic rights that it formerly proclaimed and fought for. In the post-war period all countries, one after another, have closed their doors to immigration. The working class in retreat after the defeats was not in a position to resist this abolition of its democratic rights. And it is precisely for this reason that the fight for democratic rights, as the urgent task of today, stands in the forefront of the program of international revolutionary socialism (Fourth International). It would therefore be ridiculous to assert that we are against free immigration.

But the Jewish immigration into Palestine is something entirely different. It is an immigration with the avowed aim of trampling upon and destroying the rights of the native population in that country. It is an invasion under the protection of imperialism and for the strengthening of imperialism. Zionism—and by this we mean all the Zionist parties, from the Revisionists to the so-called socialists—has openly proclaimed that the aim of this immigration is to attain a majority in Palestine and reduce the Arabs to a minority in a then Jewish State. Against this aim to defeat them politically and economically the Arab people, the natives in Palestine, have waged this war for two and a half years. The immigration question was and still is the pivotal point in their struggle. *Not* to support the Arabs in this just, *defensive* demand means to side with British imperialism and its tool, Zionism, against a native oppressed people.

Palestine as a solution of the Jewish question was never even a Utopia. It was a big Zionist bluff. Palestine, as a Jewish capitalist State and outpost of British imperialism, was a product of Versailles, and it failed together with the rest of Versailles. In so far as Zionism, against the express wish of the native population, fostered this imperialist venture, relying on the force of British bayonets, Zionists took the risk and must blame themselves for the failure. The sooner the Jewish people in Palestine realize

this, the better. For the continuation of the old Zionist-imperialist course will drive deeper the wedge of hatred and chauvinism, will widen the gulf between Arab and Jew, and will foster perpetual strife and civil war, endangering the very existence of the Jewish community. And in saying this, it is not the Zionists we have in mind. We mean the great mass of the Jewish workers and small peasants. They can solve the Jewish problem of Palestine very easily. What is needed is solidarity and coöperation of Jewish and Arab workers and peasants, and a united struggle for an independent free Palestine of workers and peasants, liberated from the shackles of imperialism-capitalism. But for this they must first break with their chauvinistic leaders, who have chained them to the chariot of Zionism-imperialism. It will then be easier for the Arab workers to free themselves from the influence and leadership of the equally chauvinistic effendis and mullahs. Once class unity is achieved, the solution of both the Jewish and the Arab question is assured.

* * *

The same confusion that exists regarding the Jewish problem in Palestine is also evident in connection with the general Jewish question. The anti-Semitic wave and bestial persecution, which is today stronger and more universal than at any other time in modern history, makes the problem more acute and urgent. But its solution cannot be found in any panacea. The solution of the Jewish problem lies in socialism. Lenin saw this thirty-five years ago, and history since then has proved it conclusively. The national problem in Russia found its solution through the October Revolution of 1917. If the Thermidorian period has brought retrogression in this sphere, as in any other, such retrogression does not in the least invalidate the fundamental proof of Leninism tested in practical life during the years 1917-1924. At the same time the various solutions offered by the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, including that of Austro-Marxism and that of the Jewish Bund, proved their bankruptcy under test. Since Versailles, Wilson's self-determination, the minority status of the League of Nations, *etc., etc.*, the position of the national minorities has become intolerable and is going from bad to worse.

Scattered throughout the world there are from sixteen to eighteen million Jews. Everywhere they are a national minority. Everywhere, except for the three million in the Soviet Union, the bulk of them are suffering from oppression and persecution. As a result of the universal cancer of anti-Semitism, fostered by the ruling classes, their suffering is greater than that of any other national minority. Since Hitler's coming to power and the growth of fascism in every country, their sufferings and anxieties have enormously increased. For fascism, crushing the working class wherever it advances, destroying the workers' organizations, crushes the Jews at the same time. This proves again Lenin's truism, that the fate of the Jews in every country is intrinsically bound up with the fate of the working class. Even in the Soviet Union their fate is bound up with the victory or defeat of socialism. Restoration of private ownership of the means of production as a result of external defeat in war, which would mean of course a fascist régime, would bring in its wake massacres of Jews by the "White" bandits.

As has been proved by the latest events in Germany and Italy, capitalism in decay has become cannibalistic. In any case, there is no longer any place for liberalism and bourgeois democracy, to which the Jewish petty bourgeoisie along with reformism might look for salvation. The sole form of rule for decaying capitalism is fascism. Just as there is no special remedy to bring about the deliverance of the working class from under the iron heel of fascism, except the road of revolution, so for the Jews there is no special remedy except the advance in union with the working class along the revolutionary road. Only the emancipation of the working class from the yoke of capital, only socialism, can bring emancipation to the Jews.

CAPETOWN, Nov. 1938.

The SPARK

Haya de la Torre and Democracy

A PROGRAM OF A MILITANT STRUGGLE OR OF ADAPTATION TO AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

THE AUGUST 1938 number of the Argentine review *Claridad*, publishes a letter on the Peruvian situation by Haya de la Torre.* We won't apply either a Marxian or socialist criterion to this document; Haya de la Torre wrote the letter as a democrat and we shall consider it from that angle, primarily from the democratic point of view. A good democrat is better than a bad socialist, but precisely from this point of view, the letter of Haya de la Torre has great limitations.

It seems that Haya de la Torre limits the dangers which threaten Latin America only to Italy, German and Japan. He does not consider imperialism in general but only one of its varieties, fascism. He declares categorically: "In case of aggression, we all certainly think that the United States—the guardian of our liberty—will defend us." Could it be irony? Of course not. Speaking of the possibility of intervention against the Latin-American continent by the fascist "aggressors", the author declares: "While the United States is strong and alert, those dangers are not immediate but . . . they are dangers." It is not possible to speak with greater clarity. The A.P.R.A. leader searches for a powerful protector.

The United States only exists as a "guardian of liberty" for Haya de la Torre; we see in that country the most immediate danger and, in a historical sense, the most threatening. With this we don't wish to say that the governments of the Latin-American countries should not utilize the antagonisms between the different countries and imperialist groups in order to defend themselves. But the tactical utilization of such antagonisms on certain occasions, according to the concrete circumstances, is one thing; to base a strategical calculation upon the idea that the United States is a permanent defender, is something else. We consider this opportunist position not only erroneous but also profoundly dangerous because it creates a false perspective and hinders what is the real task, the revolutionary education of the people.

In what sense can one qualify the United States as "the guardian of the liberty" of those very peoples it exploits? But every such act of "defense" would imply the complete reduction to slavery of the country "defended" by the United States. The example of Brazil demonstrates that the higher "guardians" are not at all interested in "liberty". The relations between Washington and Rio de Janeiro have not become worse but indeed have improved after the *coup d'état* in Brazil. The reason is that Washington considers the Vargas dictatorship a more docile and sure tool of American imperialist interests than revolutionary democracy. This is, basically, the position of the White House in regard to the whole southern continent.

Can it be that Haya de la Torre starts out with the premise that the imperialist domination of the United States is a "lesser evil"? But one must say openly in this case: democratic policy demands clarity. Moreover, until when will this evil be the lesser? To ignore this problem is to risk too much on chance. The United States is ruled by the same historical laws dominating the European capitalist centers. The "democracy" of the United States at the present time is nothing more than one expression of its imperialism. Due to the frightful decay of North American capitalism, democracy will not hinder the "guardians" of liberty from displaying in the near future an extremely aggressive imperialist policy, directed especially against the countries of Latin America. This must be pointed out clearly, precisely and firmly and this perspective must be placed at the base of the revolutionary program.

Strange as it may seem, some of the A.P.R.A. leaders declare that an alliance of the A.P.R.A. and, in general, of the Latin-American national revolutionary parties with the revolutionary proletariat of the United States and other imperialist countries hasn't any practical meaning because the workers of those countries would not be interested in the condition of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. We consider this point of view suicidal in the full sense of the word. While imperialism endures, the colonial peoples will not be able to liberate themselves and the oppressed peoples will be able to defeat the imperialist bourgeoisie only by allying themselves with the international proletariat. One cannot but fail to see that on this fundamental question, the position of the most opportunist leaders of the A.P.R.A. is corroborated by Haya de la Torre's letter. It is self-evident that he who considers the North-American imperialist bourgeoisie the "guardian" of the colonial peoples' liberty cannot seek an alliance with the North-American workers. The underestimation of the rôle of the international proletariat on the colonial question arises inevitably out of the effort not to frighten the "democratic" imperialist bourgeoisie, above all, the bourgeoisie of the United States. It is very clear that he who hopes to find an ally in Roosevelt, cannot become an ally of the international proletarian vanguard. This is the fundamental line of demarcation between the policy of revolutionary struggle and the unprincipled policy of adaptation.

Haya de la Torre considers the unification of the Latin-American countries necessary and finishes his letter with this formula—"We, the representatives of the United Provinces of South America." In itself this idea is absolutely correct. The struggle for the United States of Latin America is inseparable from the struggle for the national independence of each one of the Latin-American countries. However, it is necessary to respond clearly and precisely to this question: Which roads can lead to unification? One can conclude from the extremely vague formulæ of Haya de la Torre that he hopes to convince the present governments of Latin America that they should unite voluntarily . . . under the "guardianship" of the United States? In reality, only through the revolutionary movement of the popular masses against imperialism is it possible to attain that great end. It is a difficult road, we admit, but there isn't any other.

We note, moreover, that this letter of a programmatic character does not say a single word about the Soviet Union. Does Haya de la Torre consider the U.S.S.R. the defender of colonial and semi-colonial countries, their friend and ally, or does he agree with us that under the present régime, the Soviet Union represents the greatest danger for the weak and backward peoples whose independence is far from being complete. The silence of Haya de la Torre is also determined in this case by openly opportunist considerations. It appears that de la Torre wants to hold the U.S.S.R. in "reserve" in case the United States will not support him. But he who desires many friends will lose the few he has.

These are the ideas that come to our mind after reading the A.P.R.A. leader's letter; although we limit ourselves to purely democratic criteria. Are our conclusions erroneous? We shall listen with pleasure to the answers of the A.P.R.A. representatives. We only want their replies to be more precise, more concrete and less evasive and diplomatic than Haya de la Torre's letter.

MEXICO CITY, Dec. 1938

[Translated by Bernard Ross.]

Diego RIVERA

* Haya de la Torre is the leader of the Peruvian A.P.R.A. (Popular American Revolutionary Alliance) a powerful petty-bourgeois, reformist and anti-imperialist movement which in the 1936 presidential elections received over 80% of the popular vote.

The German Left and Bolshevism

INTELLECTUAL LIFE IN THE Soviet Union throughout the rule of the epigones has consisted exclusively of the struggle against "Trotskyism", to the point where it finally perished on this diet and all that is wafted to us today from Stalin's realm is the icy air of the grave. The struggle against Trotsky, which was conducted under the sign of canonizing Lenin and Bolshevism as Stalin understood them, also collided with the disturbing shade of Rosa Luxemburg. And upon the ukase of the ruffian and illiterate to whom not very deferential history, by one of its odd dialectical capers, confided the heritage of one of the most gifted scientific minds of all times, a pack of yelping curs flung themselves upon the corpse of the great revolutionist that was thrown before them. At that time it was the self-evident duty of every Marxian publicist who takes his task seriously, to come forward in defense of the memory of the great proletarian leader and to underscore as they deserved to be her progressive sides, her immortal merits. In contrast to Stalin's kept young rogues, Rosa Luxemburg had to an outstanding degree those qualities which distinguish a true revolutionary leader: scientific seriousness in the treatment of every question, unselfish absorption in the cause, self-discipline and exemplary courage.

If, however, the question is once more put today of the content of the differences between Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg—and it must be put again, in so far as this question relates to the solution of present tasks—we cannot content ourselves with a simple obeisance to the memory of Rosa Luxemburg. Besides, it would mean today to profane instead of honor Rosa's memory if we were to allow the discussion on this theme to be influenced in the slightest by the Stalinist publications. Shafts from this side cannot touch Rosa Luxemburg. As an ideological current Stalinism is dead. It does not stand before history as accuser, but as accused.

On the other hand, there are today numerous currents which counterpose to the Bolshevik conception, so to speak, a Luxemburgian conception. These gentlemen see in Stalin's total police dictatorship and the Moscow Trials the direct result of Lenin's "centralism" and deduce that Rosa Luxemburg has remained correct in her polemic against Lenin's alleged overestimation of centralized leadership. This at first blush fascinating argument overlooks, nevertheless, the fact that if Lenin is to be made responsible for Stalin, it is no less justified to load Rosa Luxemburg with the responsibility for the rule . . . of Hitler. And actually there is in both assertions a kernel, only a kernel of truth, but it is just this kernel that must be discovered.

Comrade Max Shachtman, in an exceptionally interesting article on this theme ("Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg," *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, May 1938), endeavored to explain the differences between Lenin and Luxemburg by the historic diversity of Russian and German conditions. Now such an investigation of the objective background of the divergences is naturally entirely necessary for an understanding of them. But the investigation cannot and should not stop there; otherwise we run the risk of falling into Austro-Marxism, that is, a Marxism which confines itself to demonstrating, with the aid of the Marxian method (a caricature of the Marxian method), that everything happened as it had to happen, and which thus eliminates from history the responsibility of the subjective factor. In reality, however, we all know that the revolutionary labor movement up to now foundered not on the objective situation as such but on its subjective subjugation. Then if we are to overcome the crisis of the labor movement, we must pitilessly lay bare the ultimate causes of this subjective failure and make the balance-sheet of this dearly paid-for historical experience part of the inalienable theoretical capital of the Fourth International.

International Significance of Lenin

In defense of Luxemburg's "anti-Bolshevism" comrade Shachtman correctly points out that even Lenin erred in the estimation of the factions of the German social democracy. Lenin's great mistake consisted in this, that he applied his organizational, literary, strategical and tactical plan only to Russia, and pursued it to its final consequences only within the Russian movement; that, indeed, he regarded Bolshevism as the representation of the tendency of Bebel and Kautsky on Russian soil. So great was Lenin's confidence in Kautsky that he paid no attention to the difference that arose in 1910 between Kautsky and the German left, and thus missed a highly favorable opportunity to create a firm support for Bolshevism in Germany, to extend the Bolshevik plan internationally. And in the last analysis, this mistake, this failure, this exclusively national application of the essentially international Bolshevik plan, is the deepest reason for the isolation of the Russian Revolution and, therefore, for the Stalinist Thermidor and impending fall of the Soviet Union. Or in other words: The gifted Leninist works, *What to Do?* and *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward* of the first years of this century are in no wise of specifically Russian—as comrade Shachtman also seems to assume—but of international significance. The ideas developed in these books on the relationship of spontaneity to conscious plan, on the rôle, organizational structure and tasks of the revolutionary party and their relationship to the proletariat and the other classes of society, the relationship of Marxian science and the labor movement—all these ideas have nothing specifically Russian in them.

In his work which appeared three years after the victory of the October Revolution, *The Infantile Sickness of Communism*, Lenin then tried to make the Bolshevik conception of 1903 accessible and understandable to the West European workers. The question why this attempt failed should be treated anew in connection with the hapless March adventure of the German Communist party, and we reserve this for a later article. Here it is a question only of the following: whoever studies attentively the *Infantile Sickness* and compares it with the early writings of Lenin, will find again the same ideas and the same conception, even if in highly popularized form. That, however, would refute the view that Lenin did not consider his ideas of 1903 as "export commodities". In 1903, Lenin did not think of any exporting only because he imagined that he was importing into "backward" Russia the ideas of Bebel and Kautsky which had long ago become unavowed truisms in "progressive" Germany, in order to have them prevail over the revisionist, opportunistic and centrist currents of Martinov and Martov; whereas in reality it should have been a question of counterposing the Bolshevik conception, the program of *What to Do?*, to the whole theory and practise of the Second International, the Bernsteinian as well as the Kautskyan and Luxemburgian tendencies.

