
July 1942

Fourth International

Their Peace Aims:

Washington's "New Order" by *Marc Loris*

The Soviet Pacts and the Peace . . . *Editorial Comment*

Labor Under the Third Term

Roosevelt's Election Pledges--And What Happened to Them

By JOE ANDREWS

The United States of Europe by *Leon Trotsky*

The Wailing Liberals by *Art Preis*

Stalin's "New" Tradition by *A. Roland*

The Crisis in Agriculture by *C. Charles*

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

From a friend in New Zealand come these most welcome words: "I am receiving both weekly and monthly papers fairly regularly and enjoy same. The monthly is the best I have ever read."

The very interesting letters we continue to receive from abroad are a real source of inspiration.

Home-letters from agents and friends are likewise interesting and not without inspiration.

A letter from the new agent *K. M., of Detroit*, shows that a real speed-up is taking place in all phases of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL activity: "The Public Library here has accepted a complete file of our newspapers and magazines . . . This material will be available, of course, to the general public.

"We are planning to place complete files of our theoretical magazine in both the city and state universities if it is possible to do so. At present we have a large number of back copies but with various numbers missing from each volume. Enclosed you will find a list of what we have on hand. If you could supply us with copies of the numbers which we lack, you would be more than welcome to the copies of those numbers of which we have too many.

"Our efforts to push the sale of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, to obtain new subs for it, and to use it in our contact work insure us against a similar accumulation in the future."

As far as we know, all agents who have made the attempt have been successful in placing FOURTH INTERNATIONAL files in the public libraries. This is really a fine idea and you agents who have not gone into this matter ought to dig into your back files, make up complete sets of the magazine, and contact the library in your town. If there are back numbers missing, write us and we'll send you those particular issues so that you will have a complete file of the magazine.

Our agents on the West Coast have made an excellent showing during the past month.

C. T. of San Francisco: "Enclosed you will find money order for \$152. We are anxious to whittle down the outstanding bills to a reasonable low in as

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume III July 1942 No. 7 (Whole No. 23a)

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

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.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor FELIX MORROW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment	195
The Wailing Liberals.....By <i>Art Preis</i>	201
The Crisis in Agriculture.....By <i>C. Charles</i>	204
Stalin Bolsters His "New" Tradition By <i>A. Roland</i>	208
Washington's "New Order".....By <i>Marc Loris</i>	211
Labor Under the Third Term....By <i>Joe Andrews</i>	214
International Notes	219
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism:</i>	
The United States of Europe..By <i>Leon Trotsky</i>	220
<i>Book Reviews:</i>	
Property versus Liberty.....By <i>William Lane</i>	223
Aviation and the War.....By <i>Jack Ranger</i>	223
 214	Manager's Column Inside Front Cover

short a time as possible.

"Please apply \$100.00 on the Militant bill and \$50.00 on the F.I. If I can lower the boom on some prospective contributors I will probably have more for you this month.

"We are determined to liquidate our outstanding obliga-

tions and will make every effort to avoid falling again into the pitfall of debt. It's much easier getting in that getting out."

J. B. of Los Angeles sent us money on account and wrote:

"We ordered an extra bundle of FOURTH INTERNATIONALS

(current issue) but have not received them. Twenty extra were ordered, but we can use 25 copies." A week later we received another letter from *J. B.* asking us to increase the July bundle to 125 copies.

I. S. of San Diego: Enclosed you'll find a P. O. Money Order for \$6.00. Five dollars of this goes to pay off San Diego's F.I. debt. The other dollar is for a six-month subscription to the F.I."

J. B. of Montana sent us the full amount of his bundle account, as he has done regularly each month in the past, and says: "The F.I. was very good this month. I will have to give Felix Morrow a hand for his article, 'Stalin Blames the German Workers.' That should open the eyes of a lot of readers."

A. R. of Texas: "Enclosed is a dollar. You can be assured that you shall receive at least that much each week and maybe more after a bit. We are going to take a trip this weekend about 60 miles from here, in order to obtain some money. Let's hope we meet with success!"

C. A. of Indianapolis: "Enclosed \$2.00 is to apply on Indianapolis' account for FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and Militant. Similar payments will be made weekly until accounts are in shape again."

G. H. of Louisiana has become very active. Lately he has been sending in payments on his bundle account and in his letter accompanying last payment of \$2.00, he says: "In sending the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, please add five more to my supply. . . ."

B. R. of Chicago, the new agent, sent us a \$14.00 subscription letter containing four one-year combination subs to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT and a one-year sub to the F.I. We are looking forward eagerly to the materialization of the last paragraph in her letter—"More later."

== ==
We've received many requests for Leon Trotsky's article, "Their Morals and Ours," contained in the June, 1938, NEW INTERNATIONAL. Our stock of this issue has been depleted, but we have been informed that this article "Their Morals and Ours," will soon come out in pamphlet form. It is being printed by Pioneer Publishers to be sold at a popular price.

Bound Volume of NEW INTERNATIONAL and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1940 and 1941

Price \$3.00

Order now from

Business Office

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place

New York

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME III

JULY 1942

NO. 7

Editorial Comment:

Washington's Plans for Europe—Stalin's Commitments to the "New Order"— The Meaning of His Search for New Strategic Frontiers—The Real Plight of the Soviet Union—The Soviet Need for the European Revolution and the Kremlin's Counter-Revolutionary Basis

Elsewhere in this issue, Marc Loris analyzes the reactionary content of the post-war "order" adumbrated in the recent speeches of spokesmen of the "democracies." We need add but little to his incisive refutation of the claim that world capitalism can rise renewed like a phoenix and create the prosperity and security after the war's devastation that capitalism was unable to create before the war. A simple question answers the demagogy of Vice-President Wallace's promise that everybody in the world will have a quart of milk a day after the war: What prevented world capitalism from giving everybody a quart of milk a day before Hitler's rise? And, since 1933, has Hitler been interfering with the cows all over the world?

Since Marc Loris' article was written, two items have appeared in the press which indicate the counter-revolutionary character of the "new order" of the democracies. The June 29 *Newsweek* publishes "an outline of the State Department thinking that inspired Under-Secretary Welles' recent discussion-stirring remarks about a 'cooling-off period.'" Point 2 of the outline reads: "the prevention of revolutions in vanquished countries." Point 4 reads: "the 'probationary' establishment of liberal governments in the conquered countries which would be watched for their trustworthiness and ability to maintain democratic law and order." Since the fascists and their collaborators are to be disarmed, punished and in other ways rendered harmless with the war's end, it is clear that the "democratic law and order" will be aimed against the left and not against the right. The armed power of the "democracies" in the conquered countries is to be backed up with food shipments, reports James B. Reston in the June 30 *New York Times*: "it is pointed out in Washington" that "unless the food and other raw materials are brought immediately to the conquered and enemy countries, war may be followed by a revolution that would jeopardize the chances of writing a constructive and lasting peace." A corollary of this is that where revolution does take place, no such food will be forthcoming—in the same way that the Allies starved out the 1919 Soviet regime in Hungary and threatened an economic blockade of Germany if a Soviet regime were established.

Extremely significant in this connection is the formula of Welles' Memorial Day speech concerning punishment of those responsible for the war. "No element in any nation will be forced to atone vicariously for crimes for which it is not responsible," said Welles; but he also said that "'Individuals, groups or peoples' responsible for the war will receive swift punishment." (*N. Y. Times*, May 31.) This formula is simply a "clever" restatement of that of Churchill's spokesman,

Lord Vansittart, who calls for the punishment of the entire German people. If post-war conditions require it, under Welles' formula the "individuals, groups or peoples" in Central Europe who constitute a revolutionary threat to the new "order" will be labelled subject to punishment as responsible for the war. This formula will provide a juridical sanction for "international police" action against those "individuals, groups or peoples."

The Soviet Pacts and the Peace

Stalin has committed the Soviet Union to support of this post-war "new order." Such is the unambiguous meaning of the post-war provisions of the May 26 British-Russian Treaty and the June 11 U. S.-Soviet Agreement.

In order to obscure the real meaning of our criticism of Stalin's counter-revolutionary policy, the Stalinist press is once again pretending that we Trotskyists oppose any and all pacts between the Soviet Union and capitalist nations. The July *Communist* asserts that Trotsky "denounced the prospective alliance of the Soviet State with the United States." This is a deliberate lie. The fundamental attitude of Trotsky and the Fourth International toward such military alliances was laid down in the theses, *War and the Fourth International* (1934), as follows:

"In the existing situation an alliance of the USSR with an imperialist state or with one imperialist combination against another, in case of war, cannot at all be considered as excluded. Under the pressure of circumstances a temporary alliance of this kind may become an iron necessity, without ceasing, however, because of it, to be of the greatest danger both to the USSR and to the world revolution.

"The international proletariat will not decline to defend the USSR even if the latter should find itself forced into a military alliance with some imperialists against others. But in this case, even more than in any other, the international proletariat must safeguard its complete political independence from Soviet diplomacy and thereby also from the bureaucracy of the Third International."

The military clauses in the British and American pacts are undoubtedly an instance of the "iron necessity" visualized by Trotsky, dictated by the fact that, contrary to all Stalin's boasts before war began, the Soviet Union is militarily weaker than its Nazi opponent.

The necessity of Soviet military alliances with imperialist powers cannot, however, serve to justify the clauses in these pacts which commit Stalin's regime to support of an imper-

ialist "peace" and post-war "order." No word-twisting can justify these clauses as required for the defense of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, these clauses create new dangers for the Soviet Union, both in the present war and in the post-war world, as well as striking terrible blows against the world revolutionary movement.

Let us analyze the most important of these clauses:

1. *No separate peace with ANY government in Germany.*

The pact with Britain commits the Soviet Union not to make any armistice or peace with *any* German government—i. e., including a Workers' Government which would arise from a revolution in Germany—except with the consent of Great Britain. Here are the words of Article II of the pact:

"The high contracting parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggression intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude, except by mutual consent, any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe." (Our emphasis.)

If these words mean what they say, then no matter what kind of government is established in Germany, the Red Army is obligated to continue hostilities against it until British imperialism agrees to a cessation of the war. If the workers of Germany rise and overthrow Hitler and his capitalist masters, they will find themselves still officially at war with the U. S.-British-Soviet alliance.

American and British imperialisms, which fear socialist revolution in Germany even more than they fear Hitler, would of course refuse to enter into an armistice or peace treaty with Soviet Germany—they would declare it outside the pale of diplomatic intercourse, as the Allies did to the young Soviet Republic during 1918-21. By the terms of the Anglo-Soviet pact, the Soviet government would be obligated, at the least, to refrain from entering into an armistice or peace treaty until the "democracies" gave their consent.

Pravda's editorial commenting on the pacts, in dealing with this section, states merely:

"... the treaty precludes any possibility of negotiating or concluding an armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other state associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe, except by mutual consent." (Reprinted in July 1942 *Communist*.)

If the treaty could be interpreted to mean that a Workers' Germany would be otherwise treated, we can be sure that the *Pravda* commentary would have said so.

2. *The disarming of ANY Germany.* Article III, section 2 of the Anglo-Soviet pact provides that

"... they will after termination of hostilities take all measures in their power to render impossible the repetition of aggression and violation of peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe."

Here again there is no distinction between an imperialist Germany or a Workers' Germany. By this formula British and American troops can carry through military occupation of a Germany in which the workers have overthrown the Nazis and their capitalist masters. What would then happen to the revolution we know: what would have happened to the Soviets if Germany or the Allies had been able to occupy the young Soviet republic?

By what conceivable logic could anybody claim that the defense of the Soviet Union requires military occupation of a defeated Germany? A *defeated* Germany is, obviously, no longer capable of "repetition of aggression" for a long time to come. It took Germany, after the 1918 defeat, twenty years

to prepare again for war. This alone makes it clear that those who "will after termination of hostilities take all measures in their power to render impossible the repetition of aggression," will in reality be taking measures, not against another war but against a socialist revolution in Germany.

These clauses dealing with post-war Germany completely identify the Kremlin with Anglo-American war aims against Germany. They make it impossible for the Soviet Union to arouse the German proletariat to overthrow Hitler, since the USSR, like the "democracies," holds out only the prospect of a second and worse Versailles.

The Millennium à la Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin

3. The "aggressors" having been defeated, then disarmed and kept disarmed, what then happens in Europe? For a period of twenty years, by the terms of the Anglo-Soviet pact, the signatories

"agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after re-establishment of peace for the organization of security and economic prosperity in Europe."

In the U. S.-Soviet Agreement it is stated that

"the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declare that they are engaged in a cooperative undertaking, together with every other nation or people of like mind, to the end of laying the bases of a just and enduring world peace securing order under law to themselves and all nations."

Pravda's commentary on the pacts says:

"The treaty considerably widens the scope of Anglo-Soviet cooperation, which in the future will be extended not only to the conduct of the war, but to all problems connected with the peace settlement, as well as to realization in the post-war period of the principles enunciated in the declaration made by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, to which the Government of the USSR has adhered." (July 1942 *Communist*.)

The Stalinist *Daily Worker* waxes lyrical over the post-war millennium, in an editorial entitled "A Great Day for Democratic Mankind":

"These points of the U. S.-Soviet Agreement guarantee the peaceful and cooperative co-existence after the war of the world's two greatest powers, America and the Soviet Union. They point the way to a world in which national independence, security from aggression, and peaceful progress will be developed jointly by these two great countries in close collaboration with Britain, China, and other peoples and nations.

"These points, in short, open a new epoch in world history. They open the doors for 'the century of the common man.'" (*Daily Worker*, June 12.)

If "the century of the common man" can be achieved under the leadership of the capitalist United States what, then, happens to the class struggle, socialist revolution and world socialism to which Stalinism still pays lip-service? Up to now the Stalinists relegated socialism to the period after the present, but with assurances that the postponement was temporary. Thus the Stalinists justified support of the "democracies" for the sake of defeating fascism after which, presumably, there would be a return to revolutionary struggle. Now, however, they call for support of the "democracies" after the defeat of fascism—for the period of "the century of the common man." Why only a century? If "enduring world peace," "economic prosperity and security," "peaceful progress" can be obtained under capitalism, why should there ever again be any need of the class struggle and socialism?

Why, indeed? The Stalinist leader, Robert Minor, proceeds to vigorously protest against Attorney General Biddle's prediction that there will be violent class conflict in the United States after the war:

"Our country has just entered into an agreement of vast scope . . . to remain united in friendly collaboration with our allies after the military conflict shall have ended. . . .

"International relations are distinct from domestic relations, it is true. But the domestic situation no less than the world situation is decisively affected by the war; and any dogmatic assumption that the present understanding with the trade union movement for uninterrupted production must give way to violent class conflict during the readjustment at the end of the war would be the kind of stuff that is found in the speeches of Herr Goebbels but not in the scientific works of Marx. There is no reason to assume in the present world situation that the character of the 'people's war' cannot extend into the readjustment after the war. It is true that history proceeds by violence; we are having that violence now, and I see no reason for Americans to assume that our country must be split wide open in violent forms of class conflict as soon as the present violence is over; such assumptions do not help toward victory." (*Communist*, July 1942.)

Minor's logic is correct, granted his assumptions. If the imperialist "democracies" can conduct a progressive war, then why not a progressive peace—and a progressive world? Rosa Luxemburg in April 1915 summed up this question in one sentence: "Either the class struggle is the imperative law of proletarian existence also during war, or the class struggle is a crime against national interests and the safety of the fatherland also in time of peace." Minor agrees with Rosa, except that he is on the other side of the barricades.