It would, however, be wrong to ignore the enormous qualitative difference in the historical mistakes of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg. While Lenin succeeded in creating the first truly Marxian party, which led the Russian proletariat to the summits of power and thereby gave the world proletariat a tremendous impulsion and a vast mass of new points of view, experiences and lessons; while Lenin's conception of 1903 found its highest confirmation in the planfully directed October uprising; Rosa's conception suffered a terrible shipwreck in January 1919, and the German left presented us, besides a series of remarkable characters and martyrs to the cause, only the bitter lesson of a new defeat.

At bottom, the disastrous mistake of Rosa Luxemburg was concentrated in the question of the rôle of the party, in the

definition of the social democracy "as the self-movement of the working class", which she counterposed to the brilliant Leninist definition of "the revolutionary social democrats as Jacobins bound up with the working class". "The social democracy as the self-movement of the working class" can never be anything but trade unionism transferred to the political sphere. Such a social democracy will never shake bourgeois society to its foundations. It will either run its head vainly against the solid walls of the bourgeois state or voluntarily submit to the latter as it stands. The proletarian class as a whole is, under the conditions of capitalism, not in a position to raise itself to such a level of consciousness as to be able to confront the bourgeoisie in a superior manner in all fields, to destroy bourgeois authority and to replace it with proletarian authority. Capitalism would not be suppression, exploitation and slavery if that were not the case. That is just why the problem is to create out the specialists closely bound up with the working class a firmly disciplined organization which, with the aid of Marxian armor, destroys bourgeois authority first in theory and then in practical reality, and leads the "self-movement" of the working class beyond the limits set for it.

Two Mistakes

Now Rosa Luxemburg had the advantage over Lenin of observing the German party at closer range. That is why she recognized its conservative character as early as 1904. She sees that the party is stuck in the mud of tradition, refuses to raise up new problems, limps behind the masses. And what conclusions does she draw from this? "The conscious initiative of the party leadership in the shaping of tactics plays only a slight rôle." "The fighting tactic of the social democracy is the result of a continuous series of great creative acts of the experimental, often elementary class struggle." "The unconscious precedes the conscious, the logic of the objective historic process precedes the subjective logic of its bearers." "The only subject upon whom the rôle of guide now devolves, is the mass-I of the working class." In short, in her despair over the conservative inertia of the social-democratic apparatus in Germany, Rosa Luxemburg created what Lenin characterized with full justice as the "not-to-be-taken-seriously nonsense of organization and tactics as a process", although, to be sure, he overlooked the fact, as we have already emphasized, that Rosa was completely in the right in her characterization of the German party. But even here Rosa committed the grosser mistake. She separated form from content, she combatted centralism as such, instead of counterposing the centralism of the revolutionary Marxists to that of the opportunists. In this way, Rosa, in spite of the fact that she agreed with Bolshevism in most political questions at the international congresses, was driven to the same position to which Menshevism fled in the face of Lenin's intransigence. And history prepared the same fate for both of them, deciding each time in its own manner for "centralism": while the Bolsheviks drive the Mensheviks out of the Soviets, Noske succeeds in flinging Spartacus out of the chamber of the German revolution and shutting the door behind it.

The lack of final consistency accompanied Rosa throughout her political life, whereas Lenin, precisely because of the relentlessness with which he carried out a once recognized necessity, was in a position to accomplish his historic mission.

In her work written in 1899, *Social Reform or Social Revolution*, which will forever remain a pearl in Marxian polemical literature, Rosa Luxemburg rightfully demanded the expulsion of the Bernsteinians from the party. In the second edition of this work, which appeared in 1908, she omitted all the corresponding passages. Bernsteinism had eaten its way into the flesh of the German party like a fungus; the flesh was decomposing. But what new consequence did Rosa draw? None at all. She threatened the petrified leadership: the masses will teach you new

mores! But if the masses will correct the mistakes of the party out of their own initiative, why then the demand for Bernstein's expulsion in 1899? In 1910, Rosa saw through the pedantic officialdom of Kautsky and attacked him sharply in a series of articles. Yet again she does not draw the final consequence of her judgment. Although she stops her Sunday visits to Kautsky and thus gives new evidence of her spotless and exemplary character, she is nevertheless lacking politically in the same measure of resoluteness. If the party was ravaged by Bernsteinism and even the "Marxian center" of the *Neue Zeit* had come to a standstill in the routine of the "tactic that stood the test for forty years", then it was absolutely necessary to unturl the Marxian banner anew and in the eyes of all, with the formal question whether to constitute a new party immediately or to remain for a while inside the social democracy as a firmly-disciplined faction, playing a minor rôle. In any case, however, it was necessary to come out against the reformism and centrism of the social democracy in every single question and permanently, to drive it out of reality instead of letting oneself be driven out by it. The German left never raised this question clearly, much less did it have a firm plan for resolving it.

Luxemburg's Illusions

It is known that Lenin first regarded as a *Hobenzollern* forgery the number of the *Vorwärts* which brought the report of the vote of the German social democracy in the Reichstag. This is not to be wondered at and is in accord with his previous attitude, i.e., with his illusions relative to Kautsky and the German center. But Rosa, who had seen through the opportunistic character of the German party ten years earlier, who experienced the worst disillusionment above all at the Jena congress of 1913—what was her attitude? She gave way to convulsive sobbing in the *Vorwärts* editorial board, thought she was going mad, yes, even the thought of suicide came to her mind. Again a reaction which wrings from us the greatest human sympathy and respect for this singular woman, but which nevertheless also clearly discloses the main political weakness of the German lefts. She had seen through the Bernsteinians and the Scheidemanns, the Legiens and even the Kautskys and Hilferdings, and in spite of it she was steeped in illusions about the social democracy, in spite of it she believed that this Bernstein-Kautskyan social democracy would pass a great historical test. In reality, if the German left had drawn the final consequence from its criticism of the official social democracy—and whoever does not draw the final consequence in politics, lands unfailingly under the wheels—it would have been prepared for the 4th of August, foretold it and warned against it. It is clear that in this case the catastrophe of the 4th of August would not have taken on anything like its scope, the reorganization of the vanguard would have proceeded much more easily and the revolutionary maturing accelerated much differently, and the German revolution in general would have taken on a different course. Thus even Liebknecht allowed himself to be taken by surprise by the decision of the Reichstag fraction and it took months for a tiny handful to assemble again: Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Klara Zetkin, Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogsches, Paul Levi. The profounder reason for the illusions of the German left with regard to the whole social democracy was founded, in turn, in its main error, in the disastrous ignoring of the reciprocal relation between party and masses. Rosa Luxemburg and her friends consoled themselves with this, that in the great historical crisis the masses would correct the party and sweep it along. Now they had to witness the fact that there was nothing for the masses to do in this situation except to follow—even if perhaps while gritting their teeth—the instructions of the party.

Yet, while Lenin immediately draws the last consequence from the 4th of August with his customary keenness: "The Second International is dead, long live the Third!" and now seeks

to develop, also in the International, all the elements to a Bolshevik conception of things (see, for example, his criticism of the Junius brochure), the German left continues to remain steeped in its fundamental mistake. The same erroneous conceptions on the rôle and task of the party which Rosa Luxemburg defended in 1904, recur in an article which she published on March 31, 1917 in the Duisburg organ of the U.S.P.D., *Der Kampf*. "The Spartacus League tendency," it says, "does not counterpose another program and a fundamentally quite different tactic to the Independent social democracy, which supply at every moment and as a permanent structure the basis of a separated party existence [that's just what the problem was! W.H.], rather it is only [!] another historical tendency of the whole movement of the proletariat, from which follows, to be sure, a different attitude in almost every question of tactics and organization. The opinion, however, that from this follows the necessity or even only the objective possibility of now jamming the workers into different, carefully separated party cages corresponding to the two tendencies of the opposition, is based upon a conventicle-conception of the party."

From the "not-to-be-taken-seriously nonsense" of the organization as a process, runs a straight line to this no less curious philosophy of an organization which, although it does not counterpose to the opportunistic tendency any independent program and any fundamentally quite different tactic, nevertheless does embody "another historical tendency". With such light ideological baggage did Spartacus march in the German revolution. The catastrophic effect was not to be averted.

The German Catastrophe

Came November 9, the "spontaneous people's revolution", which the S.P.D. resisted to the very last minute, but for which neither the Independent S.P.D. nor Spartacus had taken the initiative. The November revolution in Germany could overturn the solid structure of capitalism just as little as could the February revolution in Russia; in both cases they were only able to eliminate the monarchistic embellishment. The real work first began after November. It is of course to the honor of Spartacus that it recognized this and refused to be party to the general round of fraternization which always followed every popular uprising organized "from below" and victorious at the first shot and into which such "Bolsheviks" as Stalin also fell in February 1917. Still, Spartacus committed the reverse mistake and adopted an ultimatum attitude towards the masses. The same Rosa Luxemburg who in her criticism of the Russian revolution had reproached the Bolsheviks for the lack of democracy and the suppression of the Soviet minority, refused to be elected into the Executive Council of the Berlin Workers' and Soldiers' Councils together with the social democrats of the Ebert tendency. The masses did not accept this ultimatum of the Spartacus League, and the result was an Executive Council without Spartacus. The further result was that Spartacus did not get the slightest influence upon the elections to the first German Council Congress and remained without representation in it. Liebknecht had to confine himself to impotent attempts to conquer the Congress "from without". These events ought now to have sufficed to show Spartacus what its task was: namely, Lenin's program of April 1917. Patiently explain, restrain the small revolutionary minority from ill-considered steps, penetrate into the mass organizations and all the classes of the population, expose and polemically annihilate the reformists and centrists, in order finally, at the historically ripe moment, to proceed to the insurrection.

The founding congress of the communist party, which finally takes place at the end of December, decides however to drive the line of abstentionism to the point of absurdity, to boycott the elections to the National Assembly; there is even a discussion on withdrawing from the mass trade unions. And Rosa, who had just accused the Bolsheviks because they renounced the institution of the

National Assembly *after the victory*, that is, possessing power they exercised the dictatorship—Rosa suffered the misfortune of becoming the prisoner of a party which renounces the National Assembly *before the victory*, which, as a small minority, undertakes the hopeless attempt of imposing its ultimatum on the vast majority. Although she herself spoke for participation in the elections and lamented the "immaturity" of the congress, she did not recognize that her own disorganizing organizational principles had suffered shipwreck here, that in her own way she had created a Utopian-radical instead of a Marxian party. No surgeon can operate with a dull knife, no Marxian can act with an undisciplined, Utopian party. And still Rosa does not dare to carry out the break with this Utopian element, she herself becomes the victim of the organizational fetishism with which she wrongly reproached Lenin, and she goes to the operating table of history with a dull instrument. Possibly it is only because she has still not yet grasped the fact that the success or the failure of the revolution depends upon her own self, upon her own policy. And thus we also find once more in the Spartacus program, adopted, characteristically, unanimously by the same congress which decided on abstention from the elections, the old mistakes. Just read the following passages: "In tenacious struggle with capital, breast to breast in every factory, by direct pressure of the masses, by strikes, by creating their permanent organs of representation, the workers can achieve control over production and finally the actual direction." "The Spartacus League is not a party which seeks to reach dominion over the working masses or through the working masses. The Spartacus League is only [!] the most conscious part of the proletariat, which, at every step of the whole broad mass of the working class points out its historical tasks." It follows clearly that Rosa Luxemburg had an entirely inadequate picture of the course of the proletarian revolution. She conceived of the proletarian revolution as a sort of new November revolution, as a chain of strikes and uprisings which finally merge into a general strike or even a popular uprising. With her the rôle of the party was confined to summoning the masses to action, until finally the power will fall into the lap of the party as a ripe fruit, something like the social democracy reaped the fruits of the first revolution. She did not recognize that it is the task of the party to assemble the masses and to discipline them like troops for a battle, and that the leadership of the party, like a gifted Field Commander or General Staff, must have the strategic plan of battle in its head and convert it into a reality.

It was the ignoring of this task of the party that misled Spartacus to the worst mistake that a revolutionary party can ever commit, namely, to play with the insurrection. For the Spartacus insurrection of January 1919 was nothing but a completely planless, positively inconceivably naive playing with the fire of insurrection. The narrow-minded counter-revolutionists, Hohenzollern sergeants-majors, stupid fanatics of Order and bloodhounds of the bourgeoisie, Noske and Ebert, set a trap for Spartacus and Spartacus fell into the trap with covered eyes. And thus did also Liebknecht, Luxemburg and Jogisches suffer the typical fate of all German revolutionists, which the exceptionally talented poet Oskar Panizza, who later went mad, epitomized in the unsentimental phrase: "Until now the Germans have unfortunately known only the passive form of beheading: being beheaded." While on the contrary, the Russians under the leadership of the Bolsheviks proceeded to the realization of the prediction made as far back as 1896 by the same Panizza: "Russia, that lurking brain, will some day burst out frightfully and the people of the Bakunins and Dostoevskys will gain its freedom by a fallen head." Between beheading and being beheaded, however, between active and passive, between Lenin and Luxemburg, there is no compromise.

Nov. 10, 1938

Walter HHL

[Max Shachtman will comment on this article in an early issue of the review. ED.]

Behind the Farmers' Vote

THE ELECTIONS DEALT a powerful blow at the Roosevelt administration and Democratic control of the national government. The Democratic majority in the Senate, which had been 57 before the elections, was reduced to 41 after the election returns. That a more severe defeat would have been certain if all Senators were up for election instead of the one-third provided by the Constitution is proved by what happened in the House of Representatives. There the Democratic majority, 233 before the elections was slashed almost two-thirds and reduced to 88.

Not only were the elections a blow at the reformist wing of finance capital, represented by the New Deal Democrats, but it was also accompanied by the virtual decimation of the Progressives and the Farmer-Laborites. Before the elections there were five Farmer-Laborites and seven Progressives—twelve in all. Only four survived the election returns. The middle ground upon which all these reformists were trying to stabilize capitalism was crumbling beneath their feet. As usual, the tight-rope walkers and the unconnected "friends of labor" were the ones to feel most sharply the political impact of the crisis.

The most important reason for the Democratic defeat was the revolt of the middle class and the farmers. The farmers were especially important, defeating the Democratic candidates with monotonous regularity throughout the middle and far west. The farmers will become politically more and more important with the passing years. It would be wise to see why they turned against the Democratic Party.

One reason given is that the farmers were hostile to the curtailment of crops imposed upon them by the New Deal. The implication is that the farmers like to produce big crops, that the enforced curtailment of production ran against the farmers' "instinct of workmanship" and that they considered the New Deal economy of scarcity immoral, unnatural, and ungodly. For these and similar reasons they turned upon the Democrats and cast them forth from office.

Such an explanation has much in its favor. It has been widely publicized by the Republicans. It can be easily accepted, since it is current coin. Moreover, no one can question the truth that the farmers are hostile to the Democrats—witness the elections—and the Democrats are friendly to curtailment of crops. Therefore, and the logic seems so obvious, the farmers are also hostile to curtailment of crops. Many a muddle-headed reformist has repeated this logic and it is beginning to seep into our own ranks.

If this were true, the New Deal should have been overwhelmingly defeated in 1934. By that year the crop-curtailement policy of the Roosevelt Administration was in full swing. The production of wheat was curtailed to 526 millions of bushels, and one had to hark back to 1896 to find a wheat crop that was so small. Corn was down to 1,478 million bushels for the United States, and even the year 1880 had a greater growth. Cotton was down to 9.5 million running bales, the smallest crop produced in the twelve years preceding. If this explanation were true, and the crop-curtailement policy of the New Deal is the reason why the farmers voted the Democrats out of office, then they should have voted them out much more quickly in 1934. Perhaps the proverbial backwardness of the farmer may be invoked. Then certainly the farmers would have awakened by 1936

and refrained from voting the Democrats into office by the greatest landslide in the history of American politics.

If their curtailing crops were the basic reason for defeating the Democrats, then conversely the Democrats would have been voted into office overwhelmingly in 1938. For wheat production, which was so low in 1934, had risen to 874 million bushels in 1937. This was 250 million bushels more than 1936 and 200 million more bushels than could be consumed in the United States at the current rate of consumption. Cotton production, which had fallen so low in 1934, rose to an all-time high in 1937 of 18.7 million bales. Corn harvested as grain, which had dropped to 1,253.8 million bushels in 1936, returned almost to normal in 1937 with an output estimated at 2,343.6 million bushels. These hard facts shatter to smithereens the myth that they had limited production. Had the fate of the Democrats risen and fallen with the production of crops, they would have been voted into office with far greater acclaim today than in 1934 and 1936.

The fact is, the farmers did not defeat the Democrats because the latter curtailed the crops. The plain facts show that they did not. And that is precisely why the farmers tossed the Democrats out of office—*because they did not curtail the production of crops.*

For this reason it would be disastrous to interpret the vote against the Democratic party as a vote against the New Deal aims in agriculture. On the contrary, it is a defeat for the Democrats because they did not carry out in practise the aims of the New Deal. The clue to what these aims are is given by the one word "adjustment"—adjustment of prices upward in order to increase profits for the farmers; adjustment of production downwards in order to make it equal domestic demand and in this way ensure a more stable and higher price; adjustment of purchasing power of the farmers, through control of production and prices on the one hand and through government subsidies on the other, in order to make it equal the one they had during 1909-1914, the golden age of the farmers.

The farmers defeated the Democrats because they did not fulfill the first aim of the New Deal: the adjustment of prices upward. Prices averaged considerably lower during the period of Roosevelt regulation. This becomes crystal clear when we compare the average prices for wheat, corn, and cotton, the three great crops around which the whole agricultural program is built, and see how they fared during the five years preceding the New Deal and the five years of regulation. The price of wheat during 1928-1932, the five years preceding the New Deal, averaged 69 cents a bushel on the farm. In the years 1933-1937, which were five years of regulation, the price had fallen to 50 cents, a drop of almost thirty per cent. In cotton, too, the Democrats failed to fulfill the aims of the New Deal, since the price here also fell about thirty percent, being cut from 11.28 cents to less than 8 cents a pound on the farm; and in corn, the 57 cents a bushel received on the farm during Democratic regulation was one half what they got before. The farmers wanted higher prices.—Here is the cause of the farm revolt. The New Deal promise was higher prices. The Democratic betrayed their promise and the farmers. The farmers kicked them out of office.

Nor, for that matter, did the Democrats succeed in adjusting production to equal domestic consumption by curtailing crops. This second aim of the New Deal had to be fulfilled if prices were to be stabilized at a high level. As has been shown before, the Democrats succeeded at the beginning in curtailing production. The farmers elected them then. They failed to curtail crops in 1937. The over-supply in relation to the domestic demand, in addition to the general recession, drove farm prices down pre-

* The editors find themselves in disagreement with a number of the points raised in this article, and in particular with the apparent failure of the writer to understand the role of agriculture as a whole in the economy of monopoly capitalism or to differentiate in his analysis among the various strata of the agricultural population. They nevertheless believe the material presented to be of sufficient interest to merit publication. The columns of the magazine will be open to comment and discussion of the problems herein raised.—ED.

capitately during the latter half of 1937 and the first half of 1938.

This double failure—failure to keep up prices and keep down production—shattered the vision encouraged by the New Deal—purchasing power parity. Not that the Democrats did nothing to aid the achievement of this vision. They contributed enough to give the hopes a foundation in reality. "Cash income from the sale of farm products and from government payments in 1937 totaled \$8,521,000,000 (according to the estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics) or 7.6 percent more than the \$7,920,000,000 received during 1936 and about double the \$4,328,000,000 from marketings in 1932," says the *Survey of Current Business* of March 1938. But this was far short of the 11 to 12 billion dollars that the farmers averaged between 1923 and 1929. And while the purchasing power of the farmers went up much faster than their income, because of government aid, the recession that swooped down struck them even harder. 1937 marked a turning point in their onward march to purchasing power parity. "The year began with the purchasing power of farm products at the highest level since November 1925; but, with prices received declining sharply in the course of the year and prices paid showing relatively little change, the ratio dropped from 101 in January to 81 in December," continues the same issue. This 20% slash in the purchasing power of the farmer continued and grew in 1938, and showed the Democrats unable and unwilling to achieve the aims of the New Deal for agriculture.

That the farmers should defeat the Democrats was to be expected. Sentiment played quite a subordinate part in the elections. The Democrats had not delivered the bacon—higher prices and purchasing power parity. The farmers were willing to do anything—restrict the bounty of nature, destroy the plenty inherent in mechanized agriculture, mutilate their "instinct of workmanship", submit to the reactionary aims of the New Deal and forget the myth of individualism to take farm relief—so long as prices and purchasing power could be restored. Farmers in only two communities of the 140 surveyed by the thorough *Rural Trends in Depression Years* were quoted as saying, when they received the subsidies, "We don't believe it's right but if Uncle Sam insists on giving away money we might as well get ours." And even here the feeling of righteousness was harnessed safely to—profits.

However, the farmers' swing from the Democrats to the Republicans was the agitated action of men whose day is ending and whose doom is sealed. For neither Republicans, LaFollette Progressives, nor any other capitalist party can save them. The cause of their doom is this: The farmers as a class have become antagonistic to the needs of society and to the requirements of the dominating forces of modern capitalism.

The antagonism today between the farming class and the needs of society is basic. Society requires an increasing output in order to raise constantly the per capita consumption of the great majority, and in order to increase constantly the standard of living. But the farmers strangle the productive forces and restrict the bounty inherent in modern agriculture. Based as they are upon capitalist property-relationships the farmers, as a class, must reduce acreage and output in order the better to boost up declining prices and profits. This economic struggle between profits and plenty is the basis for the fundamental conflict between the needs of society, and the needs of the farmers.

The farmers as a class come into conflict not only with the needs of society but also with the requirements of the dominating forces of modern capitalism. High prices for farm goods have a depressing effect upon the prices of manufactured goods sold in the cities. Higher profits for the farmers mean lower profits for industrial and finance capital. Agriculture, whose profitable expansion was at one time indispensable to the expansion of industry and finance, is now a drag upon both. Like men in a

sinking submarine, the capitalist groups are grasping for the same life-giving oxygen—profits. The destruction of the prices and profits of the farming class is essential to keeping up the prices and profits of industrial and finance capital.

Their anomalous position makes the farmers an easy adherent of fascism. Mulcted by industrial and finance capital, betrayed by the Republican and Democratic parties, tortured by economic decline, the farmers cannot rest. The fascists, whose grandiose promises and aggressive actions that seem to indicate a desire for fulfilling their promises, are certain to attract them.

The only alternative for the revolutionary party is to put forward and carry into action a concrete program directed to driving a wedge between the most oppressed strata of the agricultural population and the well-to-do farmers, putting the oppressed of the farm areas in motion behind the revolutionary leadership of the city workers. This will break them off from ideological and political submission to capitalism. But we can free them from their ideological submission only if we free ourselves first. To ensure this, never subordinate ourselves to prevailing "sentiment" and the capitalist propaganda organs which dominate it. We must ourselves decide perspectives after analysis of economic trends, class needs and the level of the class struggle instead of following the "sentiment" of the moment.

DAVID COWLES

Karl Kautsky

THE DEATH OF Karl Kautsky has passed unnoticed. To the young generation this name says comparatively little. Yet there was a time when Kautsky was in the true sense of the word the teacher who instructed the international proletarian vanguard. To be sure, his influence in the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially also in France, was less considerable; but that is explained by the feeble influence of Marxism in general in these countries. On the other hand, in Germany, in Austria, in Russia and in the other Slavic countries, Kautsky became an indisputable Marxian authority. The attempts of the present historiography of the Comintern to present things as if Lenin, almost in his youth, had seen in Kautsky an opportunist and had declared war against him, are radically false. Almost up to the time of the World War, Lenin considered Kautsky as the genuine continuator of the cause of Marx and Engels.

This aberration was explained by the character of the epoch, which was an era of capitalist ascension, of democracy, of adaptation of the proletariat. The revolutionary side of Marxism had changed into an indefinite, in any case, a distant perspective. The struggle for reforms and propaganda was on the order of the day. Kautsky occupied himself with commenting upon and justifying the policy of reform from the point of view of the revolutionary perspective. It was taken for granted that with the change of the objective conditions, Kautsky would know how to arm the party with other methods. That was not the case. The appearance of an epoch of great crises and of great shocks revealed the fundamentally reformist character of the social democracy and of its theoretician Kautsky. Lenin broke resolutely with Kautsky at the beginning of the war. After the October revolution he published a merciless book on the "renegade Kautsky". As for Marxism, Kautsky, from the beginning of the war, behaved incontestably like a renegade. But as for himself, he was only half a renegade from his past, so to speak: when the problems of the class struggle were posed in all their acuteness, Kautsky found himself constrained to draw the final conclusions of his organic opportunism.

Kautsky undoubtedly leaves behind numerous works of value in the field of Marxian theory, which he applied successfully in the most variegated domains. His analytical thought was distinguished

by an exceptional force. But it was not the universal creative intelligence of Marx, of Engels, or of Lenin: all his life Kautsky was, at bottom, a talented commentator. His character, like his thought, lacked audacity and sweep, without which revolutionary politics is impossible. From the very first cannon-shot, he occupied an ill-defined pacifist position; then he became one of the leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic party which tried to create a 2½ International; then, with the débris of the Independent party he returned under the wing of the social democracy. Kautsky understood nothing of the October revolution, showed the petty-bourgeois savant's fright before it and devoted to it not a few works imbued with a spirit of fierce hostility. His works in the last quarter of a century are characterized by a complete theoretical

and political decline.

The foundering of the German and Austrian social democracy was also the foundering of all the reformist conceptions of Kautsky. To be sure, he still continued to affirm to the last that he had hopes of a "better future", of a "regeneration" of democracy, etc.; this passive optimism was only the inertia of a laborious and in its way honest long life, but it contained no independent perspective. We remember Kautsky as our former teacher to whom we once owed a good deal, but who separated himself from the proletarian revolution and from whom, consequently, we had to separate ourselves.

Leon TROTSKY

COYOACAN, D. F., Nov. 8, 1938.

Is Austria a Nation?

THE NATIONAL QUESTION FOR THE AUSTRIANS IN LIGHT OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

AFTER AUSTRIA'S annexation by Germany, the Stalinists issued a call to the "People of Austria" in which they said: . . . Defend yourself, resist the foreign invaders . . . Catholics and socialists . . . join together . . . into a front of all Austrians . . . All party distinctions retreat into the background before the sacred task today confronting the Austrian people . . . to drive Hitler's *soldateska* out of Austria . . . Make a reality out of the slogan: "*Rot-weiss-rot bis in den Tod!*"¹ The Austrian people has been ravished but . . . by its own strength and with the aid of the world-front of peace, a free, independent Austria will rise again . . .

In August 1938, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria declared in a manifesto:

The Austrian people has accomplished its state, economic and cultural evolution . . . under other conditions than in the [German] Reich. *By virtue of its independent history, of its will to independence, the Austrian people was and became . . . an independent whole, a people*—in the family of Central European peoples—*capable of living by its own strength, no different than the German-speaking Swiss.*

At the beginning of August 1938, the Central Committee of the C.P.A. adopted a resolution in which it regrets having "underestimated the possibility of a union of the labor movement with sections of the Schuschnigg camp and of the Fatherland Front."

Furthermore, the existence of the Austrian nation, violated by Germany and hence under nationally alien dominance, is again emphasized. It says literally:

A special weakness of the [communist] party lay in the fact that it did not, punctually and decisively enough, put clearly before the popular masses the fact that *the Austrians had developed historically into a nation of their own and are not a part of the German nation . . .* (All italics mine.—C. C.)

These are only a few juicy examples from the flood of official and semi-official Stalinist enunciations of the same content: Long live the People's Front with the Schuschnigg gangs, long live the independent Austrian nation! That is, back to Versailles!

It is not easy to demonstrate *exactly* to a non-Austrian the unbelievable idiocy of the Stalinist discovery of the "Austrian nation". Nations have arisen time and again through the fusion of different peoples but also through the splitting apart of originally identical peoples. Centrifugal and centripetal forces have always been at work at the same time. In the long run, the political-social processes culminate in psychological acts: in the formation of a new national consciousness. In principle, therefore, the rise of an Austrian nation would by no means be excluded. The Stalinist idiocy lies, however, in the most primitive confounding of the worst provincialism of the most retrograde strata with a new national culture, that is, with a new national

consciousness—of the most advanced and representative strata and not backward or declassed cretins! But we leave it to the Austro-Marxists to refute the Stalinist nonsense with scientific thoroughness and therewith to expound some commonplaces. We refer below to an Austro-Marxian article devoted to this purpose on the question: Is there an Austrian nation? We consider a debate with this article to be far more fruitful. Some information on a few facts which are perhaps unknown to the reader appears, however, to be indicated.

The Stalinists did indeed attempt to defile the labor movement by solicitations to the Schuschnigg gangs.² The absurd theory of an Austrian nation was propagated in the past only by a few monarchists, a few snobbish intellectuals and—the Christian Social party. The latter was founded towards the end of the last century by Dr. Lüger as the party of the little man, of the decaying middle class, and was equipped with a Catholic-social-anti-Semitic, demagogic doctrine. It was a nest of corruption, survived the war, and continued to rot along with the petty bourgeoisie. Dollfuss-Schuschnigg took over from it a rather extremely narrow mass basis and something like an ideology—primarily "Austriandom". It was this dictatorship that glorified the "Austrian nation", something like a community interested in folk lore which carefully nurtures the barbaric dialect of a village idiot. The ideological level of this dictatorship and its "Austriandom" is positively unimaginable. It lost its scanty support almost entirely to the Nazis. Nobody ever took the "Austrian nation" seriously, hardly even Schuschnigg. That was reserved for the Stalinists.

In Nos. 9 and 10 of the Austro-Marxian *Sozialistische Kampf*, a spokesman named F. Valentin refutes the Stalinist standpoint with considerable diligence. He quotes Otto Bauer, who defined the "nation" as a community of character resulting from community of destiny, and Kautsky, who missed in this definition the community of language. Valentin takes delight in refuting the C.P.A. by—Stalin, and quotes his work, *Marxism and the National Question*.³ In it the criteria of the nation are enumerated as: community of language, territory and economy and a psychical singularity revealed in a community of culture. On one page after another, Valentin shows that none of these criteria is applicable to the so-called Austrian nation. The "different economic and political conditions of life" of the Austrians as compared with other Germans, as adduced by the Stalinists, are no argument: most nations and national states arose in the struggle against these

¹ Without success. The Vienna workers, summoned for help by the creatures of the murderous Schuschnigg regime on the very eve of the *Anschluss*, demonstrated under the slogan: "Down with the Nazis—not for Schuschnigg!"

² This is the theoretical work of Stalin before the war which is incessantly quoted as proof of his fertility.

³ Red-white-red to the very death!—the slogan of the Schuschnigg gangs (*Heimwehr*).

"different conditions", in wars and revolutions, as was especially the case with Italy or Poland. Austrians and the other Germans undoubtedly speak the same language; they have a common territory to the extent that it was divided only by political (dynastic and then Versailles) frontiers. Geography does not represent the slightest hindrance.