Let us recall that the "new epoch" will be bristling with bayonets; we refer to the description of the "enduring world peace" which appears in Section 3 of the Polish-Russian Treaty of December 4, 1941 which states:

"Once the war has been brought to a victorious conclusion and the Hitler criminals duly punished, the task of the Allied Governments will be to establish a just peace. This can only be achieved by new organization of international relations based on the association of democratic States in union. Such an organization to be a decisive factor must have respect for international law and be supported by the armed forces of all the Allied Governments. Only under such conditions can Europe be reestablished and the defeat of the German barbarians achieved; only thus can it be guaranteed that the catastrophe caused by the Hitlerites shall never repeat itself." (*N. Y. Times*, Dec. 6, 1941. Our emphasis.)

Until now, no one attempted to characterize as a millennium a state of things which could be maintained only by force of arms—no one, that is, except the Hitlerites and their "New Order." Now, however, the Stalinists are underwriting the proposition that "the century of the common man," replete with "economic prosperity" and "enduring world peace," "can only be achieved . . . by the armed forces of all the Allied Governments."

With victory and "the Hitler criminals duly punished," against whom will "the armed forces of all the Allied Governments" be directed? Against a new rise of fascism? But even the Stalinists used to know that fascism arises from the decay of capitalism, is an expression of capitalist desperation. If there will be "economic prosperity," etcetera, then there will be no danger of a repetition of Hitlerism and no need of "the armed forces of all the Allied Governments." If, however, collaboration of the United Nations is incapable of producing "the century of the common man," then fascism will rise not

only in the vanquished nations but also in the "Allied Governments," in which case their armed forces will be imposing fascism and seeking new life for capitalism by seizing the resources of the Soviet Union. Either the armed forces of the "democracies" are unnecessary in the post-war period or they are a menace to the Soviet Union. There is no third alternative.

Contradictions abound not only within Stalin's present formulas but also between those and what he said yesterday. As late as the *History of the CPSU* (1939), Stalin still conceded that the USSR would be in danger so long as capitalism existed:

"But there was also the international aspect of the question, namely, the sphere of the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries, between the Soviet people and the international bourgeoisie, which hated the Soviet system and was seeking the chance to start again armed intervention in the Soviet Union, to make new attempts to restore capitalism in the USSR. And since the USSR was as yet the only Socialist country, all the other countries remaining capitalist, the USSR continued to be encircled by a capitalist world, which gave rise to the danger of capitalist intervention. Clearly, there would be a danger of capitalist intervention as long as this capitalist encirclement existed. Could the Soviet people by their own efforts destroy this external danger, the danger of capitalist intervention in the USSR? No, they could not. They could not, because in order to destroy the danger of capitalist intervention the capitalist encirclement would have to be destroyed; and the capitalist encirclement could be destroyed only as a result of victorious proletarian revolutions in at least several countries." (*History of the CPSU*, p. 274.)

The "century of the common man" is also a century of capitalist encirclement. But now this no longer constitutes a danger to the Soviet Union, according to the Stalinist dithyrambs about the new pacts. Thus, in addition to deluding the world masses concerning the post-war world, in particular Stalinism is attempting to lull the masses of the Soviet Union into a false sense of security.

The Meaning of Stalin's Seeking New Frontiers

The buncombe about post-war world security is exploded by the Kremlin's attitude toward post-war frontiers. In addition to the war aims he shares with the "democracies," Stalin has one of his own—reincorporation into the Soviet Union of the Baltic states and the territories seized during the Hitler-Stalin pact from Finland, Poland and Rumania and some additional territory. On June 2nd the Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times*, Ralph Parker, sent a cable, either directly inspired by the Soviet Foreign Office or certainly approved for sending, which stated:

"It is Soviet Russia's declared and reiterated aim to bring back under Soviet power the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, (Finnish) Karelia, (Polish) Moldavia, (Polish) White Russia and the Ukraine, now largely under Nazi domination. . . .

"Except for Latvia and Estonia, which have an outlet to the Baltic, all these republics border foreign countries and therefore have a peculiar strategic importance to the Soviet Union.

"During that period envisaged by the Atlantic Charter and before the victorious nations can afford to disarm, these regions are likely to play an important role in the Soviet Union's security and it would be surprising if the realistic-minded men directing the Soviet Union's destiny during the war should

abandon a single inch of territory that is strategically important during the armistice period.

"Exactly what these limits of security are is a matter difficult to determine in detail, but a study of military history indicates that the Danube delta and the Carpathian watershed are parts of them, while only by control of the Baltic republics can Leningrad feel safe from the west and only by control of the Karelian Isthmus from the north. . . .

"For the Soviet Union the situation of the Baltic republics after victory is outside of discussion. Every Red Army man believes that the Red Flag will be hoisted again in Vilno, Kaunas, Riga and Tallinn. . . .

"These are axioms of the Soviet war aims, understood throughout the Red Army." (N. Y. *Times*, June 3, 1942.)

It is notable that this dispatch was sent *after* the May 26 signing of the Anglo-Russian Treaty. The insistence on the Danube delta, the Carpathian watershed and the Karelian Isthmus indicate that present Soviet demands go considerably beyond the territorial gains of the Hitler-Stalin pact period.

It is now well known that before the Anglo-Soviet Treaty was drawn up, the Kremlin demanded a British guarantee of restoration of Russia's frontiers of June 22, 1941, plus slices of Rumania and Finland. The British were reluctantly disposed to agree, but Roosevelt intervened against it, and the Kremlin yielded to the extent that the question of frontiers is not dealt with in Anglo-U. S.-Soviet pacts. But in no way has the Soviet government abandoned its demand for those frontiers; it simply awaits a more propitious moment or the end of the war for making sure of those frontiers.

Why this preoccupation with new strategic frontiers? Against whom are they needed? Obviously not against the "Hitler criminals duly punished." Obviously not against the vanquished nations, but against the victors, Britain and the United States.

Stalin's present search for new strategic frontiers bears considerable similarity to his activities during the Stalin-Hitler pact. There is a flagrant contradiction between what is *said* and what is *done*. The land seizures from Finland and Rumania, the occupation of the Baltic states and Bessarabia constituted a frantic search for more effective frontiers against the coming Nazi attack; but simultaneously Stalin was swearing to Ribbentrop: "The friendship of the peoples of Germany and the Soviet Union, cemented in blood, has all grounds to be prolonged and stable." (*Daily Worker*, Dec. 26, 1939.) The Hitler-Stalin pact was declared to have "ditched the predatory plans of the Allied warmakers against both the Soviet and the German peoples." (*Ibid.*, Feb. 25, 1940.) Molotov insisted "that a strong Germany is an indispensable condition for a durable peace in Europe." (Nov. 1, 1939.) The partitioning of Poland, declared a joint Soviet-Nazi statement of September 28, 1939, should "make an end to the war existing between Germany on the one hand and England and France on the other," and should the "joint efforts" of Germany and the Soviet Union for peace fail, "then the fact would be established that England and France are responsible for the continuation of the war, and in case of continuation of the war the Governments of Germany and Soviet Russia will consult each other regarding the necessary measures." (*Ibid.*, September 29, 1940.)

Who was fooled by these fawningly pro-Nazi statements from the Kremlin? Certainly not Hitler, who proceeded with his attack on the Soviet Union according to his timetable. The world working class was fooled, and alienated from the Soviet Union by the Kremlin's support of the Nazis and the unexplained seizures of land.

The contradiction between the pro-Nazi avowals and the land seizures actually aimed against the Nazis expressed the bureaucratic character of the Kremlin's defense of the Soviet Union. The Kremlin has no faith in the world working class and its future; it does not care how it outrages the sentiments and aspirations of the masses of the world, so long as the policy of the moment may help in securing such tangibles as frontier changes, economic aid or military equipment from the Kremlin's imperialist "allies."

Hence now, in exchange for aid from the United States and Britain, the Kremlin is more than ready to pay in return with the services of the "Communist" parties and the Kremlin signature on treaties which tell the masses to believe that the "democracies" are waging a progressive war and that they will organize a progressive peace and ensuing world order. That the masses are thereby delivered into the hands of their oppressors is no concern of the Kremlin bureaucrats. That the masses are rendered completely unprepared for tomorrow's attacks by the "democracies" against the Soviet Union is also of little concern to the Kremlin which considers deluding the masses a very small price to pay compared with present imperialist aid and strategic new frontiers. The pacts with Britain and the United States are thus the latest indication that the Kremlin has no faith in world revolution and stakes its future on deals with the imperialist powers and, when those fail, purely military resistance.

The Real Plight of the Soviet Union

Stalinism, clinging to its theory of the success of "socialism in one country," evolved the theory that the Soviet Union may be in danger from military intervention but never from its own economic backwardness. Why, however, is military intervention so threatening—now from Germany and, if it is defeated, then from the victorious Anglo-American bloc? The Soviet masses have demonstrated their superior morale against the imperialist enemy. If in spite of that Germany has won such terrible victories, it is because German capitalism remains superior in its economic power, its technology, to that of backward Russia, whose productivity per capita, the *Communist* now admits (January 1942 issue), is "considerably below that of Western Europe." This superiority of productivity per capita of the great capitalist nations is a danger to the Soviet Union not only in the form of military intervention. As Trotsky put it, a Ford tractor may be just as dangerous to the Soviet Union as a Creusot gun, "with the sole difference that while the gun can function only from time to time, the tractor brings its pressure to bear upon us constantly."

Backward Russia's inferiority in productivity per capita, despite the gigantic achievements of planned production, cannot be overcome until advanced technology is made freely available to the Soviet Union by successful socialist revolutions in one or more advanced countries. Meanwhile the security of the nationalized property of the Soviet Union rests on the monopoly of foreign trade, which prevents the capitalist nations from dumping cheap goods on the Russian market in competition with the nationalized industries. Had the capitalist trusts been able to sell their goods at will within Russia, the Soviet Union would long ago have fallen under the economic (and hence political) sway of the imperialist world.

The Nazi destruction of a large part of Soviet industry will leave Russia, after the war, in an even more unfavorable situation, especially *vis a vis* American mass production of

consumers goods. Lower productivity per capita will be tremendously exacerbated by smaller total productive capacity.

The Anglo-American pacts promise Russia economic aid after the war. But on what terms? Identity of American and Soviet war aims, according to the present Stalinist formula, is due to the fact that even the giant American monopolies, recognizing that "the life of their nation is at stake," are willing to aid Soviet Russia. That, however, is for the war. What of the peace and its aftermath? It should be obvious that the monopolies will then trade with Soviet Russia only on terms advantageous to monopoly capitalism. Devastated Russia will not have available for export sufficient raw materials to pay for its needs in consumers goods and machinery.

The problem, then, will be one of long-term credits. Secured by what? The credit of the Soviet Union? But if that is not considered sufficient security by monopoly capitalism, what then? At this point in their dealings with weaker states, the monopolies seek economic concessions, control of mines and oil wells, etc., and special privileges for selling goods in the markets of the weaker countries—i. e., imperialist penetration. In the first years of the Soviet Republic the urgent need for capital and goods led Lenin and Trotsky to a few experiments on a small scale; the idea of such concessions was soon abandoned, not the least reason being their potentially dangerous effect on nationalized economy. The danger will be even greater from such experiments after this war. As for permitting capitalist monopolies to sell goods directly in Russia—i. e., to deal directly with the peasants and workers—that would mean the end of the monopoly of foreign trade, direct competition between capitalist products and Soviet factories—and nationalized property would be the vanquished.

Is Stalin promising economic concessions and abrogation or modification of the monopoly of foreign trade? Hints to this effect are asserted in the American press comment on the U. S.-Soviet agreement, referring to the following clause of Article VII:

"... the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished . . . shall include . . . the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and . . . the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. . . ." (Our emphasis.)

Do "other trade barriers" include the Soviet monopoly of foreign trade, which the imperialists have always looked upon as a barrier to economic penetration of the Soviet Union? What else could be meant, so far as the Soviet Union is involved? The USSR has always been more than willing, in return for much-needed capital goods, to sell to the capitalist world whatever could be spared in raw materials without damaging the nationalized economy. If that is all that were meant by the clause quoted, why is it needed in the pact? Obviously something additional, something new, is meant.

More important than the question whether Stalin has already committed himself to economic concessions or tampering with the monopoly of foreign trade, is the indubitable fact that Nazi destruction of Soviet industry has already left the Soviet Union in a condition desperately requiring outside aid. After the war, we repeat, that aid will be forthcoming only at a price satisfactory to monopoly capitalism and with the Soviet Union in a poor bargaining situation.

It should be understood, of course, that the Stalinist bureaucracy will not of its own free will grant the imperialists inroads into Soviet economy. The nationalized property

on which it is a parasite is the base on which the bureaucracy rests. This must never be forgotten. So far as it lies within its power, this bureaucracy will no more share control of Soviet economy with imperialism than it shared control with the property owners in the territories seized from Finland, Rumania, Poland and the Baltic states. It understands very well that private property and nationalized property are irreconcilable systems which cannot live together in one state. But will the bureaucracy have the power—not only political but economic—to resist the imperialist pressure of proffered capital and consumers goods? The danger of the economic inroads of imperialism, the Kremlin may think, is a long process. In this way, it is very likely, the bureaucracy may set its foot on the toboggan slide of imperialist penetration.

For the Soviet masses, of course, this is scarcely the only solution. On the contrary, the post-war crisis will pose for the Soviet masses the need of socialist revolution in the West which will solve the problems of Soviet economy by making it an integral part of the Soviet United States of Europe. If the choice were up to the Soviet masses they would without hesitation choose Soviet Europe and not dependency on American imperialism.

Stalinist Hostility to the European Revolution

But the socialist revolution in Europe would mean the end of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The socialist revolution—that means to arouse the masses down to the very depths, that means that the masses take their fate into their own hands, through sovereign Workers' Councils constituted by delegates elected in the factories, Peasants' Councils of elected village delegates, Soldiers' and Sailors' Councils elected from the ranks. In short, it means in Europe the rise to power of the proletarian democracy which existed in Russia in the days of Lenin and Trotsky and which the bureaucracy step by step has destroyed since 1924. It is obviously inconceivable that such proletarian democracy could rise to power in revolutionary Europe, and leave the totalitarian bureaucracy untouched in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, proletarian democracy in Europe would be the signal for the Soviet masses to topple the bureaucracy and revive proletarian democracy. Hence the very existence of the bureaucracy is menaced by revolution in Western Europe. Hence the fundamental clash of interests between the revolutionary needs of the Soviet masses and the counter-revolutionary basis of the bureaucracy.

Before Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, various "democrats" (including Norman Thomas) raised the bogey of a Stalinized Europe developing as the "democracies" and the Nazis exhausted each other. Stalin's success in incorporating into Soviet economy the territories he seized was cited as proof of the possibility of his swallowing all Europe. But what Stalin could do in the small areas he seized, practically all of them extremely backward and rural in economy, he would find impossible on a larger scale.

In order to wipe out the bourgeoisie in the areas he occupied, Stalin had first to call upon the masses there to establish workers' control of capitalist enterprises, throw out and arrest the capitalists, etc. Soon enough these aroused masses were repressed, the factory committees displaced by bureaucratic managers, but first came, no matter how bureaucratically tele-scoped, the mass actions against the capitalists and landlords, without which it was impossible to establish nationalized prop-

erty. Stalin could risk this process in Galicia and Bessarabia. But in Berlin and the Ruhr factory committees, once masters of the factories and the streets, will not be subject to bureaucratic displacement by ukase from Stalin. A few isolated committees in god-forsaken Galicia could not even have the perspective of resisting the bureaucracy. But the proletariat of advanced Germany will have that perspective. And to argue that Stalin can order the Red Army into Germany to crush the German Soviets is to credit the totalitarian bureaucracy with an omnipotence it never possessed and especially will not possess after the defeat of Hitler.

Since 1933 the Kremlin bureaucracy has tightened its grip primarily thanks to the fear of the Soviet masses of Nazi invasion. The masses for the time being subordinated their struggle for freedom against the bureaucracy. But with the defeat of Hitler, we can be sure, the Soviet masses will renew their struggles against the Kremlin, especially under the goad of the economic impoverishment of the country. If Stalin, under these conditions, were to attempt to send the Red Army against the European revolution, it would cost him his head.

Moreover, in its drive for world mastery the imperialist United States, having defeated Germany, would scarcely permit the Kremlin bureaucracy to expand into Western Europe. On the contrary, even now in the midst of the war, Roosevelt will not agree to Stalin's proposed new frontiers. Nationalized property, whether under the rule of the Kremlin or of Soviets, in either case is property cut off from imperialism. Under no conditions conceivable would the United States permit the expropriation of the capitalists of Western Europe. If Stalin sought to displace expropriating factory committees in Germany from one side, then from the other side the United States would be moving heaven and earth to displace both Stalin and the German workers' committees. Thus any direct move by Stalin against the German revolutionaries would appear in the eyes of the Soviet masses as a move facilitating imperialist attack on the revolution. For this reason too such a move would cost Stalin his head.

With neither genuine socialist revolution nor bureaucratic expansion into Western Europe as real possibilities for the Stalinist bureaucracy, it is clear that the Kremlin's most likely orientation after the war will be, as we have previously outlined, economic concessions of one degree or another in return for economic aid from the United States. In addition to economic concessions within the Soviet Union, the bureaucracy has a very valuable bargaining point: its political services in undermining the revolutionary movement in Europe and the colonies. Along with its magnesium and gold, the Kremlin will sell the Communist International to the United States.

The pacts with England and the United States already indicate what the line of the Stalinist party would be within Germany. Stalinism would attempt to play the same role this time that the degenerate parties of the Second International carried out after the last war. The Stalinists will argue that Anglo-American tutelage of Europe is necessary for post-war reconstruction. To talk of proletarian revolution amid starvation and devastation will be denounced as "fifth column" work by the Stalinists. They will combine praise of American economic "aid" with dire threats of occupation by Anglo-American troops—just as the Social-Democrats of Weimar Germany sang hosannahs to the Dawes Plan and threatened the Communists with Allied troops.

This post-war Stalinist strategy appears formidable—

until we examine the conditions under which it will have to operate. After almost a half-century of peace and relative prosperity in Europe between 1871-1914, considerable sections of the German proletariat could be induced to believe in 1918 that the war had been merely a temporary interruption and that the forward march of capitalism, now "modified" by democracy, could begin again. In this illusion lay the power of Social-Democracy. It is hard to believe that the illusion can be revived after the German workers' experience with hunger during the Weimar Republic.

The Decisive Difference Today

Above all, the Stalinist successors of the Social-Democrats will have no Dawes Plan to buttress them. The "stability" of the Weimar Republic during 1924-29 rested on American loans with which German industry was rebuilt. (To a lesser degree, but still a major factor of counter-revolution, were the American loans to the rest of Europe.) The American crisis, beginning in 1929, put a stop to American loans and Germany plunged downward, with only the alternatives of communism or fascism. Can the United States after this war re-finance the German bourgeoisie—and the French, Polish, Czech and English? Even for a period equivalent to that of 1923-1929?

America's role in Europe in 1923-1929 was possible only because of the peculiar dynamics of American capitalism at that time. Unlike Europe, America gained enormously from the war. In 1914 it was still a debtor nation; it emerged from the war the greatest creditor nation in history. It sat on the sidelines during most of the war, reaping profits from supplying the Allies, taking over their markets in Latin America and Asia, etc. Of the 300 billions of dollars which the war cost, nine-tenths was paid by Europe (this is the estimate of one of the authors of the Dawes Plan, George P. Auld). Counting unpaid war loans, American war expenditures were about 40 billions—a small price to pay for the gains from the war.

Entirely different will be the situation this time of a "victorious" America. By now 205 billions have been earmarked for war expenditures; this time America must largely finance its allies instead of drawing huge profits from them. We are witnessing the Europeanization of America, as the government's preoccupation with the inflation danger testifies. At the end of this war America at best will be, in relation to Europe, the America of 1929-1939 rather than the America of 1923. Sums which could be loaned with ease in 1923 will now seem astronomically difficult, while the desperate need of the European bourgeoisie will be far greater than after the last war. Loans will be forthcoming only on most onerous terms. Loans to Europe will be in the same category as investments in colonial countries—advanced only on the basis of the most stringent political and economic guarantees and the interest and payments sweated out of the toilers.

This is the real prospect for Europe after the war. This is what Stalin has underwritten in his pacts with Britain and the United States.

Will the pacts actually be observed? The life of treaties has become notoriously unstable. The further course of the war may turn them into scraps of paper, not to speak of post-war developments. Whatever the signatories may do, we are confident that the European proletariat—and not least the awakened Soviet masses—will throw these pacts into the dustbin of history.

The Wailing Liberals

By ART PREIS

America's liberals are beginning to beat their breasts in lamentation. "Democratic" imperialism is repaying their faithful services with a weighty boot on their tender backsides. Liberals and sub-rosa and one-time Stalinists are being hounded out of government jobs by the hundreds. A government witch-hunt is in progress against liberals in the shipyards, radio communications and other maritime services by orders of Secretary of the Navy Knox. The liberal literary lights, who have sought to shine in the government propaganda agencies, are being snuffed out.

These personal indignities are but half the burden of the liberals' laments. The other half is that, no matter how loudly the liberals shout, "This is really and truly a war for democracy," the deeds of the bourgeois rulers cry out even more loudly, "This is an imperialist war."

In the heat of the "war for democracy," the New Deal is melting away. Its much-vaunted social reforms, the CCC, NYA, WPA, etc., its social and labor legislation are being liquidated. The government war agencies have been tucked away in the pockets of Big Business. Reactionaries of the vilest stripe are being coddled by the administration, not only at home but internationally. The State Department is maintaining toward Petain, Franco and Mannerheim an attitude singularly fraternal for a government that is urging the masses to fight and die "against fascism."

The liberals are embarrassed. Like the dreamer who sees himself exposed in some public place minus his pants and is incapable of running to cover, the liberals are suffering from involuntary indecent exposure. Only they aren't dreaming.

"How Can Such Things Be?"

The first personal blows came when ex-Stalinoid Malcolm Cowley, an editor of the liberal weekly, *New Republic*, and the writer C. Hartley Grattan were unceremoniously booted out of the Office of Facts and Information. This first sprinkling has since turned into a flood, with hundreds of other liberals swept out of government jobs.

The Stalino-liberal newspaper *PM* has been wailing at length about this government witch-hunt. The June 10 *PM* reports:

"Employees of the Government of the United States in this year of 1942, a New Deal Government headed by FDR, have lost their right of free speech and free thought.

"This is the direct and most important result of a current 'Red' witch-hunt—the color is Dies-tinted—that has already cost several hundred persons their jobs, finds at least a thousand more on the grid, and ultimately threatens thousands more whose only crime is that they are liberals and have fought for years in the forefront of New Deal reform at home and anti-Fascism abroad."

PM cannot reconcile this witch-hunt with its picture of Rooseveltian liberalism:

"In the midst of this extraordinary phenomenon, the Vice President of this country, with the approval of the President, wrote and delivered a ringing speech which identifies our war as the climax of 150 years of revolution—revolution for the people, by the people and for a quart of milk a day for the people's children. . . .

"In the midst of this phenomenon, a liberal Attorney Gen-

eral of the country spoke at a dinner of New Deal leaders and put heart in them by saying that it was vital to the success of our war effort that they press on with their good works. That this same Attorney General, some weeks later, made a legalistic mistake and a political blunder (deportation order against Harry Bridges) has nothing to do with the fact that he was chosen by the President because of his record for liberalism."

PM simply can't explain the contradiction it sees:

"In the face of all these things, how can this witch hunt be explained? . . . How can this be? How can men be persecuted for anti-Fascist ideas in a war against Fascism? We do not know the precise answer to this paradox."

PM finally attempts an answer. It is really the insidious work of the enemies of the New Deal and Roosevelt "who have yet to make up their minds who is more important to their purpose to destroy: Adolf Hitler or Franklin D. Roosevelt."

PM is not alone in its lament. *The Nation*, traditional oracle of American liberalism, also complains:

"The persistent red-baiting patterns of the investigations and the consistency with which only liberals are fired give strong color to the suspicion that officials high up in both agencies [FBI and Civil Service] are neither ignorant nor naive. It is time we discovered who is responsible for the idiotic and dangerous procedure by which men and women appointed to government jobs because they are known anti-fascists are forthwith dismissed—for the same reason." (*The Nation*, June 20, 1942.)

Likewise the Social-Democratic *New Leader* puts on a scowl and even dares to shake a disapproving forefinger under the nose of the Commander-in-Chief himself:

"With the Department of Justice working overtime (ousting liberals), there are weighty scores against the Roosevelt administration. The White House has done little to force the removal of the isolationist Senator Reynolds from the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and even less to remove Senator Walsh as head of the Naval Affairs Committee.

"The President has permitted Father Coughlin to go free. This was done on the basis of some agreement that the radio priest would keep silent and that clerical fascism would be halted in the United States. Roosevelt has kept his part of the bargain—the other side has not." (*New Leader*, June 27.)

The *New Leader* apparently wants Roosevelt to strike bargains only with fascists who will live up to their part of the deal.

And the Stalinists join the wailing, to report that:

". . . the one man in Congress who cast his vote for democracy on Jan. 6, 1939 in opposing the infamous embargo against Loyalist Spain is being blacklisted today by government agencies.

"John T. Bernard (ex-Representative from Minnesota) has been refused his right to participate in this world war against fascism—because he is one of the nation's most stalwart foes of fascism. It doesn't make sense but it is true." (Adam Lapin, in the *Daily Worker*, June 18.)

The Bridges "Mystery"

The dilemma of the liberals is most clearly exemplified in the case of Harry Bridges, CIO Longshoremen's president, who is a model of Stalinist servility to the administration, acting as a "finger man" for the employers and FBI against

labor militants. When Attorney General Biddle, "chosen by the President because of his record of liberalism," ordered the deportation of Bridges, the liberals found themselves in quite a stew.

PM's editor Ralph Ingersoll struck on the matchless explanation that Biddle ordered Bridges' deportation because Biddle is a Biddle. "Our Attorney General is an honest, intelligent, educated, highly principled and liberal Biddle—then is it fair to ask what is a Biddle? Regrettably, we leave the answer to wiser heads than ours." (*PM*, May 29.)

We search for an answer among "wiser heads" in the columns of *The Nation*. There I. F. Stone, writing on "Biddle and the Facts" in the June 20 issue, sadly reports that "the whole case suggests absolutism in decay, rather than democracy in action: the long persecution of a workers' leader, the use of secret police for political purposes, the mobilization of witnesses from the dregs of society, the readiness of an upper-class liberal to serve as the tool of these forces."

Is there a distinction between "upper class" and "lower class" liberals? And isn't Biddle as much the "tool" of Roosevelt, who named him to office, as of "absolutism in decay"? But naturally such questions are not answered by the wailing *Nation* editors.

Common Sense, the liberal monthly, decides in its July issue that Biddle is really but a seeker for knowledge:

"How could Mr. Biddle, probably the most liberal member of F.D.R.'s cabinet, be accused of deliberately giving comfort to the enemy at home and abroad? Probably the answer is that Mr. Biddle wanted a test case before the Supreme Court on the question of whether Communists aim to overthrow the government by force."

The Stalinists solve the Bridges deportation mystery in their usual neat fashion—there's Munichmen "appeaser" work afoot: "Instead of prosecuting and jailing the Fifth Column Coughlinites, Nazi agents and Ku Kluxers, Biddle is trying to deport an outstanding anti-fascist labor leader whose work is a pillar of strength to the war effort. . . . Biddle's 'force and violence' defamations against the Communist Party are a notorious tactic of Hitler and Goebbels to divide and conquer." (*Daily Worker*, May 31.) But since Biddle is also Roosevelt's flunkie, is Roosevelt also a Munichman? The mystery deepens and Adam Lapin, Washington correspondent, can only shake his head in the June 25 *Daily Worker*: "There sure are some queer goings on in the Department of Justice under the Biddle regime."

Terrible Doings in Washington

Pointing to the blows being struck at the social agencies of the New Deal—the CCC, NYA, WPA, etcetera—*PM*, on June 15, complains:

"There seems to be a very real danger that the New Deal is losing the domestic front while its attention is absorbed with the job of licking the Fascist foe without. Bit by bit the reactionary clique in Congress is nibbling away the New Deal bases that gave the common man a real stake in democracy and saved him from succumbing to Fascist demagogues. It makes one angry to see good New Dealers in Congress on the defensive, uttering apologies, for things that ought to make our Nation proud."

Then there is the sad case of the Roosevelt-majority Supreme Court. Of one of its recent reactionary decisions, Samuel Grafton, the liberal columnist, says complainingly:

"I hope everyone has noticed the remarkable similarity between our ancient poll taxes and the recent Supreme Court ruling that it is all right for a municipality to charge a book peddler \$10, or more, or less, for a license to sell books.

"Under the poll tax, as it exists in eight states, one must pay from \$1 to umpty-ump dollars to exercise the right to vote. Under the new Supreme Court decision one must pay \$10, in Fort Smith, Arkansas, to exercise the right of free press.

"If anything were needed to show that the Supreme Court decision, a bare 5-to-4, put over by the perfectly shocking acquiescence of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, was a retrograde decision, that by it the Court speeded backward into a dark tunnel like a man with his foot caught in a roller-coaster, it is this comparison. . . . Are we going to let local government set up a kind of juridical Sears, Roebuck catalogue with prices on the various items in the Bill of Rights?"

By Gad, it's enough to make one want to get up from one's easy chair and do something about it, if only Grafton would tell us how to upset a Supreme Court decision short of revolution, and how to make a typical liberal, Felix Frankfurter, not act like a typical liberal in a capitalist government post. The June 27 *Nation* can only shake its head mournfully at the speedy demise of Roosevelt's "liberal majority" on the Supreme Court: "It is sad to see Stone, Frankfurter and Jackson taken in by the sweet company-union overtones of Byrnes in the wage-hour case."

The liberal complaints pile up, against every cabinet officer, every government department, and the government war production agencies. The latter especially, dominated by the corporation dollar-a-year men, come in for some loud wails.

The Nation catalogues the "business-as-usual" set-up of the War Production Board and ends with the pitiable plaint:

"... Something is still 'seriously wrong' . . . and it will not be corrected until Nelson, who is as fainthearted as the President about firing people, gets out the ax and keeps the promise he made when he became head of the WPB. When, Mr. Nelson, will the heads roll?" (*The Nation*, April 11.)

Yes, when? Evidently, Mr. Nelson was too busy that week to read the *Nation*. At any rate, the streets of Washington have been singularly free of rolling heads except those of liberals. I. F. Stone sadly concludes in *The Nation* of June 27:

"Carefully read and considered, the Truman report on the Guthrie case is the key to the continued setbacks suffered by ourselves and our allies. The arsenal of democracy, as the Guthrie case and the reactions to the report show, is still being operated with one eye on the war and the other on the convenience of big business. . . .

"The Guthrie report shows that, months after Pearl Harbor . . . the big-business crowd is as powerfully entrenched under Nelson as it was under Knudsen."

Stone ends with the happy suggestion that: "The solution of our problems lies in a more democratic direction of our industrial effort," although he confesses dolefully, "the trend is the other way."

And even Dorothy Thompson, who can say "war for democracy" in every language including the Sanskrit, complains that the government is giving \$600,000,000 worth of new plants for synthetic rubber production to "finance enormously rich corporations to manufacture a product for which the people themselves are a certain market. . . . Why didn't they put up their own money?" Why indeed? She finishes off with the profound suggestion: "If we are going to survive this epoch we have got to do imaginative thinking. And stop letting people whose brains have grown dull on monopoly do it for us."

The problem that is beginning to trouble the liberals more than anything else is the strange international company the "democratic" rulers are keeping these days.