Historically too there is a direct connection reaching from the Middle Ages to 1866, the Peace of Nikolsburg, in which Bismarck's Prussia forced its rival, Habsburg-Austria, to quit the German League. The political-economic raggedness of the Austrian Germans was distinguished in no respect, until 1871, when the Hohenzollern empire was founded, from that of the other Germans. The progressive forces of the young German bourgeoisie rebelled in Austria, just as in the other countries populated by Germans, against the dynasties and the economic and political dismemberment: the revolution of 1848, despite the dilletante contrary contentions of the Stalinists, was not different in German-Austria than in the other German territories—an unsuccessful struggle for national unification against the political boundaries which the mediæval dynastic powers had drawn across the body of the people. Even the peasant wars at the beginning of modern times, raised to an especially Austrian tradition by the Stalinists, were of course only a part of the German peasant wars. Valentin proves by Marx, Engels and Lenin that there was never any doubt about the Austrian Germans belonging to the German nation. He instructs the Stalinists that the development of the nations is a bourgeois-democratic affair and in no case that of a revolutionary proletarian party. He recalls that the German-Austrian "independence" since 1918 was in no way the product of will but rather of compulsion and that, moreover, even the Stalinists did not dare dispute the fact that the Sudeten-Germans, allotted to Czechoslovakia by the treaties of Versailles-St. Germain, belong to the German nation. He is against the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia because "in view of the fascist imperialism" of Germany, proletarian interests take precedence over the right of national self-determination of the fascist majority among the Sudeten-Germans.

We cannot dwell here upon the individual distortions of the Marxian standpoint as Valentin counterposes it to the Stalinists. We develop below the standpoint of Marxism. But what policy does Valentin propose for Austria? The one formulated by the Austro-Marxists about six months ago at a conference in Brussels: "In view of the accomplished fact" they declared that the liberation of the Austrian people from Nazism is possible only "by an All-German revolution . . ." Tearfully, Valentin records that first the Habsburgs and then the treaties of Versailles-St. Germain prohibited the *Anschluss* of the Austrian-Germans to Germany—which manifestly made it impossible.

We know that history is not at all made by the ominous "historical process" alone, but to an appreciable degree by men (that is, not by Austro-Marxists). In the complaint about the "forbidden" *Anschluss* lies the whole Austro-Marxist soul. A fawning respect for the power of others—called "accomplished facts"—is the obverse side of the habitual impotence to accomplish any facts on one's own, and the historical mission of always demonstrating scientifically how and why the proletariat can do nothing right now. But history does not brook being joked with.

What must happen, happens. When it does not happen through the forces of progress—then it happens anyway, but through the forces of reaction with a reversed sign! Since the proletariat, hampered by its treacherous leadership, did not liberate the productive forces in time from the fetters of private property by means of planned socialist economy, there followed—their strangulation through fascist economy! Since the Soviet United States of Europe was not created by the proletarian revolution, there arose—the League of Nations! Instead of the liberation of the nations by the world revolution, there followed—"national unification" by fascism!

An instructive glance backward at the theory and practise of the Austro-Marxists is in place here: Otto Bauer's well-known book on the national question proposed a rigid fixation of the spiritual properties of the nations inside of Old-Austria and thus satisfied neither the "legitimate" claims of the bourgeois revolution nor the dynamically progressive character of the loosening, fusion and shifting of the historically national complex begun by the industrial proletariat. And so the Austro-Marxists fought "on the basis of facts" for fossilized Austria instead of propagating its destruction. Valentin emphasizes the former struggle of his party comrades against the nationalist degeneration of the Slavic socialists in Old-Austria. Against the same degeneration of his own part—which is grounded in accomplished facts—he has no objections.

It was not the revolution that smashed Austria, but rather victorious imperialism of the West! But the latter immediately accomplished facts upon whose basis the Austro-Marxists promptly took their stand. These facts were the so-called national states of Central and Eastern Europe (torture chambers of the nations as well as of the productive forces), along with a crippled Austria condemned to independence and hunger. Although Renner, Bauer and Co. declared Austria to be a part of Germany in 1918—the *Entente forbade the Anschluss!* Valentin is wrong on that score too! The Sudeten-Germans were turned over to the Czechs and then to the Nazis by no means "because of the fascist imperialism" of Germany but as a result of the recognition of the accomplished facts of Versailles on the part of Valentin's party comrades in Vienna, Berlin and Prague. (The Sudeten-German branch of the Austro-Marxists hurried into the Prague government!) *And what did the Austro-Marxists learn from their glorious history? The continued recognition of accomplished facts: the decision that the arena of the social revolution is fixed by the boundaries drawn by Hitler! That is the meaning of the slogan of the "All-German revolution".*

The nation as an essential historical category exists approximately since the French Revolution. The productive forces of young capitalism revolted successfully at that time against the historic feudal districts. They found in the language communities that had arisen for the most part under the old régime the more or less adequate room for their most favorable unfolding. The process of the rise of the nations is as contradictory as the forces that created them. The existing degree of development, historical residues, geography and other factors constituted *centripetal and centrifugal currents*. Thus, by splitting off from their less progressive ancestral kin, nations arose out of the Hollanders and the Flemings. The Provençals became French, but the Catalans (and Portuguese) did not become Spaniards. Italians, Poles and others became nations despite the political-economic boundaries, while Czechs, Hungarians and Slovaks remained in common with other peoples. The inhabitants of the U.S.A. and of Latin America became independent nations despite their language community with the mother country. The attempt to fix within a definition the "nation" which is constantly in a process of change, does not appear to be very meaningful.

Evolution is not even. The bourgeoisie—not even in Europe—did not everywhere resolve its national task! Thus, in particular, the result of the defeat of the democratic revolution of 1848 was the uneffected union of the Germans. History punished them for it by a half-union under—the Hohenzollerns, and therewith bestowed upon them all the burdens of capitalism and only a modest share of those cultural streams of young nationalism which at one time so richly fertilized the victorious democracies, especially France. It can be said—with exaggeration, to be sure, but for the purpose of bluntness: the Germans never became a nation! (For while the nation creates the national state, it creates and develops, in its turn, the nation.) Then couldn't it be said *that Hitler is progressive at least in a certain sense?* Hasn't he united the Germans, like a sort of belated Cavour, created the

German nation, even if under the fascist knout, and thereby enforced what the Versailles victors had forbidden? Wasn't the *Anschluss* legitimate in this sense? Our Austro-Marxist, with his "All-German revolution" would have to reply in the affirmative in order to be consistent!

Yet the Anschluss was historically as illegitimate as could be! For the past 150 years the productive forces have developed enormously. The national boundaries are now the same strait-jacket as were once the feudal. The "nation" is a category of the bourgeois-democratic epoch. In the youth of capitalism, it was progressive, which is not at all the case in the twentieth century. In Germany, *a progressive postulate has become reactionary before it was fulfilled!* The "nation" has long ago lost its rich economic and cultural functions and continues to appear only in a single—negative—function: as national oppression!

National emancipation, the creation of the nation must nevertheless—apparently paradoxically—be carried through. But, so to say, only for a moment. The productive forces no longer permit the completion of the bourgeois revolution, for their field of operations is beyond the ethnographic frontiers. Hence, also, capitalism is inexorably imperialistic, and it can no longer carry out any democratic postulates. Only the victorious proletariat can. But by means of its victory it liberates precisely the productive

forces from the national fetters and thus eliminates the very premise of the democratic postulate of national freedom at the moment when it is fulfilled. For lack of any need, the "nation" and with it national freedom proves to be as superfluous as religion under socialism.

Hitler's "*Anschluss*" is therefore historically just as illegitimate as the Austro-Marxist "All-German revolution". Hitler freed a nation which continues to exist (if it does exist) only because the reaction and the Austro-Marxists have prevented the appearance of the truth—only latent because of the gruesome coercion—that it is long since the "nation" has ceased to be. The German nation was never born, it rotted inside the womb of history! Hitler did not bring a child into the world—but a stinking corpse.

And the Austro-Marxists? They take the corpse as a "given fact" and think of settling down in it after the famous "All-German revolution". But this will not prevent the proletariat from fulfilling victoriously its historic mission, *the social revolution on a world scale*, and from dropping the Austro-Marxists upon that particular dust-heap which history long ago prepared especially for them.

Early November, 1938.

Charles CROMPTON.

A Letter and Some Notes

DEAR COMRADES:

Here are a few pages of discussion on Kronstadt 1921 in which I reply simultaneously to L. D. Trotsky and to A. Ciliga. I should like to see THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, where our comrade Trotsky has several times criticized my views on this important subject.

In publishing in your August number a letter which I sent to you, you followed it with commentaries which did not come to my attention, as I did not receive that number. I am sorry. I am told that you raised the question of my attitude towards the P.O.U.M. I would not have failed to answer you fundamentally. Since I am not acquainted with your text, I confine myself today to two remarks:

1. Our comrade L. D. Trotsky wrote recently that "it is necessary to learn to think. . . ." On this point (as on many others) I am entirely of his opinion. It is even necessary, I think, to learn to discuss and that means not to mix up with historical subjects subjects of present-day policy; not to inject into the discussion of a question concerning the Russian revolution in 1921 the polemics concerning the Spanish revolution in 1936-1938. The Marxian method is more serious and more concrete; or if one wishes to discuss, for the purpose of broad syntheses, all the great questions at once, it is well charitably to notify the reader and the interlocutor of the fact; for my part I would excuse myself. . . .

2. On the P.O.U.M., however. This heroic and persecuted workers' party alone represented revolutionary Marxism in the ranks of the Spanish revolution. It gave proof of clairvoyance and a magnificent courage. It was all the more up against it by the fact that even in the best days the uncomprehending and brutal attitude of the Third International towards anarchists and syndicalists had made Marxism unpopular in the labor movement of Spain. Nevertheless, it was not infallible, far from it. And I do not dream of reproaching it for that, for I know of nobody, really, of nobody, infallible down there. On the other hand, nothing is easier than for a dozen comrades to meet, and then announce that they possess the monopoly of the full truth, the only correct theory, the infallible recipe on how to make the revolution succeed—and thenceforth to denounce as traitors, opportunists and incompetents the militants who are at grips with that reality which events and masses consti-

tute. This way of acting seems to me incorrect and vexatious, even if it happens that its defenders say things which are, in themselves, quite right. . . .

PARIS, Oct. 31, 1938

Victor SERGE

* * *

Reply to Trotsky

BY A NOTE published in America at the end of July, Leon Trotsky finally specified his responsibilities in the episode of Kronstadt. The political responsibilities, as he has always declared, are those of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist party which took the decision to "suppress the rebellion by military force if the fortress could not be induced to surrender first by peace negotiations and then through an ultimatum". Trotsky adds: "I have never touched on this question. Not because I had anything to conceal but, on the contrary, precisely because I had nothing to say. . . . I personally did not participate in the suppression of the rebellion nor in the repressions following the suppression. . . ."

Trotsky recalls the differences which separated him at the time from Zinoviev, chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. "I stepped aside," he writes, "completely and demonstratively from this affair."

It will be well to remember this after certain personal attacks directed against Trotsky out of bad faith, ignorance and sectarian spirit. For there is room, after all, in history for distinguishing between the general political responsibilities and the immediate personal responsibilities.¹

"Whether there were any needless victims," continues Trotsky, "I do not know. On this score I trust Dzerzhinsky more than his belated critics. . . . Victor Serge's conclusions on this score—from third hand—have no value in my eyes. . . ." Dzerzhinsky's conclusions, however, are from seventh or ninth hand, for the head of the Cheka did not come to Petrograd at that time and was himself informed only by a hierarchical path on which a lot could be said (and Trotsky knows it better than anybody). As

¹ As certain of the attacks to which I allude have come from the anarchist press, let me ask to specify here my thought by means of a recent example: The comrades of the P.O.U.M. and of the C.N.T. having been persecuted and assassinated with impunity in the Spanish republic while the C.N.T. participated in various capacities in a bourgeois government, the C.N.T. obviously bears its share of the political responsibility for these crimes against the labor movement, though it would be unjust to render its leaders personally responsible for them.

for myself, residing in Petrograd, I lived among the heads of the city. I know what the repression was from eye-witnesses. I visited anarchist comrades in the Shpalernaya prison, imprisoned moreover in defiance of all common sense, who saw the vanquished of Kronstadt leave every day for the ordnance yard. The repression, I repeat, was atrocious. According to the Soviet historians, mutinous Kronstadt had some 16,000 combatants at its disposal. Several thousand succeeded in reaching Finland over the ice. The others, by hundreds and more likely by thousands, were massacred at the end of the battle or executed afterward. Where are Dzerzhinsky's statistics—and what are they worth if they exist? The single fact that a Trotsky, at the pinnacle of power, did not feel the need of informing himself precisely on this repression of an insurrectional movement of workers, the single fact that a Trotsky did not know what all the rank and file communists knew: that out of inhumanity a *needless crime* had just been committed against the proletariat and the peasants—this single fact, I say, is gravely significant. It is indeed in the field of repression that the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party committed the most serious mistakes from the beginning of the revolution, mistakes which were to contribute most dangerously, on the one hand, to bureaucratizing the party and the state, and on the other, to disarming the masses and more particularly the revolutionists. It is high time this was acknowledged.

* * *

Reply to Ciliga

WHAT greater injustice can be imagined towards the Russian revolution than to judge it in the light of Stalinism alone? Of Stalinism which emerged from it, it is true, only to kill it, but in the course of thirteen or fifteen years of struggles, by favor of the defeat of socialism in Europe and in Asia! It is often said that "the germ of all Stalinism was in Bolshevism at its beginning". Well, I have no objection. Only, Bolshevism also contained many other germs, a mass of other germs and those who lived through the enthusiasm of the first years of the first victorious socialist revolution ought not to forget it. To judge the living man by the death germs which the autopsy reveals in a corpse—and which he may have carried in him since his birth—is that very sensible?

"... All that was still socialistic and revolutionary in this Russia of 1921, was contained in the rank and file," writes Ciliga in the *Révolution Proletarienne* of Nov. 10. "In standing up against them, Lenin and Trotsky, in agreement with Stalin, with Zinoviev, Kaganovich and other, responded to the desires and served the interests of the bureaucratic cadres. The workers were then fighting for the socialism whose liquidation the bureaucracy was already pursuing."² One can see, Ciliga, that you did not know the Russia of those days; thence the enormity of your mistake.

In reality, a little direct contact with the people was enough to get an idea of the drama which, in the revolution, separated the communist party (and with it the dust of the other revolutionary groups) from the masses. At no time did the revolutionary workers form more than a trifling percentage of the masses themselves. In 1920-1921, all that was energetic, militant, ever-so-little socialistic in the labor population and among the advanced elements of the countryside had already been drained by the communist party, which did not, for four years of civil war, stop its constant mobilization of the willing—down to the most vacillating. Such things came to pass: a factory numbering a thousand workers, giving as much as half its personnel to the various mobilizations of the party and ending by working only at low capacity with the five hundred left behind for the social battle, one hundred of them former shopkeepers. . . . And since, in order to continue the revolution, it is necessary to continue the sacrifices, it comes about that the party enters into conflict with that rank and file. It is not the

conflict of the bureaucracy and the revolutionary workers, it is the conflict of the organization of the revolutionists—and the backward ones, the laggards, the least conscious elements of the toiling masses. Under cover of this conflict and of the danger, the bureaucracy fortifies itself, no doubt. But the healthy resistances that it encounters—I mean those not based upon demoralization or the spirit of reaction—come from within the party and the other revolutionary groups. It is within the Bolshevik party that a conflict arises in 1920, not between the rank and file—*which is itself already very backward*—but between the cadres of the active militants and the bureaucratic leadership of the Central Committee. In 1921, everybody who aspires to socialism is inside the party; what remains outside isn't worth much for the social transformation. Eloquence of chronology: it is the non-party workers of this epoch, joining the party to the number of 2,000,000 in 1924, upon the death of Lenin, who assure the victory of its bureaucracy. I assure you, Ciliga, that these people never thought of the Third International. Many of the insurgents of Kronstadt did think of it; but they constituted an undeniable élite and, duped by their own passion, they opened in spite of themselves the doors to a frightful counter-revolution. The firmness of the Bolshevik party, on the other hand, sick as it was, delayed Thermidor by five to ten years.