Freda Kirchwey, editor of *The Nation*, had some strong words to say on this subject on January 3, after the State De-

partment had "advised" the Free French to withdraw from St. Pierre and Miquelon islands in favor of Petain. "*Mr. Hull Should Resign*" was the title of her indignation piece:

"If the State Department, without consultation with the President or the Cabinet, has plunged the nation into its present humiliating position, its officials should be called into account as promptly as were the military leaders at Pearl Harbor. Without the least delay, the President should demand the resignation of the officials who on their own say-so betrayed the cause to which this country has been pledged not only by the terms of the Atlantic Charter but in many pronouncements by the President. . . . Why should men who have demonstrated their failure with such undeviating success be permitted to direct the policy of a great power committed to a life-and-death struggle?"

Hull's Bedfellows Embarrass the Liberals

Why, indeed? Miss Kirchwey can't answer her own riddles but, evidently, President Roosevelt knows why, because Miss Kirchwey was compelled to report six months later in the June 20 *Nation*:

"But it must be admitted the future is still obscure. . . . The agreements made in Washington and London (with the Kremlin) are only a blue-print. . . . on the very day when the new coalition was proclaimed, Secretary Hull announced the resumption of shipments of food and other supplies from America to the Vichy government in North Africa.

"No promises, no pacts, no fine speeches by Welles or even (!) Wallace or Winant, can wipe out the demoralizing effect of the old diplomacy pursuing its old discredited maneuvers while the struggle against fascism reaches a climax of danger and effort."

Samuel Grafton, who poses many questions well and knows none of the answers, stated:

"The best I can make of our current policy is that we insist the French people shall rise in revolution, but not against their government. . . . Hitler thinks the French revolution is more important than the French fleet, for he has kept his hands off the latter to avoid the former. We have reached the remarkable situation in which Hitler lets the French fleet alone, to sustain Vichy's prestige, and we sustain Vichy's prestige in order to save the fleet.

"One of us must be taking a hell of an ideological beating. Who are the French people to revolt against? Hitler doesn't want them to know, either." (*New York Post*, June 16.)

And echo calls in the Stalinist press:

"How long is Marshal Petain going to be allowed to make a sucker out of the United States?" (*Daily Worker*, June 13.)

The liberals are also taking "a hell of an ideological beating" about Finland as well. Here the Stalinist press gives the lead that the liberals follow. Adam Lapin goes in for some illuminating society reporting in the *Daily Worker*, June 9:

"Mannerheim's envoy to Washington, Hjalmar Procope, spent his Sunday evening chatting and dining with high administration officials and with leading United States Senators. As plans for a new Finnish-Nazi drive against the Soviet Union, personally mapped by Hitler, were under way, some of the officials who dined with Finnish Minister Procope included:

"Milo Perkins, Director of the War Economic Board; Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the National Manpower Commission; Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold; Associate Justice Stanley Reed, of the Supreme Court; Senate Majority Leader Alben Barkley and Senator Joseph E. Guffey of Pennsylvania.

". . . it seems about time they realized that Finland is Hitler's ally, and that attending social evenings with Procope can

hardly be construed as a friendly gesture toward the Soviet Union. . . ."

The concern of the liberals about the particular attitudes of the "democratic" rulers toward Vichy and Finland has begun to broaden out into a more generalized worry about where this whole "struggle against fascism" is heading. This is best expressed by J. Alvarez Del Vayo, Foreign Minister in the Spanish Loyalist Government, in one of a series of articles on "World War III?" in the June 20 *Nation*:

"The Petains and Francos were not merely tolerated. They were, and they yet are, considered by the ruling diplomacy a useful element of counterpoise in a Europe which tomorrow might swing too far to the left. That is why the diplomacy which today still directs foreign policy on the side of the Allies, when it has a choice, prefers an Otto of Hapsburg to an Austrian Socialist, an Eckhardt to a Hungarian democrat. . . . One cannot but maintain a certain reserve when considering the question what kind of peace would emerge if the present governments of the United Nations could vote secretly on the transcendental question of the organization of the world of tomorrow."

How long? How is it possible? How can this be? How can we convince the masses that this is a "war for democracy against fascism" when liberals and anti-fascists are persecuted, when reactionaries and pro-fascists are handled with kid gloves, when Big Business is in the saddle and the old ruling diplomacy rides higher than ever? The liberals chant their woes and drench the wailing wall with their tears. But they have no answers and would not like the correct answers.

They Don't Want to Tell the Truth

If it occurs to them that Mr. Hull does not resign because Roosevelt approves his policies, or that the monopolies are running this war because it is a capitalist war, or that high administration officials maintain a certain fraternal attitude toward Petain, Franco and Mannerheim because this is not and never was an ideological war between democracy and fascism, they do not voice their suspicions. God forbid! They don't want to tell the truth about this war. They just want to save their own tender hides in the mounting reaction and continue with a straight face to be able to tell the masses that this is "our" war.

But it is becoming more difficult for the liberals to be convincing. As the intellectual spokesmen for the petty-bourgeoisie who are being crushed by the war-expedited monopoly control, the liberals are feeling the weight of reaction on their own backs. They look to the past with misgivings and to the future with rising fear. They keep shouting hoop-la for the "war against fascism" but they can scarcely conceal the feeling that somehow this "war for democracy" is writing the epitaph for bourgeois democracy in general and for its liberal exponents in particular.

Fortunately for the masses of the world, their fate does not depend on these hired mourners at the death-bed of bourgeois democracy. While the liberals wring their hands hopelessly at the spectacle of the death agony of capitalism, the revolutionary proletarian forces are building their cadres and mobilizing their strength throughout the world.

The oppressed of the earth will silence the whines of the liberals along with burying the rotting corpse of capitalism. For the masses, unlike the liberals, are seeking an answer to the question of their destiny, an answer that will sweep the globe—the socialist revolution.

The Crisis in Agriculture

III. Conditions of the Agricultural Worker

By C. CHARLES

Driven from the land, the ex-farmer can no longer find a place as an independent farmer or tenant or (if we except the present war boom) in urban industry. He either joins the 3,000,000 subsistence farmers—a mellifluous term for peasants—or becomes a migratory farm worker.

What are the living conditions of the million and a half agricultural migratory wage workers and the three-quarters of a million remaining hired hands? To answer this, it is necessary to say a few words about the technical conditions of farm work.

Farming is now characterized by a high degree of mechanization in preparing the soil for the seed and in sowing. The need for labor in these phases of the work is comparatively small. Contrariwise, harvesting, outside of the combine harvester in wheat* and the corn picker, is as yet but little mechanized and hand labor is the rule. The need of labor is relatively very great for a few days or weeks of the year during reaping time. To be able to earn a living the agricultural worker must follow the harvest as the crops mature at different times in various parts of the country. Hundreds and thousands of miles are covered in the annual wanderings. Labor is intensely migratory.

Formerly farm labor was marked by a variety of different tasks from keeping books, curing live stock and meteorological forecasts to cleaning manure out of stables. Now a farm worker is a specialist: an orange picker, an apple picker, a lettuce trimmer, a cotton picker, an asparagus cutter, a beet worker, a milker, a tractor operator. As in urban industry, the development of capitalism on the land has meant division and subdivision and specialization of labor, usually accompanied by intense monotony and drudgery.

The tempo of work in the field has been speeded up. This is caused sometimes by natural conditions, such as the need for harvesting certain crops within very brief periods, but it may also be due to market conditions, as every grower hopes to take advantage of the market when the prices are favorable. Mechanization has also aided in transformign agriculture from a leisurely occupation to toil of the same intensity as is found in the factory where work is organized on the Taylor or Bedeaux systems.

Carey McWilliams states in *Ill Fares the Land*:

*Many small farmers can keep themselves on the land only by becoming farmer-workers. The exodus from Oklahoma of the Joads, who formerly planted cotton, is directly connected with the use of the combine harvester in the wheat fields of Kansas. Previously the farmer from Oklahoma, Arkansas, or other regions would supplement his income from the soil as an "independent" farmer with the wages of two or three months' work in the wheat fields. When that came to an end with the introduction of the combine harvester beginning in 1927, which within a few years eliminated nine-tenths of the harvest hands, another prop was pulled out from under the share-cropping and tenancy system. Numerous share-croppers and tenants work in addition at picking berries, fruit, cotton and vegetables on the large farms. In 1939, 1,750,000 farmers worked part-time off their land. Of this number over 25 per cent worked at farm labor.

"The efficiency experts complain that the former harvest hands have 'horse habits' and cannot be adjusted to machine work. The typical harvest hand, they say, even shows a deplorable tendency . . . to stop every now and then and take a smoke. It is as though from force of habit he wants to give the machine a rest. The remaining farm hands are, nowadays, really machinists. Many of them do not reside on the farm but are members of special custom-work combine crews that contract to harvest wheat from Oklahoma to Kansas. With floodlights turned on the fields, they work day and night and the harvest is completed in a matter of hours. With the smaller combines mounted on rubber tires and the larger combines being transported by truck, combine crews move from state to state, from area to area, in a brief period of time."

Why Minority Groups Were Employed

If we leave aside the hired hand, the first wage workers employed on large-scale farm enterprises as modern proletarians were members of various minority races. In California it began with the American Indian, then the Chinese and Japanese, later the Filipino and Hindu and last of all, immediately prior to the dust-bowl migrants, the Mexican.

In the Southwest (and also in the beet fields of the northern states) capitalist farming was originally, and remains, in spite of the competition of white workers, based on the Mexicans. In other parts of the country Negro farm workers played and play an important role, while in the eastern states European immigrants formerly supplied a part of the labor supply.

Agricultural capital has always preferred workers of minority races and groupings, oppressed, without civil rights, and as a result more easily terrorized. Such workers would find it difficult to get decent wages and hours, and would be too fearful to organize.

Dr. George Clements of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce stated on October 15, 1935:

"We on the land have always recognized that California agricultural labor requirements made impossible to those people employed the full efforts of American citizenship and the possibility of partaking in our normal standards of living."

The number of Mexicans in California increased from 71,062 in 1900 to 683,681 three decades later.

On December 18, 1936, Dr. Clements declared:

"The 175,000 Mexicans who from 1917 to 1930 met the agricultural labor requirements . . . were adaptable labor . . . tractable labor. Can we expect these new white transient citizens to fill their place? The white transients are not tractable labor. Being American citizens, they are going to demand the so-called American standard of living."

"The Mexican has put Texas on the map agriculturally," asserted the *Literary Digest* in 1930, repeating what had been said more elegantly by the *Century* in its January 1926 issue: "His labors are the basis of that pyramid of economic prosperity which the Southwest so proudly displays."

A Texan, testifying before the House Committee on Immigration declared:

"Mr. Chairman, here is the whole situation in a nutshell.

... In order to allow landlords now to make a profit off their farms, they want to get the cheapest labor they can find, and if they get Mexican labor, it enables them to make a profit. That is the way it is along the border, and I imagine that is the way it is anywhere else."

One bank official told a representative of the Texas State Employment Service:

"Give the Negro barely enough to eat to keep him strong, and just enough clothes to hide his nakedness, otherwise he will develop the big head and get the idea he is anybody's equal."

Besides the Mexicans and Negroes, American Indians are used in regions close to reservations. Filipino labor, at one time much more important than at present, still remains in agriculture.

The basis of profits for the farm capitalists is the labor of the farm worker. The cheapest labor—from which the greatest profit can be extracted—is the labor of racially and nationally oppressed groups.

The secretary of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce feared that the white migrants would not prove as docile as the Mexican workers. The strikes of the united American and Mexican workers that swept through California agriculture like a cleansing storm proved him correct in his premonition as to the intractability of the American workers and wrong regarding the continued subservience of the Mexicans. But in the first years of the arrival of the dust-bowl migrants their hunger was so great that it was the Mexican workers who were threatened, in cases of recalcitrance, by the warning: "We'll bring in more Okies."

The new draftees in the army of the agricultural migrants, although white and born in the United States, suffer a loss of civic rights. They cannot vote because of residential requirements. They are eligible to relief only to the amount and when it suits the county relief commissioners who in rural areas are generally growers or their representatives. They are considered as inferiors and suffer from what amounts to a variety of "Jim Crowism."

The third of the important sources of today's farm labor is the hired hand. Before 1929 it was still assumed that the hired hand was in that status only for a period before passing on to independent farming, possibly via a stage of tenancy. The relation with the employer was much closer to that of master and apprentice than capitalist and wage worker. The hired hand formerly was considered nearly as one of the family and, legend has it, married one of the farmer's daughters. But the old relationship disappeared together with farming as a "way of life." The owners of the farm corporations do not even know the names of their workers, much less consider them as eligible sons-in-law. The hired hand graduates not to his own farm but into the hosts of migratory laborers, while the 750,000 hired hands who remain on single-employee farms no longer enjoy the same conditions nor wages as formerly.

Incomes of Agricultural Workers

According to the Year Book of the Department of Agriculture the probability is that the full time earnings of agricultural workers including perquisites, average under \$400 a year for the country as a whole. The daily wages in 1940 were lower than in 1931, while they sank from \$1.61 in 1937 to \$1.59 in 1940.

In his testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee, Dr. Carl Taylor estimated the annual average earnings per worker were \$185 in tobacco; \$206 in grain

crops; \$265 in truck crops in New Jersey; \$308 in corn (Illinois and Iowa) and \$340 in sugar beets.

In the southern states, net cash earnings only occasionally exceed \$100 a year, and if goods for home use and perquisites are included, the total is seldom more than \$150.

In the Yakima Valley in the Pacific Northwest, hop pickers and apple "knockers" average per family about \$254 a year. In 1936 half the families earned less than \$200. (The distinction should be noticed throughout this section between individual earnings and family earnings.)

In Arizona, Indian cotton pickers in 1940 earned an average of 50 to 60 cents a day per person, with the daily average earnings per family being about \$2.50. Entire Mexican families' averages do not exceed \$250 a year, with Mexican workers in season earning about \$6.00 a week.

In Austin, Texas, "one employer is paying his farm hands 75 cents a day . . . another farmer in the county is paying 80 cents a day." "On all the big farms the workers who draw \$1.00 a day return a generous portion of it to the landlord at the plantation commissary . . . paying from 15 to 25 per cent more for an item than they would pay for the same article in town. Many Central Texas families have not earned more than an average of five cents a day per member of the family from farm work during the last twelve months." These statements are from reports to the Tolan Committee, and refer to white cotton pickers.

The Texas State Employment Service estimates that in 1938 workers in cotton could not make more than \$37.50 per season of six months. In 1940 it was found in one county that the average income per person was \$2.53 a week. In other regions it was established that weekly incomes per person were \$1.60. An official told the Tolan Committee that "we found able-bodied men working ten hours a day and receiving as low as 20 cents for an entire day or 2 cents an hour."

The Mexican workers fare slightly better. Their wages average between 75 cents and \$1 a day during the season.

It is estimated that there are 400,000 cotton pickers in Texas, of whom approximately 300,000 are Mexican, 60,000 white, and 40,000 Negro.

The displaced croppers and tenants fare as badly in other Texas crops as in cotton. Here are some examples: digging onions in Dimmitt county—60 cents a day; spinach—\$2.50 to \$4 a week; pecan pickers average \$6 a week.

The Everglades region of Florida produces enormous yields of carrots, beans, peas and tomatoes from its recently reclaimed muck lands. The labor is mainly Negro. In a detailed study of annual earnings of sample families of wage workers it was found:

"Half of all the workers studied received an annual income of \$307 or less. . . . This income includes all cash derived from employment in the Lake Okeechobee area and elsewhere, plus value of free housing, wood, gardens, or other perquisites . . . five-sixths received \$500 or less. Only 2 per cent received more than \$800. So much for individual workers. What of family incomes? . . . 56 per cent of the incomes were \$500 or less; 15 per cent received more than \$800. Among colored families . . . 72 per cent had family incomes of \$500 or less; and only 5 per cent incomes higher than \$800."