Let us recall that several analogous movements occurred at the same time. Makhno held the countryside. Red Siberia was in a ferment throughout. In the Tambov region, the peasant army of Antonov numbered more than 50,000 men, with an excellent organization. Led by right-wing Social Revolutionists, it too demanded the end of the régime of repressions and the "dictatorship of the commissars"; it proclaimed the Constituent Assembly. It was the peasant counter-revolution of the plainest kind. Tukhachevsky subdued it with difficulty in the summer of 1921. To try to conceive what would have been the consequences of a defaulting of the Bolshevik party at the time of Kronstadt, it is well to have in mind the spectacle of vast famished Russia, in which transportation and industry were succumbing, while almost everywhere there rose, under variegated forms, not the Third Revolution but a rural Vendée.

Victor SERGE

Reply to Victor Serge

1. WHAT IS SAID so appropriately by Victor Serge in replying to the superficial elucubrations of A. Ciliga is well worth calling to the attention of our readers, especially in light of the widespread attempts by all sorts of liberal muddleheads, social democrats, anarchists and renegades from Marxism to cover their crimes by condemning, as the twin of its antithesis Stalinism, the party that organized and defended the Russian revolution. It is also worth calling to the attention of Victor Serge, for the realities of 18-19 years ago which he describes, are in conflict with his own afterthoughts on the early period of the Russian revolution—afterthoughts, we must repeat, that are *not* unrelated to his position in Spain.

2. Victor Serge finds that a factor which contributed heavily to the victory of Stalinism was "the most serious mistakes from the beginning of the revolution" committed by the Bolshevik leaders in the repression of other groups. We cannot subscribe to this repetition, however guarded, of the hoary reformist analysis of the Bolsheviks' repressions and their rôle in the subsequent development of the Russian revolution. It is unhistorical; it is thoroughly one-sided—and therefore thoroughly false—because it says nothing of *how* and *why* the repressions were directed at Mensheviks, Social Revolutionists and anarchists. That can be learned not from Victor Serge's reflections of recent date, but from that excellent history, *L'An I de la Révolution Russe* (The Year I of the Russian Revolution). For instance:

The anarchists put the Bolsheviks under the obligation for the first time to subdue by force a minority of dissidents of the revolution. Sentimental revolutionists would have resisted. But what would have happened? Either the [anarchist] Black Guards would have finally risen in arms, Moscow would have gone through days of infinitely

² Kaganovich scarcely existed in 1921. Stalin stayed in the background. I do not like to see, under the pen of so honest a writer as Ciliga, this bunching together of names belonging to different phases of history.

perilous tumult (remember the want and the lurking counter-revolution, already strongly organized); or they would have been dissolved with time, after numerous incidents difficult to settle. A revolution that did not subdue its dissidents when, armed, they form the embryo of a State within the State, would offer itself divided to the blows of its enemies. (P. 259.)

The leaders of the counter-revolutionary parties—S.R.s, Mensheviks and Kadets—had just contributed, in March [1918], a common organization, the League of the Renaissance (Soyuz Vozrozhdeniya). "The League," writes one of the heads of the S. R. party, "entered into regular relations with the representatives of the Allied missions at Moscow and Vologda, principally through the organ of M. Noulens." . . . The League of the Renaissance was the large clandestine organization of the "socialist" petty bourgeoisie and the liberals determined to overthrow the Soviet power by force. . . . The chain of the counter-revolutionary organizations thus went without interruption from the most "advanced" socialists to the blackest reaction. (P. 276.)

We commend these quotations, and a hundred others which give a complete and accurate picture of *how* the anti-Bolshevik "working-class" groups brought down upon themselves the repressions of the Soviet power, to the attention of the book's author, Victor Serge. They need re-reading, not re-writing. Or, if a new edition is needed, would it not be more in place, in view of the realities of the labor movement today, to add a few pages showing that the Menshevik and anarchist "weapon of criticism" nowadays directed at Bolshevism is in no way superior to their "criticism of weapons" directed at Bolshevism two decades ago?

3. Victor Serge's latest contribution to the story of the suppression of Kronstadt, which does not describe the alleged excesses of the Bolsheviks in the most restrained manner, in our opinion adds nothing fundamental to the discussion. Having already given a good deal of space to Kronstadt, allowing the presentation of contending opinions and stating our own views, we are now terminating, at least for the time being, the discussion of this question in the review.

The EDITORS

READING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT

By Dwight Macdonald

THE NATION SLIPS EVER more swiftly into the worn old grooves of the War To Make the World Safe for Democracy. Thomas Mann continues to extol bourgeois democracy, at good fees, before large and enthusiastic audiences. The Transcontinental & Western Air Line changes its subtitle from "The Lindbergh Line" to "The Sunny Santa Fe Trail." Random House advertizes its new *Pageant of the States*: "Will inculcate a great love of country. An ideal gift book, particularly for youngsters." Even Hollywood has dared at last, in spite of the Hays office and the Catholic censorship, to exploit the rising tide of anti-fascist sentiment. Walter Wanger, who produced *Blockade*, has joined Senator Capper, Frederick March, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Marc Connelly, and, of course, Thomas Mann in founding "Films for Democracy," while the Warner Brothers have announced no less than four anti-Nazi films for this Spring. The tragic thing is that this universal detestation of fascism is, in itself, a credit to human nature. It is only when linked up, as it must be under capitalism, with the armed defense of the bourgeois *status quo*, that it turns sour. The next world slaughter, like the last, will be staged for the highest ethical reasons.

Blow, Bugle, Blow! The strongest note in the chauvinist symphony was sounded by the President. The *Nation*—which one remembers, with difficulty, as having been once a respectable liberal weekly—ran a lead editorial: "The President's opening message to Congress rang out like a bugle across the world to rally the dispirited and retreating democracies to a stand. Both

its manner and its matter place it among the great state papers of our history. Glowingly eloquent, it was a long way from mere rhetoric. Its essential appeal was to the intelligence, and as such [*sic*] it formed a striking contrast to the frenzied demagoguery of the dictators . . . To suggest that the President, in urging definite American resistance to aggression, was whipping up a jingo spirit is grossly unjust." I don't want to be grossly unjust, especially to any one with as many headaches as F.D.R. has at the moment, but I admit I detected a certain martial strain in his bugle call.

But for all their enthusiasm, the editors of the *Nation* prudently kept their fingers crossed. As is their custom these confusing days, they took back in the fourth paragraph most of what they had stated in the first. Calling on the President to raise the embargo on shipments of munitions to Spain, they wrote: "Hesitation will reduce a magnificent speech to mere wind. We look to him to act and act now." Since a good two weeks have gone by since this was written, and the President has shown no signs of acting, I take it that his "great state paper" has now been automatically reduced to "mere wind". But what is one to think of political commentators who have to wait two weeks to find out the most elementary Facts of Life?

The *Nation* adjures the President in pathetic tones to raise the embargo. The *New Leader* headlines, "TORIES KEEP FOOD, GUNS FROM LOYALISTS". But who applied the Neutrality Act to Spain in the first place? Who clapped on this embargo on arms for the struggling Spanish people? Who but that Paladin of Liberty, that plumed knight of Democracy, Franklin D. Roosevelt! When he found that, under the Neutrality Act, he could not prevent the shipment of munitions to Loyalist Spain, the President forced through Congress a special resolution forbidding such shipments. Now that it looks as though Franco is winning, now that the republic has its back to the wall, and above all now that fascism has suddenly been discovered to be The Enemy, every one from Secretary Ickes to "Wrong Horse Harry" Stimson, Hoover's Secretary of State, wants to raise the embargo. Unquestionably, the President would like to do so. But I think it doubtful that he will, since he is neither a paladin nor a plumed knight, except in the fevered imagination of *Nation* editors, but rather an extremely skillful bourgeois politician who knows that the Catholic vote is formidable—and that, within twenty-four hours after a recent pronouncement by the Catholic hierarchy, more than 100,000 telegrams were delivered to Congressmen demanding the embargo be retained.

"Janus" sends in his monthly quota of smart remarks: There is no room in Russia for the German refugees, we hear, because the jails are full already . . . "NO COSTER CASE POSSIBLE IN SOVIET UNION" headlined the *Daily Worker*.

After all, the Russian Coster is installed in the Kremlin. . . . Although it now accepts a wide variety of advertisements in its drive towards democracy and war, the *Daily Worker* draws the line at patent medicine ads. It is satisfied with corruption of the mind . . . Chiang Kai-shek was a great disappointment to Stalin. Brüning was a great disappointment to Stalin. Schuschnigg was a great disappointment to Stalin. Chamberlain was a great disappointment to Stalin. Daladier was a great disappointment to Stalin. Roosevelt - - -?

Clare Sheridan was a good-looking young Englishwoman, a cousin of Winston Churchill, who went to Russia in 1920 to make portrait heads of the great ones of the revolution: Lenin, Trotsky, Dzerzhinsky, Krassin, Kamenev, Zinoviev. (She doesn't seem to have heard of Stalin.) When she returned to England, she wrote a little book about her experiences which, despite a certain gushiness, still makes good reading. Her account of Kamenev, under whose ægis she made the trip, is particularly interesting—and, in 1938, moving. She tells of a big labor meeting

in Trafalgar Square they attended together: "Some one recognized Kamenev, and the whisper went round and spread like wildfire. The men on either side of him asked if they might announce he was there, to which he answered a most emphatic 'No.' When Lansbury had finished speaking, there was an appeal for money for the 'Cause.' It was interesting to watch the steady rain of coins, and very touching to see how the poor gave their pennies. Lansbury buried his face in his hat to shield himself from the metallic rain. After that we went away, and a gangway was made for us, and all along the whisper went of 'Kamenev,' and the faces that looked at us were radiant as though they beheld a savior."

Later on, she describes her parting, in Moscow, from Kamenev: "He would not listen to any words of appreciation. He smiled in his genial, kindly way: 'Of course we were glad to receive you, *une femme artiste*—what did it matter to us, your nationality, or your relations. There is only one thing *que nous ne pouvons pas supporter*'—and for the first time in all the months I have known him a hard look passed over his face and he set his teeth: 'The only thing we cannot stand, *c'est l'espionnage*,' and the way he said it gave me a shiver down my spine."

Any one who has ever followed trade papers knows that business men talk quite differently among themselves than for public consumption. Such publications call spades by their right name, since their readers want information, not propaganda. Thus in a recent issue of one of those "confidential" news-letters that are sent out from Washington to a business clientele, there is a story about the New Deal's latest plans for increasing consumption. "Idea is to find ways of enabling more people to eat more food," the letter begins, and continues bluntly: "It appears to be a fact that $\frac{1}{3}$ of our people, perhaps even $\frac{1}{2}$, don't get enough to eat . . . So—step up consumption, eat up surpluses, thus aid farmers. That's the basic idea. How? One way might be by socialism or communism." Thus casually, between themselves, do business men concede that communism would give people more to eat.

To round out John Masefield's quatrain on Chamberlain, printed in this department recently, Earle Birney of *The Canadian Forum* sends this stanza of his own composition:

And as Achilles dragged old Priam's son
Three times round Troy, and then returned the dead
So Adolf tossed you from the war now sped
The gritty corpse of peace not yet begun.

The Coster Case (continued). At least two movies are being rushed to completion on the Coster case, and no doubt the full story will soon appear in book form. Meanwhile, there are several interesting items that may have escaped your attention. . . . To break a C.I.O. strike of warehousemen, the late Coster-Musica signed one of William Green's famous "fink contracts," which had the usual sections setting minimum *hours* and maximum *pay* (instead of *vice versa*, as one might expect in a union contract), and pledging the A.F. of L. to function as strikebreaker in case of any "trouble" with the C.I.O. . . . When one of the Musica sisters married a gardener, her brothers were annoyed because she had "married into the working class"—which didn't prevent them, later on, from borrowing \$1,000 from her. . . . It turns out that Coster's biography in *Who's Who* was almost 100% fictitious, including two mythical college degrees and an impressive roster of clubs to which he did not belong. The editors of *Who's Who* have stated that it is their policy to offer "without question" a listing to such pillars of bourgeois society as "heads of the established institutions of learning . . . bishops and chief ecclesiastics . . . presidents of the larger businesses." They feel that, among their 77,000 listings, "the Coster-Musica fraud has every indication of

being unique". Just what these "indications" are, they don't specify . . . The wits of Wall Street have had a field day with the scandal. It has been suggested that Coster might be termed a "hypothecary", and that he committed suicide because "he couldn't face the Musica". And a rhyme is being circulated:

Old Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard
To get her poor dog a bone;
When she got there, the cupboard was bare
—And what a surprise that was to Price, Waterhouse & Co.

No-Comment Department: "Senator Glass, when asked for an opinion, remarked with some vigor: 'Whatever is asked for relief will be three times too much'." (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 4.)

Rosa Luxemburg wrote her celebrated "Junius Pamphlet" from a German prison cell during the last war, but most of it is tragically applicable to the situation today. One passage out of many is worth recalling:

Our party press was filled with moral indignation over the fact that Germany's foes should drive black men and barbarians, Negroes, Sikhs, and Maoris into the war. Yet these peoples play a role in this war that is approximately identical with that played by the socialist proletariat in the European states. If the Maoris of New Zealand were eager to risk their skulls for the English king, they showed as much understanding of their own interests as the German social-democratic group that traded the existence, the freedom and the civilization of the German people for the existence of the Hapsburg monarchy, for Turkey and for the vaults of the Deutsche Bank.

One difference there is between the two. A generation ago, Maori Negroes were still cannibals and not students of Marxian philosophy.

When one reads a passage like that, one understands why the Kremlin has recently let loose a campaign of slander and calumny against the memory of Luxemburg.

There have been some objections to my note on the Steel Workers Organizing Committee last month, especially to the sentence: "And even if Little Steel signs up with the S.W.O.C., it will mean only that its workers will be organized under one capitalist flag rather than another." I must admit this formulation is rather too sharp. However distorted and crippled by bureaucratic control, the S.W.O.C. is nonetheless a genuine union, and hence responsive to the pressure and the needs of the workers as the company unions of Little Steel by their very nature cannot be. And the more workers flock into the S.W.O.C., the greater will be the rank-and-file pressure for a more democratic type of organization.

Note on Reformism: The Securities Act of 1933 forbade banks which accepted deposits to engage in the underwriting of securities. A great victory for the forces of righteousness! The wickedest monster of them all, J. P. Morgan & Co., was actually forced to give up its vast underwriting business! And so one of the third generation Morgans went off and founded the house of Morgan, Stanley & Co., which was completely independent of 23 Wall Street except that Morgan money financed it and Morgan customers somehow found their way thither. Latest news on the progress of this great reform move is supplied by a recent S. E. C. release on securities issued between January 1 and September 30, 1938. Morgan, Stanley is far in the lead, with \$365,100,000 worth of securities. Halsey, Stuart & Co., was a poor second with \$144,300,000 and Bonbright an even worse third with \$78,000,000.

Cat-out-of-Bag-Department: "To obtain full cooperation in such a broad and coordinated national defense program, improved relations between Government and business are necessary and will doubtless be sought by the Administration." (From a market letter recently issued by Delafield & Delafield, of 14 Wall Street.)

Chronicle of the French General Strike

A COMPILATION MADE FROM THE DISPATCHES TO THE N. Y. TIMES DURING THE STRUGGLE

(compiled from the N. Y. Times)

NOV. 15. Decree laws go into effect.

Nov. 17. The first violence occurs. A Communist party demonstration against the decree laws and the embargo on Spain was held. Demonstrators repeatedly crashed police lines in order to get into the plaza where the demonstration was held. A C.P. Municipal Councillor was arrested. Many factory workers took part.

Nov. 21. First sit-down strikes occur, instigated by C. P. (Third International) and the S.P. (Second International) members in factories. Hutchinson rubber factory in Paris suburbs, also Kuhlman chemical plant (180 workers). In Denain at an arms factory, 467 of 600 workers refused to work extra time or negotiate with factory heads. They were supported by a mass meeting of 20,000 metal workers.

Nov. 23. At Denain in the North (*Department de Nord*), 5,000 metal workers strike in sympathy with 4,000 sit-in strikers of Cail arms factory. At Valenciennes in the same district the metal workers union calls a strike of 17,000 for Nov. 24.

Nov. 25. Press reports large strike movement now exists in Paris and *Department de Nord*.

In Paris 12,000 occupy Renault auto factory. Police and Mobile Guards attack with tear gas, along previously arranged plans. Workers fight back, hurling auto parts, machinery. Many arrests—50 police and Mobile Guards hurt.

In Denain, workers seize metal plant—fierce battle with Mobile Guards. Workers are ejected, march out singing the *Internationale*. Several thousand miners join the metal trades strikers.

Small group of railway workers demonstrate in Paris—dispersed by police.

At Anzin, railway mine workers go on strike (railroad line serving mine). Government then mobilized 400 workers (Anzin) who at first refused to work, claiming their mobilization papers incorrectly drawn—later worked in afternoon.

Government sets up military courts at Valenciennes to try strikers. In Paris suburbs, workers occupy Breguel and Bloch aviation plants. (Almost all aviation plants are now tied up by strikers, some for previous causes.) In northern France, mine and metal workers now on strike total 40,000. In Denain and Valenciennes, the civil population is much excited and takes part in all demonstrations. The workers ejected in Valenciennes re-occupy the factory.

In St. Nazaire, oil workers go out.

Lille metal, textile and chemical workers vote to strike on Saturday. Workers returning from work demonstrate at North railroad station, shout "Daladier to the scaffold."

At Anzin, the strikers defy the government requisition of the railway line and block the lines in the afternoon, also pre-

venting the locomotives from getting up steam.

On this day, the Executive committee of the C.G.T. issued a call for a general strike on No. 30, five days later.

Nov. 26. The "day of protest" called by the C.G.T. Three major meetings in Paris—about 50 in the provinces. Most orators "labored hard to persuade their listeners that this is not a political strike." Radical Socialist civil servants refuse to join strike.

Workers occupy two chemical factories in Lille. Ejected by police. Government permits mass meetings in Valenciennes, but warns that those who "speak too violently" will be arrested.

Jail sentences of Renault auto workers—ten days to six months. Daladier requisitions the railroads, 506 Anzin workers to be tried by military court. 400 fired.

Daladier calls workers in Valenciennes district to colors. Four hours later union heads order strikers to return to work.

Factories and mines are cleared.

Nov. 27. Administrative Council of postal employees refused to strike—but rank and file spokesmen later issue a statement saying they will be in the forefront of battle. National Confederation of War Veterans condemns the strike.

Day reported calm except at Denain. Workers catch strikebreaker in mine, force him to carry red flag, sing *Internationale*.

Metal Workers Union at Valenciennes reverses decision of yesterday ordering strikers to return to work, now orders them to continue striking indefinitely.

At Loos, 1,000 workers occupy Kuhlman chemical plant.

Union of railway supervisors (foremen, chiefs of service) reject strike. Association of municipal employees (city, town, village, police) reject strike.

Nov. 28. 25,000 fired at Renault auto factory. Will be rehired after examination. Daladier requisitions all civil servants and employees of bus and subway using pretext of war mobilization law. League for Rights of Man opposes decree laws, also general strike. Police Federation opposes decree laws, also general strike. 5,000 metal workers out at Dunkerque, stopping work on five government ships.

Nov. 29. Eve of strike. Daladier sends troops to aid police and Mobile Guards. Especially heavy concentrations in *Department de Nord*, Paris, and seaports. He has requisitioned subways, gas, water, light, telegraph, telephone—also railways and workers in Valenciennes district.

Nov. 30. GENERAL STRIKE. All sources except C.P. press report fiasco. Government estimates strikers as from 2% or 3% to 25% in mines. Jouhaux estimates 75% to 80%. Admits failure of bus and subway strike in Paris, due to government measures—after a 2-hour walkout. Claims 100% longshoremen strike. 80% effective

in mines. *N. Y. Times* reports that only 191 of 10,842 Paris transport workers refuse work. Press reports railroads running.

United Press estimates 2,000,000 out. Paris suburbs working—except Renault. United Press reports communication services normal except in Marseilles and Boulogne where street cars and buses were on strike. In afternoon Marseilles streetcar men returned to work.

Telegraph, telephone, postal are normal.

C.G.T. claims that workers came to work in nationalized industries but did not work. United Press finds it significant that C.G.T. refuses detailed figures on strike to newspapermen, using as excuse "since there are hardly any newspapers it is not necessary to make such statements."

Disorder during day. Several hundred break police lines at auto factory; sing *Internationale*.

Textile workers of Dijon strike.

150 occupy Rennes arsenal in sit-in.

2,000 foundry workers strike, return in afternoon.

It is significant that the miners and metal workers who had been striking spontaneously for a week did poorly on day of general strike.

Dec. 1. Government estimates 70,000 fired. S. P. estimates 1,500,000 fired or locked out (100,000 textile workers in North, 25,000 school teachers, 20,000 metal, 4,000 miners, 4,000 mine railway workers).

2,500 locked out at shoe factory, riot, break way in.

Longshoremen still on strike.

Metal workers in St. Nazaire shipyards strike because of discharge of other workers for striking.

Dec. 2. Continued strikes and riots against lock-out. Riot with Mobile Guards in Denain.

2,000 demonstrate at air factory in Toulouse.

General strike at St. Nazaire—11,000 metal and shipyard workers.

10,000 metal still out in North.

Ship *Normandie* on strike. Waiters, supply men, dining-room stewards call strike against discharge of some strikers. Joined later by sailors. They defy government requisition of the ship.

Dec. 3. Total on strike on *Normandie* and other ships is 5,000 in sympathy with 60 who were discharged. Government bringing navy forces in order to sail ship.

Dec. 7. *Normandie* still laid up. Government succeeds in sailing one ship, *Paris*.

Last metal trades workers call off strike, return to work in Valenciennes. 14 leaders were sentenced from ten days to one year.

Summary

The spontaneous strikes sprang up among the automobile workers and the metal workers who were helped to some degree by the miners. Other workers going out were in

aviation, chemicals, textiles, rubber and arms factories.

The most militant were the metal trades workers of Denain and Valenciennes where the most severe fighting took place. In Denain the population took an active part in demonstrations.

The delaying of the strike call by the C.G.T.—putting it off for five days gave government time to demoralize the workers through threatening measures and radio appeals.

The militancy of the workers continued after the failure of the general strike in isolated cases. The *Normandie* strike and the St. Nazaire shipyard strike took place after the general strike.

Role of Jouhaux and the C.G.T.

Nov. 15. National Congress of C.G.T. in session rejects the decree laws "as suppression of the social reforms voted by Parliament." A resolution for a general strike presented by Chambeand, proof-readers' delegate (printing trades) was put off until Nov. 17 when it was rejected. The Convention called for "a public demonstration of protest" on Nov. 26.

Nov. 16. Jouhaux told convention the decree laws were "unacceptable as written." Said labor might "return to its supreme arm, if necessary," hinting at general strike.

P. J. Philip, N. Y. *Times* correspondent, reporting this statement by Jouhaux made the following comment: "Mr. Jouhaux has, however, a manner of placating extremists by threatening publicly measures that he himself secretly opposes and his threat should not be interpreted as an immediate menace."

Nov. 22. Six days later, after many spon-

aneous strikes, the C.G.T. announced it would call a general strike.

Nov. 25. C.G.T. calls general strike for Nov. 30. "The strike must be held without any manifestation or meeting." The workers were not to allow themselves to be provoked into disorder. "Everybody must return to work when the strike is over."

Nov. 26. At "protest meetings" C.G.T. speakers insisted that the strike was "not political."

Nov. 28. C.G.T. letter to Daladier blames him for strike, repeats it is "not political."

Nov. 30. During the day of the strike, Jouhaux writes Daladier that he, Jouhaux, had already decided to resign from all posts as representative of labor in Bank of France and other committees before he read in the paper he had already been dismissed.

Dec. 5. The C.G.T. holds a meeting in order to try to stop the strikes that still continue in the aftermath of the general strike. Says Jouhaux: "If we permitted the continuance of agitations, the Confederation would enter a phase of impotence."

Role of Blum and the Socialist Party

Nov. 17. S.P. Executive Committee demands convening of Parliament.

Nov. 25. Rumors that S.P. and C.P. will be outlawed. Blum rushes about, seeing Radical Socialist leaders, asking them to withdraw support from Daladier. Is refused.

Prints letter in *Le Populaire* to Daladier blaming him for creating conflict, and advises him, "The only admissible solution is to give up the fight—resign and pave the way for a government of peace and moral unity that can restore civil peace and republican order."

Nov. 27. Blum writes again that the Daladier requisition order affecting the rail-

ways is illegal, since it was not sanctioned by a full Cabinet meeting, as no Cabinet meeting has been held since the crisis began.

Nov. 29. On eve of strike, Blum calls for meeting of "shadow Parliament" of Socialists and all others who wish to attend to meet Friday, Dec. 2, saying "An exceptional situation demands resolutions of an exceptional character."

Dec. 1. After strike, Blum writes, "At the end of this sad day, as I contemplate the battlefield, I can see no other victor than reaction . . ."

Role of Communist Party

Nov. 17. Demonstration in streets against decree laws and the embargo on Spain. Supposedly organized by communists; C.P. Municipal Councillor arrested as leader. During rest of strike no more such meetings are reported.

Nov. 25. Duclos in a meeting of the Chamber Finance Committee protests against the "expulsion of workers by force from the factories when it could have been done by agreement."

In Daladier's radio appeals to the country in the five days before the strike, he insisted that the strikes were simply "brutal assaults on the peace policy of the government, which is seeking to avoid spilling the blood of Frenchmen for interests that are other than those of France."

Dec. 2. *L'Humanité* considered the strike a success. "Magnificent movement of protest."

The *Daily Worker* ran an ad in the N. Y. *Times* claiming that it was the only paper correctly to report the strike, beating the capitalist censorship which tried to suppress the news of the victory.

C.M.

The Paradox of Australian Capitalism

IN THE YEAR 1638 a geographical book appeared in Holland which referred to the unexplored South lands as Australia Incognita (Unknown Australia). It might well be said that Australia is still the "great unknown" to the average European and American. Even the revolutionary Marxists who reside north of the Equator have found themselves immersed in the life and death issues which confront them in Europe and the Americas, with the result that only a few have had the opportunity to familiarise themselves with Australian working-class problems.

Australia offers to all Marxists an absorbing and fascinating field for the study of many unique social features. The fifth continent should be of especial interest to American workers, because of the fact that in the evolution of the Australian working class movement, the American movement can perceive and see reflected many identical problems, important questions which it is facing today. Perhaps the most important of these considerations is the development of a labor party here; a study of the history and development of the Australian Labor party should prove fruitful.

The Australian Labor party was born out of the travail which followed two great industrial upheavals, namely, the strikes of the sheep shearers and the maritime workers which occurred in 1890 and 1891. After a long and bitter struggle both these strikes ended in defeats for the workers. It was the results of these strikes which temporarily caused the workers to become disillusioned with direct action and to turn to parliamentarianism. Labor parties were organized in every one of the six states and soon labor politicians began to make their appearance in the legislatures of the various states. It is interesting to note that the unions came to rely more on the political wing and on the objectives of that wing for the redressing of the workers' grievances. This of course succeeded in duping the masses into believing that they could be emancipated by the simple device of electing Labor governments.

It must be always borne in mind that the labor movement of Australia has never made any pretense at being anything else than openly and avowedly reformist since the years of its inception. Quite unlike its European counterparts it has never bothered to pay even lip service to Marx. With the ex-

ception of some left wing elements the Australian Labor party has always regarded itself as a purely Australian development, that is, as a party charged only with the protection of the Australian workers; as a matter of fact it has always been ultra-chauvinistic, being the chief bulwark of the "White Australia" policy. This policy finds great favor amongst the workers for they fear that if other than white workers were admitted to Australia the local capitalists would use cheap labor to smash their hard-won conditions. This goes hand in hand with a chauvinistic race and color prejudice which unfortunately is strongly ingrained in the Australian worker. It thus becomes the imperative duty of the Fourth Internationalists in Australia to fight the reactionary "White Australia" policy.

Before proceeding with the exact status of Australian capitalism today it would be well to assess the results of nearly half a century of reformism in the antipodes. Owing to the fact that Australia is a new country and a rich one, reformism has flourished like a luxuriant plant in a hothouse. The continual expansion of capitalist industry over the past fifty years has enabled reformism to win

substantial concessions for the workers. These concessions have given the Australian worker a standard of living which is only surpassed by that of the American worker. By 1913 Australia was the most highly unionized country in the world, but even then the great majority of the unions were conservative in outlook; they frowned on direct action and advocated recourse to the compulsory arbitration courts set up for the making of awards, minimum wage standards, and for the mediation of disputes between the workers and the bosses.

These compulsory arbitration courts which were mainly established by Labor governments have become an integral part of the industrial system. This is exemplified in the fact that one of the largest unions, the Australian Workers Union, openly boasts that it has never sponsored an "official" strike of the whole organisation. Nevertheless, the trade union bureaucrats amongst whom can be found many minor counterparts of William Green and John L. Lewis, do not always succeed in heading the workers into the dead end of compulsory arbitration: the press is constantly full of reports of strikes in a wide range of industries.

To sum up the results of fifty years of reformism in this country, it might be said that the workers have gained much in the way of wages and conditions, old age pensions, *etc.*; the powerful Labor parties have also enabled many militant struggles to be waged in an atmosphere of legality. One such struggle was the great conscription battle of 1916-1917 when the mass movement forced a referendum on conscription for overseas service. This referendum resulted in a defeat for the militarists' plan of conscripting Australian man-power for the European holocaust.

Slowly but surely, however, reformism is coming to the end of its tether. The world economic crisis dealt it a deadly blow from which it can never entirely recover. Secondary industry sheltered behind high tariff walls can only hope to expand for a few more years at the most, and then a severe internal crisis will develop. The life-blood of capitalist economy in this country is the returns from export of primary products such as wool, wheat, butter, metals, *etc.*, which are steadily declining. More and more every day the workers are being confronted with problems which only admit of revolutionary solutions. There is a hard core of unemployment which can never be solved under existing capitalist economy. Thus the working class will eventually be forced along the road of militant class struggle which should facilitate the building of a strong Fourth Internationalist movement in this classic land of labor reformism.

It here becomes apparent that an individual analysis of the nature of Australian capitalism is an absolute essential. Let us glance at the industrial structure as a whole. One does not need the overwhelming confirmation which is to be found in the pages of the Government statistician to realize that the problems of the Australian workers are not those of the classical semi-colonial countries;

but, on the contrary, are those same life-and-death issues which confront the workers of the United States and of the advanced western European countries.

Australian capitalism has been amazingly precocious in its development. Although Australian capitalism is still dependent on the "primary" industries to maintain the purchasing power and the national overseas income, yet, as we have seen from the census figures, the great majority of the workers derive their livelihood from "secondary" industry—thus following the European and American models. Their problems are not predominantly agrarian but, on the contrary, immediately social and industrial. The 1938 census revealed that the number of workers employed in "secondary" industry exceeded the number employed in all other industries by 209,000. Right from the Thirties of the last century the majority of emigrants preferred to remain in secondary industries in the rapidly developing cities, rather than accept the 10/- weekly wage which was offered to them by the pastoralists. The importance of manufacturing does not loom very largely in the export figures, but if we have recourse to the total volume of internal production we find that industrial production exceeds in volume the output from the pastoral, agricultural and mineral industries—that is, if they are considered in their separate categories. We here note that while the output from the pastoral and agricultural industries exceeds that of secondary industry, nevertheless the fact that most of the Australian people labor in secondary processes proves conclusively the all-important rôle that secondary industries play in the social edifice.