Average annual earnings in the Colorado beet fields in 1938 for a Mexican family were found to be \$568.49 of which \$412.46 were earned by working in beets; \$132 through other employment, and \$24.12 from relief. As families are large it is in the realm of the debatable whether average earnings per individual worker are greater than \$105. It must be remem-

bered that the sugar beet workers are the aristocracy of Mexican agricultural labor.

In the Michigan beet fields, average seasonal earnings per family were estimated at about \$640. The size of the average family is 4.4 adult workers of 14 years or over. Work is from 5 a. m. to sundown.

In the Colorado Palisades fruit region, wages average about \$1 a day. In the bean, celery, berry and tomato fields of that state Mexican workers are compelled to work for from 50 to 60 cents a day according to the Report of the Denver Bureau of Public Welfare in December 1940. If a worker does not accept this work he is forced off relief. Average annual earnings per worker in the potato fields of Colorado, Wyoming and Montana are \$230.

In the tomato fields of Indiana about 5,000 out-of-state families are employed. Their point of origin is mainly Kentucky but in the recent period Mexican families have appeared. For a 10-, 12- or 14-hour day it is doubtful if an experienced adult worker can make \$1.50 daily, with women and children proportionately less.

In the berry fields, wages range from \$108.24 to \$424 a year throughout the country. In Michigan at existing hourly and piece rates workers can average 20 to 25 cents an hour for a 10-hour day, but if the season is late, or the crop small, these days and hours are often punctuated by long periods of idleness. The average family picking berries does not earn more than \$150 to \$200 per year. Wages in other Michigan crops range from \$185 to \$400 per family per season.

The average annual income in the strawberry fields per family, of which relief payments make up a good percentage, was \$287.

For share-croppers, tenants and farmers in the Bootheel region of southeastern Missouri, the annual family income was estimated at \$415 for the white cropper, for the white laborer at \$264 and for the Negroes as a whole at \$251. These income figures include relief payments.

On the eastern shore of Virginia (broccoli, spinach and peas) the former Tennessee share-croppers earn \$8 a week.

Relief families in the Hemmerton area make \$3.30 a week in the raspberry fields, living five and six to a room. In the cranberry bogs of Massachusetts, earnings per season per family in 1938 averaged \$265, of which about 30 per cent is earned by children under 10.

Wages in the Kentucky berry fields, in which some 20,000 migrants work each season, averaged \$474 per year per family (\$77 per person), with one-crop migrants earning about half as much as the year-rounder who works in both strawberries and cotton to earn the total amount mentioned.

It is a characteristic trick of the growers always to try to maintain a super-abundance of available labor. They advertise far and wide to attract laborers; through their control of the counties they refuse relief to workers who might work in the fields. The level of farm wages can be deduced from the fact that the miserable relief is preferred by the workers to toiling in the fields.

The Rural Slums

Some of the most horrible slums in the world are located in the rural areas of the United States.

In California, since the beginning of the migration of the "Okies," there are numerous settlements on the outskirts of the established towns. These are populated by "homeowners" who have bought a plot of land from speculators for \$200

—\$5 down and the balance on payments. Housing in these settlements is a progression from tents and trailers to lean-tos and shacks, and to one- and two-room cabins, built of knotty pine or boxwood, costing \$75 at the most. Sanitation is negligible; water is expensive, often equal to the monthly payments. The soil is poor and truck gardening impossible. Some of these migrant communities number from 4,000 to 8,000 souls.

There are 5,000 private agricultural camps in California housing 150,000 persons. Due to the strikes and the exposes by Steinbeck, McWilliams and others, there has been some improvement in the standards of these camps. Inadequate as they are, they do supply some type of shelter, bathing facilities, toilets, garbage disposal, some sanitation and an adequate supply of drinking water. California camps are the best in the West. By this measure we can judge the rest.

The living conditions in the Yakima Valley are the worst in the West. There are not even the growers' labor camps found in California. The growers assert that to establish such camps on their land would provide too good an opportunity to steal fruit. In the hop camps most of the cooking is done out of doors, drainage is bad and sanitation absent.

There are four types of housing for migrant farm families in Arizona: grower camps, cheap auto and trailer camps, squatter camps and shacktowns such as exist in California.

In Maricopa and Pinal Counties, center of Arizona cotton raising, 68.4 per cent of the migrants live in 191 grower camps, totalling a population of about 21,000 people during the season. These camps are mainly "unfurnished tents, pitched on the open sun-baked mud flats at the edge of or near the cotton fields. Toilet facilities, never segregated for the sexes, consist of ordinary privies. Water is piped from wells or tanks and frequently irrigation ditch water is used. Bathing facilities are unknown." Brush has to be gathered from the desert for fuel; electric lights are as though never invented.

Approximately 21.2 per cent of the workers live in trailer or auto camps where rents range from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per week. This is preferred by many pickers, for living in the trailer or auto camp enables them to free-lance in looking for work instead of being obliged to work for the grower on whose land they camp. Also in the auto and trailer camps supplies can be bought wherever one wishes rather than from the over-charging company commissary.

Located on the roadside, ditch banks or on the open desert, usually near water, are the squatter camps, most horrible of all. In numerous cases the only shelter is the automobile. Many of these camps are the result of the policy of the growers of not admitting to their camps families with less than three pickers.

In Texas, there are generally no private camps provided. Pickers throw up their own camps wherever they can find a site. There is no effort to provide camp facilities of any kind: water, toilets, etc. The weather gets extremely cold in parts of Texas in October and November. In those cases where camps are provided they consist of sheds, barns, machine houses, or rows of one-room cabins, 20 to 60 in a row.

The season is opening in Palm Beach, in the luxurious hotels, as 20,000 migratory workers arrive in the Lake Okechobee region for their "season." White laborers live in "tents, trailers, tarpaper shacks, hovels of patched-together tin, even in tree houses." They pay \$1 to \$1.50 a week rent for ground space. The typical Negro family lives in a 10-foot square stall in a long shed or barracks, which rents for \$1 to

\$1.50 a week unfurnished. The county physician reports that "as many as 10 persons have been herded in a room 12 feet by 14 feet, with only two windows and have paid \$4.00 a week rent. . . . I know of one man in the neighborhood who collects \$2,000 per month for such substandard quarters."

Investigation in Michigan agricultural fields has unearthed some interesting facts.

In Gratiot County clusters of "terrible" shacks were found. Toilet facilities are generally absent. Four or five people sleep in one bed (there is no furniture or bedding) and the more unfortunate rest on the floor. In Monroe and Lenawee Counties, 75 per cent of the housing was found to be inadequate one- or two-room shacks, "overcrowded, vermin-infested, badly ventilated."

The following is from a WPA report on the conditions in the region around Benton Harbor:

"Many producers in the area hire from 50 to 400 workers. All the camps in which these migrants live follow the same dreary description. The only concession is a well for water, and an average of one outhouse for 50 people. When old barns and buildings are available they are used as bunkhouses to provide for an unbelievable number of people. . . . In the center of one camp were two large frame buildings each about 75 feet long and 12 feet wide. The houses had dirt floors and each was divided by flimsy partitions into eight rooms. The buildings are the homes of 100 men, women and children—an average of over eight to one small room."

This is Michigan, "enlightened" Michigan, not Mississippi!

We cannot leave the description of housing of the farm workers without quoting from an eye-witness in Florida:

The people swarm back from the field and scatter to their stalls, huts and hovels. "Finally no more sleeping places. Men made big fires and fifty or sixty men slept around each fire. But they had to pay the man whose land they slept on. He ran the fire; just like his boarding house—for hire!"

Child Labor and Health Conditions

Family labor—child and woman labor, often unpaid—make up a great part of the agricultural workers.

In the Northwest hop and apple fields, labor of women and children is very important. Sugar beet contract labor, both in Colorado and Michigan is exclusively "family contract" labor. In the Michigan sugar beet area, nearly 35 per cent of the workers are children. It is claimed in New Jersey that children make the best berry pickers.

The conditions of education of the migrant children is indicated by the saying in California: "You can't educate a procession."

In September 1940 there were more than 75,000 children reported not attending public school in Texas.

The education of the children of the Florida migrants is revealed by the statement that "enrollment in school dropped from 485 to 20 in a week" when the beans came in.

In the beet fields of Michigan the children do not even pretend to start school in the fall. They lose two or three months in the fall and one or two months in the spring.

Of the children of Mexican agricultural workers in Colorado, one-fourth of all children between 6 and 15 years of age had no school record for the year 1935-36; practically no Mexican children progress beyond the eighth grade.

At a conference in Washington on Lincoln's Birthday in 1940, a Mrs. Simmons stated, speaking of New Jersey: "New Jersey children must go to school but Pennsylvania children don't have to go to school, so we use the Pennsylvania chil-

dren in the truck gardens early in the season and in the cranberry bogs later."

In the strawberry fields of Louisiana, only about half the children attend school and those only when they are unable to find work. In the Bootheel of Missouri, of 400 schools only about 24 meet the low standards of the State Board of Education, only 54 per cent of the children attend school and they have regular spring and fall cotton "vacations."

Farming is generally considered healthful work. Never was there a greater error. The health conditions of the farm workers is glaringly expressed by an investigator in the following statement: "They seem to die fastest in areas of greatest agricultural prosperity." Low wages, poor housing, inadequate sanitary facilities, early child labor, women working in the fields, make of the agricultural workers and their families the most sickly of individuals. The "sturdy yeoman" suffers from anemia, rickets, pellagra, diarrhea, typhoid fever—the list is too long to repeat.

There are 864 rural counties in the United States, in which nearly 200,000 live babies were born in 1937, yet not a single one of these births took place in a hospital.

In the sugar beet areas of Colorado, the death rate from filth-borne diseases such as typhoid fever, diarrhea and enteritis were found to be two and one-half to five times as great as in the rest of the state. The county that leads in potato production leads as well in death rates from the above-mentioned diseases.

The report of the Kellogg Foundation on health conditions of the fruit pickers of Michigan states: "The children suffer more than any other group. . . . Impetigo and other skin diseases are very common and often progress unrecognized."

Agricultural labor is dangerous not only due to the diseases rampant among the workers but also owing to the high rate of accidents resulting from farm machinery, poorly equipped or completely unequipped with safety devices. More people are killed in the course of farm work than at any other occupation. In 1939, 4,300 workers, over one-quarter of all industrial fatalities, were killed as a consequence of farm accidents.

Agricultural workers also suffer many traffic accidents as they search for work in their antiquated, dangerous autos, or ride the freight trains or plod the highways.

Labor and social legislation does not affect farm labor outside of certain legislation for sugar beet workers. The Wagner Labor Act is not operative, nor the Social Security Act, old age and unemployment insurance, nor the Fair Labor Standards Acts with its wage minimum and hour maximum.

Only four states treat agricultural workers in the same category as industrial workers for workers' compensation insurance. Twenty-three states exclude children from existing child labor laws. Few states even make a pretense of regulation of hours and conditions of the women and children who work in the fields. Only 13 states have regulations governing private labor camps. States that legislate minimum standards of housing for cattle have no such laws for migratory workers.

In practically all social legislation the phrase can be read: "Agricultural labor is exempt." The excuse for this exemption is that agriculture is not an industry and that social legislation is unnecessary due to the benevolent relations existing between farmer and worker, different than in the shop. Yet, as we have seen, social legislation is more needed on the land than in the factory.

This is the picture of farming in America today. It is the great merit of Carey McWilliams that he has gathered many of the important facts together in his new book, *Ill Fares the Land*. But what shall be done?

The Future of Agriculture

McWilliams does not glorify or sigh for the past, impossible to recover. He says:

"... there is no point whatever in attempting to reverse a clearly defined historical trend. We cannot cope with the problem by relocating displaced farm families on subsistence non-commercial farms. Nor can we legislate the large-scale industrialized farm out of existence by conducting indignant campaigns against 'corporate farming.' ... Nor is there much point in being sentimental about so-called 'rural values' and bewailing the fact that the farmer has been robbed of many hand-labor functions now performed by the machine. Many of these functions were unspeakably dreary and unnecessarily degraded rural life. There is nothing to be gained technically, nor, in the long run, socially, by attempting to break up large holdings and to return to a concept of farming which prevailed a century ago."

He also correctly states:

"To deal with the basic causes of migration, we can no longer think in terms of rehabilitating a few thousand individual farm

families, of makeshift work programs, of improvised welfare projects, of social legislation to protect farm workers (valuable as these proposals are to attain immediate objectives). These measures will not, and cannot, suffice. We must think in bolder terms; we must plan on a much larger scale. The general direction which our thinking and planning should take is clearly indicated. Democracy is not only a means but it is the goal toward the attainment of which our efforts should be directed. ... our industrial and economic order in all its phases—industrial, agricultural, and financial—is not democratic. It is neither owned nor administered nor directed democratically. It functions in an autocratic manner. ... We need to refashion this economic order to a more democratic pattern. ..."

McWilliams, it is clear, looks forward to a socialist future; but he speaks of socialism with a most lamentable, ludicrous timidity. The Marxists say frankly what he hints:

Socialism is the only salvation not only for the worker in the city and farm, but also for the small dirt farmer. In the struggle for socialism the small farmer, victimized by capital, will be found shoulder to shoulder with the agricultural and city worker.

(This is the third and last of a series on American agriculture. The others appeared in our May and June issues.)

Stalin Bolsters His "New" Tradition

By A. ROLAND

Every regime rests on certain real and ideological foundations. The three great pillars of Czarist Russia were orthodoxy, autocracy and nationalism. Of these Stalin has established a new form of aristocracy—the Kremlin bureaucracy. He has replaced the old state-religion orthodoxy by a peculiar—because unstable and contradictory—state orthodoxy called Stalinism. And the Kremlin is doing its best to reestablish old-style nationalism.

Commenting on Stalin's July 3, 1941 speech, which appealed to the feudal Russian tradition of the defeat of Napoleon, the October 1941 *Fourth International* noted that the name of the Soviet historian, Eugene Tarle, missing since the purges of 1936, had reappeared in the Soviet press. "Perhaps," said *Fourth International*, "Tarle will now have to rewrite his writings on the Napoleonic epoch!" And so it is indeed.

Tarle was a renowned authority on the Napoleonic epoch. His "Bonaparte" was published here some years ago and was justly considered a study in the classic Marxist tradition. But that was sufficient to bring it into conflict with the needs of the Kremlin. He has now unpurged himself by meeting the demands of Stalinist autocracy and orthodoxy (as of today) by his new book on the Napoleonic invasion of 1812.* Stalin finds it necessary to recast history in order to set up once again the pillar of nationalism. Tarle writes his present book in the cause of this new "tradition."

This is not the first time that new regimes bent on serving their own ends have rewritten history. The development of capitalism provides innumerable instances. There is, for example, the difference between the defeated agrarian and the victorious bourgeois interpretation of the critical period in

American history culminating in the adoption of the much-haloed Constitution. Similarly the French revolution was much revised by capitalist historians after Thermidor and the Napoleonic period. American history books painted in entirely different colors the Civil War and Reconstruction after the reconciliation between the ruling classes of the two sections, as though the struggle had been an unfortunate misunderstanding.

But nowhere in history has there been so stupendous an attempt to pervert and distort the reality of the past as in the Russia of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This reactionary parasite tries to tear out by the roots from the living memories of men their glowing recollections of yesterday. With the aid of hirelings in all lands, they have tried to make black appear white and white black. Stalin did not help his scribblers too well, because in the devious twists and turns of his opportunist politics, he was again and again forced to call white what he had denounced as black but yesterday. These suddenly precipitated reversals merely reflected the instability of a regime which was attempting to retain the stamp of Lenin and the proletarian revolution while undermining and casting overboard the doctrines and policies of the revolution.

The revision of the history of the Russian revolution was necessitated the moment the Stalinist clique usurped power. It was necessitated by the so-called theory of socialism in one country, used by Stalin to strangle everything that might remind one of the international character of the Russian revolution. It became the aim of Stalinism to dam the revolution and to divert it solely into national channels. But the proletarian revolution could not possibly reach its socialist goal within national boundaries. Hence the Stalinist clique brought about the steady degeneration of the revolution of Lenin and Trotsky. The Kremlin dictator tried to substitute new national foundations for the October revolution, but his

*NAPOLÉON'S INVASION OF RUSSIA—1812, by Eugene Tarle. Oxford University Press, 1942. \$3.50.

failure to do so is attested by the fact that he was forced to pass over the entire period of the revolution and to go further back in history for his national traditions. He was forced to go back to the epoch of the founding of the nation, when the proletariat did not even exist.

Such was Stalin's ideological preparation of the Russian proletariat for the war against fascism. Indeed how could it have been otherwise? Could Stalin have appealed to the traditions of the Civil War and the struggles against world capitalist intervention? But they were led by the men murdered by the bureaucracy! Far better for Stalin to forget "Marshal Forward" (Blücher) and his fight against the Cossack Hetman Dutov; or Antonov-Ovseyenko in the Don defeating the forces of Kornilov; Yakir leading the Chinese labor corps against the Rumanians in Bessarabia; Putna at Kazan. It would stick in Stalin's throat to be reminded of the real turning-point of the Civil War when Tukhachevsky so brilliantly retook Simbirsk. Above all let nobody even whisper the name of the creator of the Red Army and its victories, L. D. Trotsky. The tradition of these men is sealed to Stalin by their blood.

Instead the Kremlin reaction attempts an analogy with Czarist Russia: Kutuzov and his master, Czar Alexander, are praised for preserving the Russian nation; and not only the Russian nation, for by their defeat of Napoleon, that arch-fiend, they helped to preserve all the nations of Europe.

The Marxist Estimate of Napoleon's Role

The attitude of Marxists towards the Napoleonic wars has always been quite clear. Bonaparte usurped the power of the French revolution as the aftermath of the Thermidorian reaction against the revolution. But he was also the son of the revolution in the sense that he was the arch-foe of the previous feudal ruling class headed by the Bourbons. Napoleon had no intention to restore the past, to restore serfdom. On the contrary, his rule rested on the bourgeoisie and he epitomized the fact that society now had a new ruling class, the capitalists. The wars against the rest of Europe (with the exception of England) were wars of conquest to strengthen the French bourgeoisie but, by the same token, they were wars of defense against the coalition of feudal nations attempting to restore the Bourbons and feudalism in France. Through the Napoleonic wars, the French revolution struck a death-blow at feudalism everywhere in Europe. Serfdom remained longest in Russia precisely because Napoleon failed to conquer there. Thus, while Marxists view the role of Napoleon as reactionary inside France, his role outside was progressive. The serfs everywhere hailed the coming of the French armies because it meant their liberation. This, as much as anything else, aided Napoleon in his victories. The armies of his enemies were already undermined wherever they included serfs.

No Marxist would have dreamed of defending Czarism, that system called by Lenin the "prison of the nations," against even the degenerated form of the French revolution personified in Bonaparte. That this attitude was correct is clear when one considers the effects of the defeat of Napoleon. Europe was thrown into the blackest reaction, into the dark period of the Holy Alliance founded by the Czar. Italian unity as a nation was postponed until 1870, since Italy was redivided and much of it handed back to Austria. German unity was also forfeited to a much later date. Poland was once again partitioned, the Czar getting the lion's share. The League of Nations of that period (the Holy Alliance) meant

the league of the victorious feudal monarchs against the peoples of Europe. But above all the solution of serfdom in Russia was postponed. The fear of serf uprisings as Napoleon approached the Russian interior had led Alexander to practically promise emancipation—after the war! Instead of emancipation the Czar founded the infamous military colonies.

Tarle understood the Marxist attitude to Napoleon very well, as is proved by his earlier work on Bonaparte. His new book, however, makes a complete about-face, condemns Napoleon and defends Kutuzov and the Czar. The war on the side of Russia is called a war for national liberation, no less! Worse still, Tarle falsely attributes a like view to Lenin. We await at some future time Tarle's explanation for Lenin's attitude in the first World War. Just why was Lenin no longer interested in the Russian "nation" and its preservation? Why did he actually raise the slogan of revolutionary defeatism in order to bring about the downfall of Czarism and the opportunity for the proletariat to take power? Tarle will find it most difficult to answer because he places the nation above the class in his new volume. In this he merely carries out the orders of Stalin.

Let us quote from Tarle's first book, "Bonaparte," to show how clearly he understood the epoch of the Napoleonic wars. He wrote: "In the realm of foreign policy, Napoleon's imperialistic tendencies, dictated by the interests of the French bourgeoisie, brought him into conflict with the rotting, actively decomposing semi-feudal world of Europe. . . ." The impact of the French revolution is shown again and again, even though refracted through the person of Napoleon. "He destroyed all traces of feudal laws in conquered Italy, and deprived the churches and monasteries of the right to exact extortions." Two quotations will help establish the attitude of the French quite clearly. "Yes, and how could the French peasant army forget that its Emperor had issued out of revolutionary ranks, when it witnessed with its own eyes that serfs had ceased being serfs and that the nobility no longer dared humiliate them without fear of reprisal, as was the rule in the days of the Bourbons. Instinctively, they knew that outside the borders of France, in the Europe he was conquering, their leader was following the aims of revolution, rather than counter-revolution." How did the workers of Paris feel? "Immediately before the arrival of the news of Marengo, the workers of Paris, of all France, indeed of all Europe, were asking themselves the one question uppermost in their minds: would the benefits of the revolution be maintained, or would they perish? If Bonaparte were killed or taken prisoner, or if his army were crushed by the enemy, one might expect the prompt landing of the emigres and the English in the Vendee, a campaign against Paris, an upheaval in the capital, the invasion of France from the east by the Austrians and other interventionists, the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, and the resurrection of the old feudal order."

But this is before the period of Napoleon's Russian invasion, one might say. Very well. Let us quote Tarle's earlier book on this invasion. Here is an incidental remark characterizing Czar Alexander: "Alexander had far more reason to fear Napoleon as the destroyer of the feudal order, but he knew that the transformation of France into an autocratic empire was a circumstance that undermined Napoleon's moral prestige both in France, and in the rest of Europe, among certain sections of middle-class society—among those human beings for whom the Revolution still preserved a certain fascination. This liberal censure of Napoleonic autocracy by the despotic master of an empire in which feudal serfdom still

obtained, is one of the ironies of history."

Best of all we have Tarle's earlier remarks on "national" war: "It would not be amiss here to say something on the so-called Russian 'national' war of 1812. Never did Napoleon, or his marshals, speak of the war of 1812 as a 'national' war, in the same sense as they spoke of the Spanish guerrilla war as a 'national' war. Nor could they compare the two phenomena. . . . There was not a single national mass revolt against the French, neither then nor after Napoleon's entry into Moscow. Indeed there were occurrences of quite a contrary nature, as when the peasants of Smolensk complained to the French authorities that their master, the landowner Engelhardt, had been guilty of betraying the French." Of the so-called guerrilla warfare: "The heads of the militia—Figner, Davidov, Seslavin, Kudashev, Vodolsky—were officers of the regular Russian army who had been authorized to organize detachments of volunteers (from among the soldiers of the regular army and willing newcomers). . . . The peasants as a group took no part in these activities. . . . It is clear that if the Spanish guerrilla warfare might justifiably be called a national war, it would be impossible to apply this term to any Russian movement in the year 1812."

Tarle's New Version of 1812

How differently the same matter is presented in the new book! We are told now: "Only by resisting this aggression could Russia preserve her economic and political independence. Only by fighting could she save herself from future dismemberment and the ruin incurred through the Continental Blockade. . . . In the circumstances, the War of 1812 was a struggle for survival in the full sense of the word—a defensive struggle against the onslaughts of the imperialist vulture. This is what gave the war its peculiarly national character and impelled the Russian people to wage it with such heroic fortitude."

The attempt to distort Lenin's words—which are not quoted—to give the new coloration appears in this fashion: "What then was the historical significance of the War of 1812? Lenin gives a clear answer to this question. In his view, the wars of the French Revolution, waged against interventionists in defense of revolutionary achievements, were, under the Directory and Napoleon, transformed into definitely aggressive wars of conquest; these aggressive, plundering, imperialist wars of Napoleon begot in their turn the movement of national liberation in the Europe he had subjugated; henceforth the wars of the European peoples against Napoleon became wars of national liberation. The War of 1812 was the most typical of these imperialist wars; Lenin's term can be applied to it aptly and convincingly."

The whole catch in this phraseology lies in the "application" to Russia. Napoleon helped to liberate the serfs and smash feudalism in Europe. The result was to lift up the middle class, the class on which Napoleon relied. But this class in turn acted to free the nation from the foreign yoke. This was true particularly of Germany and Italy. But it was absolutely untrue concerning Russia, which became the dominant force in the European alliance against France.

Tarle again and again refers in his earlier book to the fact that Napoleon could have saved himself in Russia by declaring the freedom of the serfs, as he had in Poland. But he refused to do so. This apparent enigma is due to the simple fact that Napoleon was not interested in the peasants, but in the middle class. In Napoleon's view the organization of soci-

ety must depend on the authority of the middle class or, where no such class existed, the feudal nobility. The latter was the case in Russia. No middle class existed powerful enough to take over the reins of government from the Czar. Hence Napoleon felt forced to seek an eventual peace settlement with the Czar, and, holding that perspective, he would not free the serfs and undermine Czarism. Until the end, however, the Russian peasants hoped Napoleon would free them, as he had freed the serfs of Poland. That is why they betrayed the landowner Engelhardt to the French.

But it is necessary now to set up 1812 as an example of national patriotism for the Russian workers and peasants, in the eyes of Stalin. So Tarle tells us something new—and false: "The morale of the people gained enormously. Not fear but anger was the dominant sentiment. Witnesses testify that in this terrible moment (the march on Moscow) all classes merged in one common emotion. Better death than submission to the invading ravisher! Peasants, lower bourgeoisie, merchants, nobility—all vied with one another in their eagerness to fight Napoleon to the death." Kutuzov, the cruel landowner, is now pictured anew: "He will be remembered as the genuine representative of the Russian people in the most terrible moment of Russia's existence."

Tarle must "correct" the impression he gave us in his earlier book. Hence he now says: "the same peasants met Napoleon as a fierce enemy, fighting with all their strength, as no other peasants had fought him except those of Spain." Then we have this travesty on the feudal peasants and serfs who formed 95 per cent of the Russian population: "For the Russian peasants, the defense of Russia from the invading enemy was a defense of their lives, their families, their property."

Tarle had told us in his earlier book of the many peasant revolts during the invasion, even among recruits. He must now explain this away. "In 1812 now in one place, now in another, the peasants rose against the landowners, as they did before and after. However, the presence of the enemy army did not strengthen but weakened the anti-landowner movement. The ruthless enemy deflected the peasants' attention from the landowners. The threat that hung over Russia, the enslavement of the entire Russian nation by the alien conqueror, became the first consideration."

Thus we see the Stalinist idea projected back in history that the nation is above the class, above all classes. Even bourgeois historians give the lie to this falsity. The fact is that the Czarist government in 1812 refused to permit the arming of the peasants, fearing quite correctly that the arms would be turned against the oppressors at home. The government went so far as to order the disarming of the peasant militias that had been in existence for some time. The idea of organizing peasant guerrillas was frowned upon. The Russian army itself experienced mass desertions. Tarle is forced to admit that bad as conditions were in the French army, they were infinitely worse in the Russian army. No wonder the army of Kutuzov dwindled almost as rapidly as that of Napoleon! Yet Tarle says: "The guerrilla movement which began immediately after Borodino, achieved its tremendous success only through the active, voluntary and zealous assistance of the Russian peasantry. . . . The national character of the war was at once revealed in organized forms—in the army. In Spain the national war assumed quite other forms because in that country much time passed before military units could be organized."

The importance of Tarle's book lies not in Tarle himself,

or in his descent into falsification of history. It lies in the light it throws on Stalinism. The present war is being fought under the leadership that has betrayed the Russian revolution. This leadership cannot possibly advance the revolutionary ideas that might lift not only the Russians but the Germans to heights of revolutionary fervor that would undermine Hitler's armies. Stalin speaks of the socialist fatherland, but his emphasis is on the idea of a national fatherland. Lenin and Trotsky also defended the socialist fatherland, but their entire emphasis was on the revolutionary internationalist methods by which and by which alone the Russian revolution could be saved. Since Stalin cannot and dares not appeal to

the German soldiers in terms of socialist revolution, he must substitute nationalism instead. The German soldiers have committed the heinous crime of obeying their masters and invading Russia. Stalin denounces them as lower than human, as completely bestial beings that must be completely destroyed.

But the Russian workers and peasants are fighting so enthusiastically not for the national fatherland in the abstract but for the fatherland that embodies the conquests of the October revolution, despite its Stalinist degeneration. What if there does come a time of fraternization between the Germans and the Russians? Then woe betide both Hitler and Stalin. The October revolution will once more come into its own.

Washington's "New Order"

By MARC LORIS

The resistance of the Red Army has shown the limits of the power of the German military machine. The absence of a German spring offensive has started to relieve the "democracies" of the great fear, and some people already forecast the speedy collapse of the Hitlerian empire. What these hopes are worth we will not discuss here. They have, however, already produced their fruits in the literary and oratorical world. Yesterday fear of successful Nazi barbarism was the preoccupying theme of the political speeches. Today the "democracies" are starting to speak of the peace and its organization; Hoover reveals to us the secrets for establishing a "lasting peace"; reinforced by official authority, Sumner Welles sketches the future organization of the world. Moreover, all these speeches on the peace do not reflect merely premature hopes. Peace aims are war aims, and war aims are weapons. In their own way they contribute to the American mobilization for the world offensive. What the speed and success of this offensive will be no one yet knows. Nevertheless, whatever the military changes of fortune and the rhythm of events may be, the most likely perspective remains the defeat, sooner or later, of Germany followed by that of Japan. In any case, this is the perspective that we must accept now in order to discuss the peace of the United Nations, that is, the American peace.

A Question of Historical Fact

One of the most authoritative statements on the future peace is that of Sumner Welles, Under-Secretary of State, before a Memorial Day crowd, May 30, in Washington. On June 17 he expounded the same views in another speech in Baltimore. Welles first had to answer a rather embarrassing question: Why did he find himself posing the same problem a second time, less than twenty years after its solemn solution in 1919? Why has humanity found itself precipitated into a second horrible catastrophe twenty years after having gone through a first one? Welles answered this on May 30:

"The failure of the American people to join in international cooperation after the last war played a large part in bringing about the present gigantic world struggle."

At first sight the Under-Secretary of State's declaration may seem surprising: the American policy "played a large part" in bringing about the present war!

The reason for this astonishing confession becomes evident when one listens to Welles on June 17:

"Have we all learned in this hard and perilous way that co-

operation is no less essential in maintaining peace than in winning war? . . . We can none of us again afford to forget the lessons we have learned—that cooperation to win the victory is not enough; that there must be even greater cooperation to win the peace, if the peace is to be that kind of peace which alone can prevent the recurrence of war."

If Welles does not hesitate to cast against his own country the grave accusation of having "played a large part" in bringing about the present war, it is because he desires to justify more and more direct intervention in world affairs by Washington henceforth ("international cooperation"). In the absence of America, the wretched peoples of Europe were unable to make peace among themselves. If Uncle Sam had been there, there would not have been war. In the future Uncle Sam must be "there," that is to say, everywhere in the world.