With the growth of industrial capital there have concurrently developed many manifestations of the existence of finance capital. This process, following European experience, received a great impetus during the crisis, which forced industry to become more dependent than ever on the banks, with the result that the necessary prerequisite of finance capital, *i.e.*, the fusion of banking and industrial capital, became an accomplished fact. If we take the case of the greatest Australian trading bank, the Bank of New South Wales, we find that its directors sit on the boards of a multitude of industrial companies which are financially dependent on the bank, thus providing us with an outstanding example of the system of interlocking directorates by which finance capital operates.

The rapid development of Australian capitalism has occasioned another significant change in governmental finance. At the beginning of the crisis the London money market definitely declined to finance any more Australian loans. This of course gave the Australian capitalists a chance which they seized with both hands. What a striking testimony this affords us as to the progress of Australian capitalism. Since 1929 all governmental programs have been met by successful internal loans. By the end of June, 1937, the holdings of the local *rentiers* in government loans had increased to 674,-

509,661 lbs., as against London holdings of 543,412,302 lbs. and New York holdings of 44,949,861 lbs. It is necessary to point out to those who hold that Australian capitalism is now totally independent that this progress has been achieved only by sometimes limiting the amount of capital available for industrial flotations.

It now becomes necessary to examine the relations of expanding Australian capitalism with British imperialism. There are some who claim that the Australian capitalists are now preparing a movement of national liberation, but while it must be admitted that many signs do point in that direction, it is still necessary to state quite definitely that such is not the case. If we study all the classical national revolutions of Europe, we find that the national bourgeoisie headed a liberation movement which was based on a centuries-old racial question. For instance, let us take the Italian, Hungarian and Polish national revolutions. These nationalities were even refused the right to retain their own languages and culture. Such powerful incentives to a national revolution do not exist in Australia. As a matter of fact the limited amount of anti-British hostility which sometimes manifests itself in Australia merely serves to bring this fact into bolder relief. While an Australian national revolution cannot be ruled out as a perspective for the future, it can be definitely ruled out in the present epoch. Although the local manufacturers, it is true, often display hostility to their British competitors and occasionally flirt with the Labor party, yet they prefer to struggle against British competition by using the weapon of high tariff walls rather than resort to the desperate expedient of a national revolution. When the Lang Labor government of New South Wales launched its repudiation movement, which was probably the nearest approach to a national liberation movement in Australia, that did not prevent the local manufacturers from placing anti-Lang slogans in the pay envelopes of their employees—in spite of their link with the Labor party by virtue of their mutual interest in high tariffs. So much for the manufacturers' enthusiasm for a national revolution.

Australian capitalism today is faced with this problem: it wisely realizes that if it breaks with Britain it will fall into the lap of some rapacious imperialism, which will not give it the same favorable treatment as accorded by Britain. It is forced to pay a high insurance premium to Britain, but it receives in exchange the right to exploit its own workers. It is also necessary to bear in mind that Australia is one of the most paradoxical semi-independent countries in the world; it acts as a junior partner of British imperialism, for which it could be said to manage a branch office; that is, Britain permits the Australian bourgeoisie to possess and exploit the mandated territory of New Guinea and also Papua. The fact that Australia possesses colonies leads one school of thought into a grave error, by causing them to proceed to the other extreme and proclaim that Australian capitalism is totally in-

dependent. This is, of course, an erroneous belief. The very fact that Australia is not yet independent in the political sense is in itself proof that it is not independent in the economic sense. Let us take an example; prior to 1905 Norway enjoyed an autonomous status which was conceded by its sovereign power, Sweden. This status was very similar to that Britain concedes to Australia. Yet as Lenin points out in his *Teachings of Marx and Engels* (p. 150), while Norway owed political allegiance to Sweden, the Swedish capitalists possessed an advantage over Norwegian capitalism. To quote Lenin's exact phrase: ". . . the autonomous nation does not possess equal rights with the ruling nation—and therefore, it becomes necessary for the autonomous nation to declare its complete independence." Only in the event of a successful national revolution could we claim Australia to be a completely independent capitalism.

To sum up the important aspects arising from a consideration of the status of Australian capitalism, we must arrive at the following conclusions: a national revolution is extremely unlikely in this epoch; if the bourgeoisie did launch it it would be the duty of Marxists to support it as a progressive move; in this period "national liberation" is a false slogan for a revolutionary workers' party to adopt. The Australian revolution will be both social and national in content. Just as the bourgeoisie of Russia failed to carry out the democratic revolution—so in this epoch will the bourgeoisie fail to carry out the national revolution of Australia. Therefore, the Australian workers must carry out a dual revolution which will be primarily social, but will also carry out the tasks of the national revolution. The only possible slogan for the working class is: Forward to the Social Revolution!

In conclusion let us glance at the Australian scene today. The position is that Labor governments are in office in three of the six states, namely, Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia, while Tory administration controls N. S. W., South Australia, Victoria and the Federal parliament. In Queensland where Labor has been in office with only one break since 1915, the administration reflects and defends the interests of the powerful sugar combine which controls the whole industry. This phenomenon can be noted throughout the labor movement, that is, the Labor parties in the various states show considerable differences in viewpoint; for instance, the N. S. W. party led by J. T. Lang is considerably to the left of the Queensland party.

The great issue which agitates all workers in all countries today is the war question and Australia is no exception to this rule. The Federal Government which is dominated by the United Australia party, the party of the middle class and also of big business, has launched a 43,000,00 lb rearmament scheme as an integral part of the war plans of British imperialism. The federal Labor party is an ardent advocate of rearmament, but at the same time poses an untenable isolation policy. It contends that in the event

of a European war Australia should refuse any European entanglements and merely guard its own territory. The Stalinists bitterly attack this policy as being a rejection of the precious doctrine of "collective security." Only the small group of Fourth Internationalist takes up a true international position on the war question.

The greatest danger inherent in the policy of Australian imperialism lies in its possession of New Guinea. It appears that this question may lead to some friction between Chamberlain and the Australian bourgeoisie. If Chamberlain, having regard to the exigencies of British imperialism, wishes to come to an agreement with Hitler by ceding him New Guinea as a part of a general colonial arrangement, the Australian government will probably use its influence in the councils of British imperialism to urge resistance to this claim. W. M. Hughes, Australian Minister of External Affairs, has recently declared that "all hell will not shift us from New Guinea" and this declaration has been subsequently approved by the government in an official statement.

It will be observed from this that the Australian revolutionists have the task of exposing the embryo-imperialism of their own government. The revolutionists must and will point out that while they are not in favor of handing Australia's ex-German colonies back to Hitler, neither do they favor their exploitation by Australian finance capital. It should here become apparent to all sincere militants how necessary it is to build a strong Fourth International which can liberate the colonial peoples not only of New Guinea but of the whole world. It becomes even more apparent that the urgent national problems of the Australian workers continually blend with the international problems of the world working class. In short, the Australian workers can only find emancipation in the stern struggles on the world arena, by an iron alliance with their proletarian brothers in all countries.

The mandated territory of New Guinea and Papua (an outright possession of Australia) have become fertile fields of exploitation for the bourgeoisie. In 1935-1936 the New Guinea territory imported from Australia 675,652 lbs worth of goods, and exported to Australia goods valued at 950,240 lbs. While Papua imported from Australia goods valued at 145,534 lbs, and exported to Australia goods valued at 254,132.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the balance of trade in favor of the colonies is deceptive as a large proportion of their exports to Australia are processed and reexported overseas, this applies particularly to products such as gold, and copra. In addition, practically all the share capital invested in companies operating in these two territories is held by Australian investors. Here we see clearly revealed the fundamental considerations, apart from the strategic ones, which make the Australian bourgeoisie so reluctant to relinquish New Guinea. It affords us a neat if miniature study of imperialism.

To return to the mainland, we have seen demonstrated how it has proved profitable during the last half century for the ruling classes to permit reformist concessions, but faced with the tragic decline of the world market, the bourgeoisie will be forced to attack the greatest gain of the Australian worker, his standard of living. This standard was only possible because of the rich new field of exploitation which a virgin continent offered. According to the celebrated estimate of national wealth made in 1914 by the British economist, Sir Josiah Stamp, the per-capita wealth of Australia equalled Britain's, standing at 318 lbs per head, and was exceeded only by the United States with 424 lbs, and the Argentine with 340 lbs. These same proportions were preserved during the early post-war years, but an end to this constant upsurge in Australian economy can be anticipated within a few years.

Thus an intensification of the class conflict is inevitable, and so the Fourth Internationalists must build an organisation which is strong enough to take advantage of this opportunity when the time comes. The Australian worker possesses a great historical tradition. He is highly unionized, and given correct leadership will assuredly contribute some epic chapters to the great and progressive fight for world working class emancipation.

SYDNEY, Nov. 23, 1938 Stan. BOLLARD

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITORS,

Sirs:

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Trotskyist press has been its scrupulous avoidance of character assassination, personal vilification or libel in its disputes with serious political opponents. Unlike the Stalinist publications, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *Socialist Appeal* have, in the past, always attempted to conduct their polemics on the plane of intellectual decency. Unhappily, this is no longer true.

In your January issue, Professor James Burnham and Max Shachtman in their article "Intellectuals in Retreat" (to which I shall reply elsewhere) have been guilty of a disgraceful and libellous personal characterization to myself. In this article your authors declare: "We understand that Harrison's ringing break with Marxism [*sic!*] in the *New Leader* followed negotiations for a well deserved appointment in the Federal Housing Administration." The method of presentation employed in this gratuitous remark is obviously evasive and cowardly, typical of the sort of under-handed innuendo which frequently appears in the *Daily Worker*. Standing by itself it is doubtful if this statement is actionable. However, elsewhere in their article your authors continue on the same tack: "But then, it [my disassociation from the Trotskyist movement] had to be delivered openly if the unemployment crisis in the United States was to be solved, at least so far as Mr. Harrison is concerned." No intelligent reader (and your readers are intelli-

(Continued on inside back cover)

Will India Accept Federation?

"One can only speculate regarding the future, but one possibility is that even in our own lifetime we shall see this great creation—the British Empire—crumble and fall to pieces."

* * *

THE RETURN of Lord Linlithgow, viceroy of India, from the council rooms of Chamberlain has made it clear that the masters of India are prepared to shortly put into effect their Federation scheme. The *Times of India*, organ of English imperialism, bluntly states that all but minor preparations have been made to enforce this new device by means of which the British *raj* is to be strengthened and furthered. Reports indicate that the Princes of India's feudal states, whose consent to Federation is needed, have about completed their secret negotiations with the British and have accepted. The Maharajas of Hyderabad, Baroda, Travancore and Kashmir (most important of the native states) conferred among themselves last November and drew up concrete demands as their price for acceptance. These crafty and absolute dictators feel they can drive a hard bargain with embattled, post-Munich Britain. Above all, they demand suppression of the Indian Nationalist Congress in the British provinces, plus greater support in crushing their own People's State Congress movement.

Federation is the burning question of India today. It is absolutely synonymous with the question of India's liberation. Every struggle of the Indian masses in the past five years—from a strike to mass *bartal*—will assume its ultimate meaning as measured against the approaching Federation war. Successful imposition of their plan by Britain and its native allies would push back the possibilities of a free India perhaps for decades. It is important, therefore, for us to know the provisions of Federation.

Federation "reflects in its content . . . merely the determination of British imperialism to beat back the rising tide of mass revolt in India by tightening its octopus hold over the country with the help of a new constitutional machinery." It is a detailed plan for welding the feudal and land-owning interests together as a *bloc* and for preparing India for participation in England's coming wars. ". . . it organizes at the top all the anti-democratic and unprogressive vested interests under the direct control of imperialist bureaucracy." "British imperialism is attempting to cement all its reactionary alliances, to forge stronger instruments for repression and to tighten its girdle for a fresh and more powerful offensive against the freedom movement of the country." (Quotations from: *The Indian Federation* by Z. A. Ahmad.)

Federation tips the balance overwhelmingly in favor of feudal, land-owning (*zamindari*), banking and finance interests and thus turns the administration of India over to the most reactionary forces. The proposed Federal Constitution will work as follows:

1) The high command will be a British-

appointed Governor-General with dictatorial powers. He can veto or approve any bill; prohibit discussion or amendment of any bill; suspend the Constitution; summon or prorogue the Legislature; appoint or dismiss any Minister; make police rules; issue decrees; utilize the armed forces, *etc.* The cynical British—fearing they may have missed up somewhere—have added in 32 *sections* powers which this Governor-General may exercise in his individual judgment, without even consulting his self-appointed ministers! "The Federal Government will thus be in reality a one-man rule, unsurpassed in many respects by oriental despotisms or modern dictatorships." (*Ibid.*)

2) Section 5 of the Government of India Act (1935) provides for a Federation composed of the British provinces and acceding native states. Accession of the states is voluntary; that of the provinces compulsory. The states are granted superior positions. Although possessing only 25% of India's population, they receive in the two-house legislature provided by the act 33% of the seats in the lower house (Federal Assembly) and 40% in the upper house (Council of State). In addition, the Princes may appoint their entire quota of representatives to the legislature, thus forcing the 81 million States people living under their absolute domain to be without any representation. This is part of the basic constitutional provision by means of which the Indian States can retain their present governmental systems of feudal despotism without having to introduce any reforms.

3) The voting system provided for is a throwback to British imperialism's most reactionary methods. In the Native States there will be no voting whatsoever. In the Provinces, property requirements limit the total vote to 150,000 people. 150,000 may vote out of a total population of 365 millions!

Legislature seats are divided along communal lines. There are special seats for communal minorities in addition to general seats. Moslems, Sikhs, Scheduled Castes, Christians, *etc.*, all have separate elections. Each territorial constituency is split up into communal groupings when voting takes place. This harmonizes with best British "divide and rule" traditions. Its proposal is final proof of the abysmal failure of Gandhi's civil-disobedience movement of 1931-1933 which was directed primarily against separate electorates.

4) Federal Finances: Over 80% of the Federal budget is non-votable and outside Legislative control. 90% of Federal revenue will be drained from the British provinces; only 10% from the states. The revenue flow provided for will be directed toward the central government and will leave the provinces responsible for the upkeep of the various public services. The effect of this will be that these public services (health, education, medicine, *etc.*) will "remain as of old—stunted and undeveloped, and the illiteracy, disease and poverty of the

people will continue to be as rampant as they have ever been. . . ."

No trade restrictions against England are permitted; any preferences granted to Indians must likewise be granted to the British; the boards governing the Indian Reserve Bank and railways are to be appointed by the Governor-General. These and a host of other measures will assure the economy of Federated India remaining in the hands of its despoilers.

To summarize: Federation means the forging of an alliance between the British imperialists and the native rulers, land-owners, bankers and industrialists—all having as their aim the exploitation of India's mass population. It means the crushing of the national liberation and revolutionary movements. Federation means a one-man military dictatorship presided over by an English Führer. This is a constitution of slavery and bondage, seeking relentlessly to reinforce the entire system of imperialist exploitation.

* * *

The Indian Nationalist Congress is on record as opposed in principle to Federation. This opposition, however, is purely verbal. The I.N.C. today more than ever is dominated by the Gandhi-right wing group of native bourgeois whose interest in "independence" consists in their desire to create an India wherein their own brand of capitalist exploitation may be "freely" employed.

The All-India Congress met during the crucial days of Munich. The outcome of this meeting clearly displayed the I.N.C.'s desire to compromise the Federation issue. The nationalist leaders refuse to attack Federation in its vital spots. Their program is expressed by Sardar Patel, leading bourgeois nationalist and the Jim Farley of India. Patel demands of the British an overhauling of the Constitution with an eye to granting more representation to the provinces before the I.N.C. will talk compromise. He will accept any agreement that grants a freer hand to the native capitalists. Gone is any idea of unconditional opposition and mass *satyagraha* (civil disobedience) to Federation. These Congress leaders are unquestionably carrying on secret negotiations with the British authorities.