It is worth while pausing a moment over this argument, because this point of history has an enormous importance for the future. Was the anti-Wilsonian reaction, in particular the refusal of the United States to enter the League of Nations, the radical defect which provoked the bankruptcy of the Versailles Treaty? During the first imperialist war the United States accumulated enormous wealth in a few years, and from a debtor country rapidly became a creditor country to which Europe owed many billions of dollars. Precisely because of the prodigious speed of this ascension, the consciousness of the American bourgeoisie lagged behind the new reality. This is rather frequently the case in history. In particular, the whole drama of the present epoch is in the difficulty which the proletariat encounters in adjusting itself to its historic task. But that which requires long effort for an oppressed class is relatively easy for a governing class: the American bourgeoisie rapidly adapted its political consciousness to its new economic power. The anti-Wilsonian isolationism of the immediate post-war period was only a short episode. As early as 1923, to use the language of Welles, the American people had joined in international cooperation. The "American people" was personified by General Charles G. Dawes, who presented to the European governments a plan of reorganization of German economy. And these debt-ridden governments, willy nilly, had to accept the General's plan, for it was supported by a promise of an 800 million dollar loan from the American banks. From then on American finance did not cease to make its voice, irritating but none the less convincing, understood in impoverished and indebted Europe. Not only

the bourgeois leaders, but also the small tradesman, the worker and even the peasant of Europe had to learn from the daily newspapers to pronounce the names of Owen D. Young, Charles G. Dawes, and Kellogg. For on them depended the stability of the mark, the franc, even of the pound sterling, that is, the preservation of the meager revenue and salaries of Europe's masses. At the risk of contradicting Welles, one must recognize that America throughout played a not negligible role in "international cooperation"!

The Versailles Treaty is now blamed for all the misfortunes of Europe. But it was itself more a symptom than a cause. The cause is the economic and social stagnation of Europe. On the basis of this stagnation, the slightest problems become insoluble difficulties, just as a sick body turns the slightest scratch into a festering wound. Take even the question of reparations. After the war of 1870 France had to pay Germany, on very short order, a billion dollars. For that epoch it was an enormous sum, but the transfer was effected with amazing ease and long before the time-limit set by Germany. The payments contributed to the capitalist development not only of Germany, which is obvious, but also of France, by accelerating the development of its great banks and the transformation of its peasant economy. Ascending capitalism knew how to profit from even its mishaps to expand its empire. In 1919 the Allies fixed a ridiculously high total of reparation. But what Germany really paid for a few years were annuities of 300 to 400 million dollars. These amounts, although enormous, were not out of proportion with the indemnity of 1871, considering the great increase of national wealth in the meantime. However, the transfer of these sums, far from benefiting a single country, even France, provoked crises which menaced the stability of currencies, of governments, even of the social system.

In 1928 one of Dawes' collaborators, George Auld, published a book to show the workability of the American plan and the capacity of Germany to pay. The book would be convincing, if only there was any truth in the hypothesis on which the whole demonstration rests: "with constantly expanding markets."*

Against this background the question of America's entry into the League of Nations manifestly takes on an episodic importance. Only a legalistic mind could see in it one of the principal causes of the European crisis. This crisis is caused first of all by the impasse of European capitalism. And this impasse was due in great part to the appearance across the Atlantic of a rival, richer in resources and better organized, while the European continent was torn to pieces. The enormous material superiority of the United States automatically excluded all probability of economic revival for capitalist Europe. In the absence of the proletarian revolution a new war was inevitable, sooner or later, whatever may have been the political combinations. Certainly we do not wish to deny Welles' affirmation that the United States "played a large part in bringing about the present gigantic struggle." However, it incurred that responsibility not by some episodic *political abstention*, but by an enormous *economic participation*.

Welles' singular assertion of American responsibility is directed, naturally, against a new threat from isolationism,

*George P. Auld, *The Dawes Plan and the New Economics*, 1928. These four little words which underlie the whole reasoning of the book are written a single time, as by chance, page 168. The author does not discuss them at all, as though they were a natural truth.

but it also aims to hide the real character of the present war. If the war is due "in large part" to a political error in the composition of the League of Nations, then it is not the product of a general decline of capitalist society and, consequently, once this unfortunate accident has passed, society will be able to proceed with its march forward. Promises to this effect are multiplying. Doubtless because the phrases about a better political order, about democracy and freedom, have lost their attraction for the people, assurances that the war leads us towards a new era of economic prosperity are becoming more and more numerous. Welles promises a "new frontier of human welfare" and "freedom from want" after the war. Lyttelton, British Minister of Production, assures us that "we have passed from an age of scarcity to an age of plenty." Henry Wallace, Vice-President of the United States, affirms that "the object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day." Donald Nelson, chief of the War Production Board, announces to the world that "poverty is not inevitable any more."

"A New Frontier of Human Welfare"

How to fulfill these extraordinary promises? The heads of the "democracies" have already declared in the Atlantic Charter that their countries "will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." What they mean by that, however, they will never deign to explain. One of their spokesmen, Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for the Colonies, has just stated in the House of Lords on June 2nd the government's views on the "post-war problems." The Atlantic Charter, he said, laid down the fundamental aim on which a peace settlement must be based. Then he refused to add anything: "Anything said today would not be merely useless but more likely to do more harm than good." Let us listen carefully, the question is not the details of some practical application, the question is one of "fundamental aims" for which millions of men are killing each other, but speaking of these aims does more harm than good! A touch of bitter irony is added to this picture by Goebbels. As is known, the free access to sources of raw materials has been one of the demands of Nazi foreign policy. The peculiar position of German imperialism gives this demand a semblance of justification. At the end of May, Goebbels complained bitterly that the "democracies" had appropriated the slogan. "The Anglo-Saxon statesmen are plagiarizing," he charged. Millions of men are being killed to decide, it seems, which camp has the honor of offering the world free access to raw materials!

In order to reach his "new frontier of human welfare" Welles repeats the Atlantic Charter's assurances on the "free access" to raw materials; the only clarification he gives is that the United Nations will "provide the mechanism whereby what the world produces may be distributed among the peoples of the world." What could this wonderful "mechanism" be? Until now, this "distribution" of what the world produces has been operated by the institutions called trusts, monopolies and banks. Where this "mechanism" has led the world, everyone knows. Does Welles propose another "mechanism"? There is none—except socialism.

Reading these fabulous promises of economic progress and well-being for all, one asks some questions: For a long

time the "democracies" have had "free access" to raw materials; how would capitalism be able to make such improvements? Why didn't they undertake this before the war? Why must it be accomplished only after the war when all the countries will be considerably impoverished and some completely destroyed?

At the end of May, England has spent in this war nearly 9 billion pounds sterling, which was already 200 million pounds more than the total credits voted from 1914 to 1918. British expenses continue at the rate of 12 million pounds per day. In order to visualize what a flood of wealth is being hurled into the abyss, one must recall that in the most difficult moments of the last war, in 1917-18, Great Britain spent daily an average of 6½ million pounds, that is, the tempo of the spending is today doubled. And how long this will last no one knows. In August 1941, before the difficulties on the Russian front, Germany had already spent more than 100 billion marks in the war, not counting a pre-war armament program of 90 billion marks, and its present total expenditures remain unknown. At the end of May, the United States had already spent 30 billion dollars for the war. The expenditures continue at the rate of a billion dollars a week. At the end of the last war the United States had a national debt of 25 billion dollars, about three months' national income. Now, if the calculations of the administration are not upset by accidents such as inflation, the national debt in 1943 will be 110 billion dollars, more than twelve months' national income. No one yet knows what the total will be at the end of the war. How will these enormous sums be paid? There are only two ways: taxation, a tribute paid from the income of the coming generations; or inflation, the impoverishment of entire layers of the population. Whichever method is used, the result will prevent a certain number of persons from drinking the daily quart of milk promised by Wallace.

Not only does the war destroy accumulated wealth. It also destroys the capacity of the system to recuperate. War greatly accelerates the centralization and concentration of capital, it ruins many layers of the middle class. It deepens and exacerbates all the contradictions of the system. It renders the system subject to economic crises always more profound, always more persistent; it reduces the possibility of a way out.

The End of Imperialism . . . of Others

The economic realities of the world of tomorrow are indicated by the political program of the "democracies." Today this program is incapable of reviving the humanitarian and pacifist illusions of Wilson's 14 points. Today no one speaks like Wilson of general disarmament. Welles, repeating the Atlantic Charter, proclaims the "disarming of all aggressors," which is a simple measure of war. As for the "peace-loving" nations "and other like-minded states," they will form "an international police power." The Earl of Selborne, speaking to the House of Lords on behalf of the British government, affirmed that the United Nations "must keep armed for the maintenance of peace." Secretary of the Navy Knox, it will be recalled, said the United States will police the world for a hundred years. If capitalism were capable of assuring the entire world an "age of plenty" and "freedom from want," if it would put an end to "poverty," then how does one explain the need of "international police" for a regime which would have such attraction for the masses?

However, Welles' speech on the future economy of the

world does not merely consist of empty phrases and false promises. Some of his declarations are much more serious than would seem at first glance. Thus he declares: "The age of imperialism is ended. . . . The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole—in all oceans and in all continents." The last sentence is a direct and categorical reply to Churchill, who had declared that the Atlantic Charter should not be applied to India. Thus the meaning of the first part of the statement becomes clear: The age of imperialism is ended . . . for England.

Because of the peculiarities of its development, having vast resources on one continent at its disposal, the United States appeared late on the world arena, after the other imperialist powers had divided the rest of the world. So it was able to cover its imperialist expansion with liberal and humanitarian slogans such as "freedom of the seas" or "the open door in China." Today this American imperialist method is at its peak: the most explosive imperialist expansion in history is being prepared under cover of the slogan "the end of imperialism"!

The United States now occupies the place Britain held in the Nineteenth Century, that of the first economic power of the world. But England still holds an enormous colonial empire from the past. The present war is the struggle between Berlin and Washington for the English heritage. If Germany is defeated the dominant feature of the capitalist relations of tomorrow will be the passage of the British Empire from the orbit of London to that of Washington. Australia and New Zealand are rapidly moving in this direction, while Canada has already preceded them. Tomorrow, America will "open the door" of India after having "liberated" China. England's resistance will, of course, be hopeless. The whole question is merely one of form and time.

The peace of Versailles was a compromise between the conflicting demands of the victors. Among Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Wilson there was no great disproportion of power. Today, however, America's superiority over England is much greater than that of England over France, or of America over Europe, in 1919. By the end of the war this American superiority will become still greater. The peace will be, above all, an American peace.

There is, however, a factor which is always present in the minds of all the imperialists and which they scarcely dare to mention: the revolution. That we are soon to enter a new epoch of revolutionary crises no one doubts, especially not the imperialist leaders. The appearance of the revolutionary proletariat on the scene will reveal the lies and emptiness of the imperialist peace plans. It is for this embarrassing situation that Welles has projected a "cooling off" period. The Under-Secretary of State did not reveal an abundance of detail on this period. He contented himself with making it understood that the United States would reshape the world as it pleased, before becoming immobilized in a peace treaty. Since the imperialist adversary will have collapsed, whom will this "cooling-off" period be directed against, except the peoples in revolt?

During the period between the two wars American intervention, especially in Europe, took primarily financial forms. While he carried the title of General, Charles G. Dawes' arms were the billions of Wall Street, not tanks and planes. But that is now the pre-history of American imperialism. Tomorrow "the international police power" will attempt to enforce Yankee order in the entire world. In Europe the "second front"

might be the prelude to military occupation of the continent. On the wasted, starving countries, America will seek to impose its will by the blackmail of food, then loans, and if necessary it will employ the still more convincing argument of bombing planes.

Until lately democrats of all shades were fond of contrasting the German economy, prey of the vampire state, to the American economy, paradise of free initiative. These were two conceptions of the world, two radically opposed philosophies. After a few months of war, the American economy is not easily distinguished from the German economy and will be less and less so in the future. The fundamental difference was that Hitler was five years ahead in his preparation for war. And America must now work twice as hard, both in the

war and the organization of the world. Today Hitler's "New Order" has already shown its real face. It is something old—oppression, misery, exploitation. But the "democracies" as well have nothing else to bring to the world. American imperialism is unable to develop the wealth of the globe by making fantastic promises. Far from raising China and India to the material level of the advanced countries, it can only reduce Europe to the level of India.

But if the democratic "New Order" cannot bring more than the Nazi "New Order," it will clash with the same obstacle: the revolt of the workers. Even though prepared by a "cooling off" period, the *pax americana* will be, in the final count, as unstable as the *pax germanica*. The union of the workers will be the peace of the world.

Labor Under the Third Term

By JOE ANDREWS

When the war broke out in Europe in the summer of 1939 there were 11 million unemployed in America, according to the conservative AFL figures. Thus Roosevelt in his first two terms in office had not succeeded in solving any of the basic problems of the American workers. Mass unemployment, insecurity and suffering continued to weigh upon the lives of the millions of toilers.

Though the NRA, the Wagner Act, relief and WPA had convinced most workers that the man in the White House was their friend, these stop-gaps had solved nothing. The era of internal attempts to stem the decay of capitalism by pump-priming and reforms was over. The New Deal was replaced by the War Deal. As a matter of fact, the new orientation was signaled on October 5, 1937, when Roosevelt made his "quarantine the aggressors" speech. By the time Roosevelt's third term began, he was well on his way toward the war of world conquest which was the urgent necessity of the ruling class.

The orientation toward war meant that the administration had to initiate severe internal economic and political changes. Participation in the war meant:

1. An increasing diversion of the productive capacity of the country to military goods and the sharp curtailment of consumers goods. With this would inevitably follow the slashing of the living standards of the workers.

2. The more and more complete merger of Big Business and the apparatus of government, and pressure upon the CIO and AFL leaderships to become junior partners in this capitalist unity.

3. The curbing of labor's rights and independence, to prevent the workers from struggling in defense of their living standards.

While this was the basic perspective of Roosevelt as he campaigned for the presidency in 1940, he camouflaged it behind a series of fraudulent pledges to the workers. At the convention of the AFL Teamsters International on September 20, 1940, Roosevelt made two categorical promises to labor:

1. "We will not participate in foreign wars."

2. "We need not swap the gain of better living for the gain of better defense." Warning the workers not to vote for Wendell Willkie, he said, "Do you want to abandon collective

bargaining, the minimum wage, time and a half for overtime, the elimination of sweatshop conditions, by turning them over to the proven enemies of labor?"

In his last speech of the campaign on November 2 he pictured the Utopia awaiting the workers under the third term: "I see an America where the workers are really free—through their great unions undominated by any outside force."

The overwhelming majority of the working class believed in these pledges. That's what they voted for.

We need only summarize the events of the third term so far to demonstrate how Roosevelt violated his election pledges.

Once the election was over Roosevelt launched a big propaganda campaign around the slogan "National Unity." The final election returns were no sooner completed than a rally was organized at Carnegie Hall, where leading Roosevelt supporters, prominent Republicans like Landon, and Howard Coonley, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, joined together to make a plea for "National Unity" behind Roosevelt's war machine.

At the same time a film short was shown at tens of thousands of theaters throughout the country, calling upon all Americans to "forget their political differences" and to unite behind the President in the interests of "National Defense."

Behind this campaign was the determination to create a chauvinistic atmosphere in which labor could be forced to submit to regimentation and passive acceptance of the consequences of the war drive.

Roosevelt's First Moves Against the CIO

In his first interview following his re-election, Roosevelt served a demand for AFL-CIO unity, as part of the "national unity" campaign. This demand was designed to weaken and undermine the CIO movement for industrial unionism. Roosevelt "ignored" the issue of industrial unionism. On the contrary, the timing of the labor unity demand was deliberately designed to play into the hands of the AFL craft unionists against the CIO. During the 1938-39 recession, the balance of power had shifted temporarily from the CIO to the AFL.