The A.I.C.C. met for five days. All it did was to launch a fierce drive against the Congress left wing! A resolution charging the "lefts" with preaching violence and class-struggle was adopted. The left wing was threatened with exclusion. Although war was so close that the British had begun to mobilize native troops and were prepared to outlaw the Congress, no resolution on the subject was adopted. For five days these pathetic "leaders" sat around praying that the war danger would pass over. The right wing was fully prepared to participate in the war as England's loyal ally. Gandhi conveniently forgot his "non-violence" to justify a war against Hitler. With the exception of the communist party, the left-

wing leaned towards pacifism. The Stalinists bleated about the danger from Japanese imperialism and extolled the virtues of the English brand. All in all, the Congress leadership showed itself as spineless and incapable of action. Had war broken out, there is no doubt that an unwilling India would have been forced to participate as Britain's ally and 1914 would have been repeated.

So stifling was the atmosphere of this A.I.C.C. meeting that the left wing members staged a demonstrative walk-out. Gandhi, servile tool of the British and native mill-owners, then delivered an ultimatum to the left wing in his weekly paper, *Harijan*. He is more than ever wrapped up in his credo of non-violence and passive resistance. The Mahatma has by no means finished his career of sabotaging India's liberation struggles! Lately, he has condemned peaceful picketing by strikers because it may lead to violence. He even frowns upon his own technique of mass *satyagraha*! To him, the slogan of non-violence is an efficacious corollary in his defense of imperialist violence. The fact that this life-long traitor is still the leading figure in India's nationalist movement is sufficient indication of the state of affairs. Gandhi is still Britain's finest policeman in India.

What of the Congress ministries today ruling 8 out of 11 British provinces? Particularly of late have their actions earned the hatred of the peasant and working masses. Let us cite a few examples:

1) *Madras Congress Ministry*—Suppressed various newspapers, including Congress and nationalist organs. Has likewise suppressed many civil liberties of the people.

2) *Behar Congress Ministry*—Arrest and gagging of numerous *kisan* leaders. Concerted drive to crush peasant organizations.

3) *North-West Frontier Congress Ministry*—Beating, jailings and murdering of Congressmen, Congress Socialists and, above all, *kisan satyagrahis*. This ministry is particularly distinguished for its ferocity against the peasantry.

4) *Bombay Congress Ministry*—Adoption of a Labor Disputes Bill, called by workers the *Black Bill*. Ordered police to fire on strikers three times during November 7th general strike in Bombay. Leads ministries in justifying violence against "disorderly" workers and peasants.

5) *United Province Congress Ministry*—Open support to terror organized by *zamindari*. Thousands of tenants have been dispossessed. The slogan of this ministry is "relief to the *zamindars*!"

In broader outline, the Congress ministries have done the bidding of the British; supported the employers as against the unions; the landlords as against the peasants. They have moved steadily to the right by ignoring the Election manifesto and have alienated the peasant and toiling masses. Office acceptance—originally explained as a move to win liberation from "within"—has decidedly strengthened the British *raj*. Moreover, it has provided the governmental staff and apparatus necessary to administer the coming Federation.

The Congress directly sabotages the struggles of the States' people against their feudal lords. The A.I.C.C. adopted a resolution re-affirming its official position of "non-interference" in States' affairs. As late as December 1938 the Congress Working Committee (top leadership) again stated this hands-off position. Thus the Indian nation is divided—by the British and Congress—into two camps. Meanwhile, one can say that the most significant event of the past year has been the mass uprising of the States' people against their rulers. In Rajkot state a violent battle has been proceeding against the local *Maharajah*. Gandhi demanded withdrawal of charges against this Prince so that he could negotiate a peaceful settlement. The masses refused and continue their fight. Another example is Travancore—long upheld as a model Indian state. Here the fight against the ruler has been led by a State congress—the *praja mandal*. Thousands have been jailed, hundreds wounded in street fights, and 40 killed to date. Gandhi demanded suspension of this struggle and met the same refusal. Due to the Congress' hostile attitude toward them, the States' people look upon Congress as an enemy organization and appear determined to carry on independently.

The I.N.C.'s rapid shift toward reactionary policies has succeeded in dragging the Congress left-wing along with it. This is especially true of the Congress Socialist Party, and its unofficial leaders, Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. Nehru, just returned from a lengthy tour of Europe and England, arrived amid paens of praise from the Communist Party of India for whom he has apparently become a front. The language of Stalinism—supplied at first hand by his private secretary whose membership in the C.P. is well known—fits the Pandit well. "The only possible policy, if Britain believes in democracy [?], is to shed imperialism utterly and rapidly and replace it by free democratic institutions in these [colonial] countries, which instead of weakening it will then be powerful allies." (Nehru, *The Congress Socialist*, Nov. 20, 1938.) In other words, for a mess of constitutional reforms Nehru will become Britain's loyal ally. He also proposes a *real* "collective security." Henceforth Nehru takes his place in the list of Stalinist fronts, to be cynically tossed aside after serving his purpose. Let him remember the fate of a Largo Caballero!

Nor does Subhas Bose, Congress President, offer a more revolutionary appearance. This pitiful "leader" wallows in the wake of the Congress right wing, invariably "compromising" the uncompromisable by accepting the High Command's dictate. He is silent on the many crimes committed by Congress against workers and peasants. On the Federation issue he says, "If Federation is imposed, we shall have to resist it by non-violence and if necessary [!] by a civil-disobedience movement." This petty-bourgeois democrat understands nothing of Gandhi's failure and is fully prepared to again break the neck of the liberation movement. These men are simply leaders without program.

The reaction of the Socialist party to the offensive launched against it by the Congress right wing was to beat a hasty retreat—almost a rout! At the A.I.C.C. meeting they had no independent plan of action against war and Federation. Pacifist phraseology was their contribution. When Gandhi threatened to split the Congress, Masani, acting secretary of the party offered to have anyone expelled from his party who was caught advocating "class struggle or violence"! Masani, "extreme" left-winger, author of fine articles on the Moscow Trials and the war question, blossomed forth as a Gandhist policeman! In this age of centrism the cleavage between words and deeds assumes Hamlet-like proportions in men like Masani. Behind the ancient cry of "Don't split the Congress," the C.S.P. indulges in endless capitulation to the High Command.

The Bombay general strike of Nov. 7 measured the merit of each left wing organization. This strike arose from an attempt of the Congress ministry to adopt a reactionary labor bill demanding class peace and approaching forced arbitration of strikes. The bill encouraged company unionism and challenged elementary labor rights. The All-India Trade Union Congress condemned the bill. The Bombay unions prepared for mass opposition. But the Congress Socialists brought everlasting discredit to their organization by accepting, "with reservations" this bill. They proposed amendments. When the unions decided to have a general strike, the Bombay C.S.P. refused support and insolently withdrew from the entire struggle. They were with Congress, right or wrong. Aside from completely discrediting themselves in the eyes of the Bombay proletariat—the most advanced of all India—the C.S.P. turned over strike leadership to the Stalinists and the notorious Dr. Ambedkar, demagogic head of a reactionary communal movement. Dr. Ambedkar, posing as the leader of a militant workers' party seems to have gained the most. The tragedy of the entire matter is that this former British stooge has now become the unquestioned leader of Bombay's Hindu "untouchable" workers.

The strike failed to prevent adoption of the Black Bill. But it did demonstrate an enthusiasm for battle on the part of Bombay's workers. An estimated 150,000 to 20,000 participated in a 24-hour strike despite police firings and repression. But its Stalinist, communal leadership had no aim beyond that of winning a temporary, demagogic influence over the masses. After the strike, the C.S.P. issued a smug statement claiming events had justified their boycott. It will pay dearly for its withdrawal from and condemnation of this proletarian activity. A so-called "revolutionary socialist" party that refused to lead anxious workers may find itself in rapid decline unless it makes a sharp re-evaluation. As for the Stalinists—threatened with exclusion by the Bombay Congress—they are already abjectly apologizing. Bombay's militant proletariat is leaderless and victimized.

The course of this strike is a significant example of two major tendencies—both equally soothing to Britain's fears of losing India—that account for present Indian

Correspondence

(Continued from page 60)

gent) in the light of these remarks and the general frame of reference to myself throughout the entire article can fail to arrive at the following conclusions. First, that because I was unemployed or threatened with unemployment I wrote the *New Leader* articles in the hope that as a result I would secure a position with the Federal Government; second, that the United States Housing Authority negotiated to bribe me as payment for these articles; third, that the opinions set forth in these articles do not represent my honest opinions and convictions and that consequently I am an author whose political and social opinions are for sale to the highest bidder and hence without value.

The remarks of your authors referred to above are deliberate and wilful lies, utterly without basis in fact and were inserted in their article for the apparent purpose of discrediting me with my readers. And because it is imperative to my reputation as a writer that these wilfully damaging remarks be corrected, I offer the following facts concerning my career in low-rent public housing.

1) For nearly five years I have participated in the low-rent housing movement in America in an official capacity. From the beginning of 1934 until the end of 1938 I was director of public relations for the New York City Housing Authority. I am the author of brochures on this subject which are considered as authoritative and are used as supplementary text material in many universities and colleges throughout the country. I am so well known in this field and my services as a writer and lecturer on the subject are so much in demand that my colleagues in housing (who, unfortunately, do not read

Will India Accept Federation?

(Continued)

politics. On the one hand, the I.N.C. has adopted a direct anti-working class and anti-peasant policy as part of its real aim of compromising Federation. On the other hand, the so-called "left wing" prepares the masses for passive acceptance of the approaching Slave Federation by failing to offer a program of action, a goal or leadership worthy of the name. One must frankly state that unless drastic changes take place, a terrible catastrophe will befall India's workers and peasants—namely, imposition of Federation.

The masses of enslaved Indians have long outgrown Gandhism. For decades they have been ready to push ahead to decisive combats with the British *raj*. A signal to launch a mass attack on Federation would be only too welcome. Will India accept Federation? Or will a war against Federation be the start of a direct struggle for independence, developing into a colonial workers and peasants socialist revolution?

S. STANLEY

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL) would be vastly amused at the suggestion that I would be offered a housing position in payment for an attack on an obscure political party.

2) Messers Burnham and Shachtman for years have been aware of my official standing in housing. On more than one occasion Mr. Shachtman has called upon me for personal advice on the question. On several occasions during the past three years I have lectured on the subject at New York University, where Professor Burnham teaches. On the basis of this it is evident that both your authors were aware that I have long been engaged in this field and that, consequently, no political writing of any sort is required for me to secure a position in the professional field in which I specialize.

3) I was in no danger of unemployment at the time that the *New Leader* articles were written, as a matter of fact I had received an offer to go with the United States Housing Authority almost immediately after its inception in November 1937. As a matter of fact I served as a special consultant to it on more than one occasion during the summer of 1938. My work is well known and favorably received by the heads of the U.S.H.A. Employees of this agency are either Civil Service or chosen for their achievements in this highly technical and specialized field. The assertion that the United States Housing Authority would make a deal with one of its employees or future employees calling for an attack upon Trotskyism is not only libellous but absurd. The staff of the U.S.H.A. includes persons of all political shadings and even includes two Trotskyists.

4) I resigned from the New York City Housing Authority on a question involving procedure. My acceptance of the U.S.H.A. offer actually involved a loss in income of nearly \$2,000 per year; this hardly can be construed as "payment" for services rendered.

Information regarding appointments and salaries of Government employees are public property and are available even to writers of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL; if Burnham and Shachtman were interested in the truth the information above could easily have been verified. Instead, however, they preferred to publish a malicious and libellous statement. In view of the foregoing I have no other alternative but to make the following demands upon you. These demands, of course, are made without prejudice to future action on my part. They are as follows: (a) that this letter be published in full in the February, 1939, issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and that it be as prominently displayed as the offending article containing the statements referred to above, and, (b) that the editors publish a full and complete retraction, and, (c) that Professor Burnham and Mr. Shachtman, in the same issue publish a public apology. Unless this is done, and unless I receive a satisfactory reply to this letter from you within one week from today, I shall be compelled to take legal action.

Very truly yours,

Charles Yale HARRISON

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan, 18, 1939

A Reply

Charles Yale Harrison,
Public Relations Counsel,
United States Housing Authority,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

We are glad to print your letter in accordance with our tradition of granting all the necessary space for reply to all opponents against whom we polemicize and *not* in accordance with the rather more widely practiced tradition to which you appeal—that of calling the cops in the attempt to silence revolutionists.

We imagine that some of our readers may be interested in these selected details from your financial autobiography. More of them, we feel, would have wished to read your replies to the not unimportant historical and political questions raised in our article.

Like you, we regret your temporary wage-cut, but take cheer. Experience in these matters has shown that your present employers, like their prototypes everywhere, know how to reward renegades. We feel sure that your achievements in ballyhooing the phoney Roosevelt housing program in order to grease the ways for the war policy of the Fourth New Deal, will not go unnoticed.

You write that you are "the author of brochures on this subject [housing] which are considered as authoritative". It is a pity that you did not provide our readers with a *full* bibliography. They would have been interested in a number of your previously-expressed opinions of the social rôle of housing programs under capitalism, especially of the New Deal program in this country.

You naturally believe that in your attack on revolutionary Marxism you would get further in a courtroom than in the columns of the labor press. We on our part prefer the latter but would not find ourselves at all dismayed at the need of inquiring into these matters further under juridical auspices.

James BURNHAM

Max SHACHTMAN



Notice To All Agents

Subscription copies and bundle orders of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL are always mailed at the same time. Either subscription copies or bundles of the magazine therefore arrive in a given city simultaneously, since the magazines are placed in a U. S. Mail Sack specifically designated as to place of destination. When NEW INTERNATIONAL agents become aware of a new issue through the presence of subscription copies by subscribers, they should immediately inquire from their Postman or at the Post Office regarding the bundle, so that delivery thereof is not unduly delayed. If said bundle is not on hand at the Post Office, please notify THE NEW INTERNATIONAL immediately so that a check may be made at once.

Bound Volumes of The New International for 1938

All twelve issues of The New International for the year 1938—384 pages—are now available in a bound volume, stoutly and neatly united within hard covers, with the name of the review and the year stamped on the back. A thorough index, dividing all the contents by subjects and by author, has been included in the volume for handy reference.

The printed index is available separately at 15 cents per copy. The bound volume costs little more than the annual subscription to the magazine—\$3.00. Only a limited number of indexes and bound volumes are for sale. Send in your order immediately by addressing it, together with remittance, to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Off the Press!

Daniel Guerin:

Fascism and Big Business

With a Special Introductory
Essay to the
American Edition

on

"Fascism and the
American Scene"
By Dwight MacDonald

Publication Price: \$2.00

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place, New York

WHY NOT INSURE YOURSELF?

The only way of making certain to receive The New International regularly, every month, delivered to your door by the Post Office, is by sending in a subscription. From one of the scores of letters received, we quote: "Every member of the working class . . . should for his own enlightenment subscribe to and help support The New International."

Take out a one-year's insurance policy for yourself by sending \$2.00 for the next 12 issues of the magazine.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE,

NEW YORK CITY

Our Answer to War and Fascism!

Beginning February 1, 1939

The SOCIALIST APPEAL

WILL BE PUBLISHED TWICE EACH WEEK

The voice of revolutionary socialism responds to the great needs of the hour by doubling its frequency of publication.

In addition to our regular articles covering world events and the struggles of American labor, we are inaugurating a host of fascinating features. Movie and theatre reviews; book reviews; column on workers' health, etc. The **Appeal** will be more popular than ever!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

\$1.00 — 6 months

Sub Rates same as Formerly

\$2.00 — 1 year

Twice as many copies.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

(Official Organ of the Socialist Workers Party)

116 University Place

New York City

UNSER WORT

The organ of the German Section of the Fourth International, No. 88-89, containing the "Balance of the Philosophies and Politics of the German Emigration", is now available. Also important articles by Leon Trotsky. Published monthly; \$.60 per year. Order through Labor Book Shop, 28 East 12th Street, New York City, or through: L. de Lee, Postbus 296, Antwerp, Belgium.