Why did Roosevelt direct this blow against the CIO? Not because he thought Philip Murray and the other top CIO leaders were any less subservient to the government than Wil-

liam Green and John P. Frey. Both the CIO and AFL top leadership would, Roosevelt knew, join the war camp. The difference was in the composition of the membership of the AFL and the CIO. The predominantly craft elements of the AFL are an aristocracy of labor, relatively easy to regiment for the war. But the new unions of the CIO are composed of the proletariat of the heavy industries, mass production workers, downtrodden and militant, conscious of union action as essential for their well-being. These CIO masses were pushing their leaders to fight for the workers' rights. AFL-CIO "unity" on terms which would make the AFL leadership dominant in the united organization would bring the weight of AFL craft conservatism to bear against the CIO ranks.

Fortunately, the CIO refused to be dragged into what Murray correctly called "shotgun unity." Hillman's attempt to carry Roosevelt's line was decisively beaten at the Atlantic City convention of the CIO, which opened November 18, 1940. The millions of CIO members were in no mood for capitulation to the AFL, but were beginning a big drive for wage increases, union conditions and standards in the mass production citadels of the open shop.

War production was beginning to fill the mass production industries with workers ready for union action, and this was the field of the CIO. Hence the rabid attacks against the CIO in Congress, the press and radio, ostensibly because the CIO would not agree to "labor unity," but in reality because of the CIO's growing power in the war industries. This anti-CIO attack reached major proportions when the Vultee aircraft strike began in Downey, California, on November 17, 1940.

The Vultee workers were fighting for a 75 cent minimum wage, and a ten cent general wage increase. It was the first strike in an aircraft plant working on military orders. Taking up Roosevelt's slogan during the WPA strikes that "you can't strike against the government," Congressmen claimed that any strike in a military plant was a strike against the state. Sumners of Texas, poll tax chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, demanded: "Give the strikers a double dose of the kind of violence they understand." Attorney General Jackson, Roosevelt's appointee, vied with the Dies Committee in red-baiting the Vultee strikers, claiming the FBI had discovered that the strike was "provoked and prolonged by Communists."

In spite of the attacks, the Vultee strike was victorious, and a 62½ cent minimum wage was established to replace the 40 and 50 cent minimum previously prevailing. This victory was the forerunner of the coming strike wave in the war industries.

What was the most effective method for smashing these strikes? The *New York Times* in an editorial on November 20, 1940, sounded the programmatic keynote for the administration policy in the coming period. The editorial proposed "to avoid government coercion or elaborate machinery as much as possible. *The problem of public policy is to eliminate such strikes or reduce them to a minimum with the least possible coercion.*" This formula accurately describes Roosevelt's method. As little coercion as possible—but as much as necessary.

On the morrow of the Vultee strike, Roosevelt appointed Dr. Millis to the NLRB, to replace former Chairman Madden. Millis was a known conservative, with a pro-AFL bias. The CIO recognized this as a hostile move against the mass production workers and cautioned the CIO unions against resorting too often to the NLRB.

The CIO was the butt of another open attack from Roosevelt in the last week of 1940. For many months the CIO had demanded that the government refuse military contracts to the big corporations—Ford, duPont, Bethlehem Steel—which had violated NLRB decisions. Roosevelt's definitive reply came on December 27, when the War Department announced that "after careful consideration of the protest" against contracts awarded to Ford, "the award would be allowed to stand."

In December of 1940 the administration made another attack on the union movement. Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, appointed by Roosevelt ostensibly as a fighter against the trusts, made a speech attacking the closed shop in American industry. Claiming that it "destroyed competition between workers for jobs" Arnold demanded the freeing of open shop conditions because it was essential to "free enterprise."

On December 29, 1940, Roosevelt delivered one of his "fireside chats." In the same unctuous tones in which he had promised two months earlier that "we need not swap the gain of better living for the gain of better defense" he now warned that "the lowering of the standard of living is necessitated by the arms drive." Should any militant worker or labor leader consider fighting against attacks on living standards, Roosevelt threatened that the administration would use "the sovereignty of the government against trouble makers."

As 1941 got under way, the underlying reason for Roosevelt's moves against the CIO in favor of the AFL became clear. On January 4, the AFL Metal Trades Department adopted a "Defense Plan" stating that there must be no stoppage of work during the "national emergency," and the AFL officials moved into the lap of the administration. This declaration was not only a blow at the hopes of the AFL rank and file, but a direct attack on the CIO which was still defending the right to strike.

Philip Murray and other CIO leaders were in a contradictory position. They were giving full political support to Roosevelt and his war aims, but they also wanted to build the strength of the CIO to a position of greater bargaining power and were under the pressure of the mass production workers. The ensuing period was one in which these opposed policies repeatedly clashed, and in which the CIO leaders more and more yielded to the pressure of the government.

The Strike Wave of January-April 1941

The pressure for organization from the masses of industrial workers gained momentum and reached tremendous proportions in the first months of 1941. The rapid expansion of industry under the impulse of war production created an inevitable upsurge among the workers.

A new stage of government coercion came on January 15th when the workers at the Eaton Manufacturing plant in Detroit went out on strike. Roosevelt dispatched Federal Conciliator James F. Dewey to the scene, and he immediately served the union a 24-hour ultimatum to return to work and negotiate afterward. The workers in Michigan were confused and dismayed by the move. The strike was called off. The ultimatum served as a signal to the employers to stand fast in strikes and await governmental pressure to force the workers back into the plants.

When, on January 19, a few days after the Eaton strike, the Ryan Aeronautical workers took a strike vote and pre-

pared for a walkout, the employers immediately asked for government intervention. The California draft headquarters responded with a "work or fight" order. The national CIO rose up in fury against this move, and the administration found it necessary to retreat. Selective Service Administrator General Hershey repudiated the California draft headquarters, stating that such use of the Selective Service Act was in violation of its original intent. This was but a temporary retreat, as later events showed.

We can mention but a few of the strikes of these months, most of which were successful: the San Francisco shipyard workers; the Phelps Dodge plant at Elizabeth, New Jersey; the Babcock and Wilcox plant in Bayonne; Youngstown Sheet and Tube; International Harvester; the New York bus workers; Midland Steel; the Federal Truck plants in Detroit, and the Vanadium Corporation plant in Bridgeville, Pa.

A two-day stoppage (January 24-25) at the great Bethlehem, Pa., steel plant and another two-day strike (February 28-29) at the big Lackawanna plant of Bethlehem Steel showed the rising strength of the SWOC.

Great organizing drives were meanwhile developing. The Ford workers were pouring into the UAW by the thousands during January, February and March. The CIO initiated a big organizing drive, in Chicago, among the parts plants and farm implement workers. On February 20, 1941, the North American workers voted for the UAW-CIO in an NLRB poll. The CIO was gathering momentum.

On February 1st, poll tax Vinson, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, proposed a bill to enforce a 90-day waiting period before a strike could be called, and providing for the compulsory open shop. This attack on the unions in Congress was used by Roosevelt to press for voluntary agreement from the CIO to abandon the strike weapon. The effect of this and other anti-labor bills was to create a certain confusion and fear among the workers and to increase the timidity of the top union officials. But these effects were far outweighed in this period by the propulsion of the industrial boom, which moved the workers inexorably toward the struggle for wages and union conditions.

The first week in March the Bethlehem workers capped their previous two-day battles at Lackawanna and Bethlehem with successful strikes at Bethlehem and Johnstown, Pa. This brought on a new wave of anti-labor agitation. OPM head Knudsen, who on March 1st had made a statement opposing anti-strike legislation as "unnecessary," on March 7th demanded a law to provide a waiting period and secret ballot of all workers in a plant before a strike could be called.

Far more skillful than the Knudsens, Roosevelt understood the need for more flexible instruments than legislation. Above all it was necessary to secure the cooperation of the top labor leaders, who could not possibly endorse open anti-labor legislation. The necessary flexible instrument was an authoritative government-labor-business board to curb strikes. Roosevelt pressed the CIO leaders to agree.

At first Philip Murray refused. On March 10 he correctly analyzed the proposed National Defense Mediation Board:

"1. Such a board will necessarily find its attention directed against labor in order to maintain the status quo as much as possible, and will strive to stop wage increases or improvement of working conditions for labor.

"2. Compulsory arbitration will result from the board activities, since it would . . . bring terrific pressure to bear on labor to agree to arbitration in practically all situations.

"3. The set-up of the proposed board carries strong anti-labor possibilities in the three members supposed to represent the public. It has been the experience of labor that representatives from the public are usually taken from the ranks of retired business men." (*CIO News*, March 10, 1941.)

But a week after making this irrefutable analysis, Murray yielded to the pressure of Roosevelt on March 17th. Murray and UMW Secretary-Treasurer Kennedy became members of the board. As an excuse to the workers, Murray claimed that this was the only way he could avoid compulsory arbitration laws threatened in Congress.

This set the pattern for future surrenders by the CIO officials. It became the formula for capitulation to Roosevelt.

Another government experiment with strikebreaking methods came during the Allis-Chalmers strike which had begun January 22nd at West Allis, Wisconsin. After four weeks of the strike the OPM ordered the union leaders to call off the strike and to come to Washington to settle the issues. This was accompanied by an OPM threat to take over the plant under control of the Army and Navy, and to hire a new working force of scabs from the civil service lists. When the strike still held firm, OPM Knudsen and Secretary of the Navy Knox on March 26th issued a joint telegram commanding the strikers to go back to work. Murray repudiated the wire as illegal. With the entire CIO backing the strike, the government went no further.

In the Allis Chalmers strike, as well as in the Harvester strike in February, the AFL intervened as a recruiter of scabs, discrediting itself in the eyes of millions of workers.

The strike wave reached its peak the first week in April when the Ford workers climaxed a series of sporadic sit-downs with the closing down of the great River Rouge plant. Ford, who had sworn never to deal with the union, granted the UAW-CIO a closed shop, check-off agreement. The unionization of Ford added over 100,000 workers to the rolls of the CIO.

In April the soft coal operators had to yield to a strike of the United Mine Workers and granted a dollar-a-day wage increase. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation, after a series of strikes, granted a ten-cent general wage increase. The General Motors workers, after a one-day strike in Flint, Michigan, won a ten-cent general wage increase.

Following this series of conquests, the CIO workers of every major corporation, and many AFL workers as well, made demands for wage increases, and unorganized workers joined the unions by tens of thousands, bringing the labor movement to the peak of its power.

Reactionaries in Congress foamed at the mouth. The Vinson Bill was brought on the floor of Congress, this time in form to authorize Roosevelt to invoke compulsory arbitration by decree. With this held as a club over the heads of the union officialdom, Roosevelt played the "hard-cop, soft-cop" game: Give up the right to strike, he warned, or Congress will take it away from you.

The North American Aviation Strike

But the foregoing methods had failed to stop the CIO. They had to be combined with an open show of force. Roosevelt picked the North American Aviation strike which began on June 6th at Inglewood, California. He was aided by the fact that Philip Murray condemned the strike as a "wildcat" walkout and had sent Richard T. Frankenstein, CIO aircraft director, to oust the local union officers and call off the strike.

When the workers refused to return to work without a contract, Roosevelt, with Hillman at his elbow, sent troops to break the strike and take over the plant. The strikers had as their slogan "75 & 10" a 75-cent minimum wage to replace the 40- and 50-cent minimums prevailing, and a 10-cent general wage increase. North American, a subsidiary of General Motors, earning tens of millions of dollars of profits, had refused to grant the increase.

In addition to the use of troops, General Hershey issued a "work or fight" order to further intimidate the strikers. Hershey on January 19th, during the dispute at Ryan Aeronautical, had said: "We are always opposed to use of the selective service system for purposes for which it was not intended. This is an industrial dispute and we are not policemen." Now, at the command of Roosevelt, he reversed his position.

The employers of course endorsed the "taking over" of the plant. An editorial in the June 10 *Wall Street Journal* stated: "The Company will receive compensation, so it will not be without income for the period." The *New York Daily News* on the same day wrote: "Of course forcible suppression of these disorders means a step toward totalitarianism in this country. Necessarily civil liberties will take it on the chin . . . but that's just too bad."

The use of troops at North American put an end to the strike wave. The cowardly tactics of the top union officials had contributed to the workers' dismay. Murray had paved the way for the troops by denouncing the strikers and sending Frankenstein, who openly welcomed the use of troops.

The militant auto locals of Flint and Detroit and many steel and mine locals passed resolutions condemning Frankenstein for his strikebreaking. Only after three days of this rising protest did Murray issue a statement. The three-day interval after the troops had been called in, during which the CIO leadership kept silent, cast a gloomy pall over all the CIO workers. Nor was Murray's statement calculated to renew their militancy. The statement first criticised anti-labor bills in Congress, secondly deplored the "work or fight" order of General Hershey and as a third point merely stated: "The injection of armed forces into a private industrial dispute must also be condemned." That "also" indicated Murray's pusillanimity. Murray did not mention by name the North American strike. He did not name Roosevelt at whose order the troops had been called out. It was obvious that he was not providing the workers with a fighting lead against Roosevelt's forcible smashing of the strike. The workers were left staggered by the event.

It is interesting to note for the record what the Stalinists, who had participated in the leadership of the North American strike, then said. On June 17, 1941—it was just five days before the Nazi-Soviet war!—William Z. Foster wrote in a front-page editorial in the *Daily Worker*:

"When President Roosevelt sent Federal troops against the aviation workers and broke the strike it was a taste of the Hitleristic terrorism that Wall Street capitalists have in mind for the working class. These war mongering imperialists who dominate the Roosevelt administration are determined to compel the workers to accept lowered living standards and restricted civil liberties. Roosevelt's use of troops at Inglewood was not an isolated act of impatience with these strikers but a considered phase of a developing anti-labor policy. Labor, therefore, on pain of disaster, needs to break its alliance with the Roosevelt administration in the so-called 'National Unity.'"

It was in the atmosphere of the subsiding labor movement

after the North American Aviation defeat that, on July 15th, came the federal indictments against the leaders of Teamsters Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party. The Minneapolis truck drivers had disaffiliated from the AFL and joined the CIO. Upon the request of AFL Teamsters President Tobin, one of his chief labor lieutenants, Roosevelt injected the Department of Justice into the conflict between Tobin and Local 544-CIO. It was a government move against the right of workers to join the union of their choice. The prosecution aimed at beheading the anti-war Socialist Workers Party. The American Civil Liberties Union in a letter of protest to Attorney General Biddle, stated:

"It seems reasonable to conclude that the government injected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of the one side (Tobin) which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policies."

As the use of troops had shown Roosevelt's readiness to use force, the Minneapolis case showed his readiness to use the criminal code and jails against militant labor. Eighteen of the 28 defendants were convicted, sentenced to 16-month and 12-month prison terms, and are now out on bail pending appeal.

The Labor Movement in Retreat

On August 8th, with the strike wave broken, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau introduced his new tax program. The new proposals lowered the income tax levels to include \$750 annual incomes for single persons and \$1200 for married couples. The CIO attacked the new tax program as "relief for the rich at the expense of the poor."

Later in August Roosevelt addressed Congress on the question of wages. "Labor has far more to gain," he said, "from price stabilization than from abnormal wage increases."

The general retreat of labor was interrupted by one exception which showed what could be done. On September 14th the captive mine workers, after months of negotiations, went out on strike for wage increases and the closed shop. After five days, John L. Lewis agreed to a 30-day truce. During October and part of November the issue—now boiled down to the closed shop—remained in the mediation board. Lewis set a deadline for November 15th, which coincided with the opening of the 1941 CIO convention on November 17th. As the convention was about to convene, the NDMB rejected the miners' demand for the closed shop, after the AFL members of the board had broken their word to the CIO and voted with the employers. The first days of the convention were preoccupied with the captive mine strike.

The convention went on record to back the miners to the limit. Enthusiasm for the miners' cause pervaded the delegates. That enthusiasm was decidedly unwelcome to CIO President Murray and his associates. As head of the SWOC, Murray blocked all attempts to swing the steel workers into action behind the miners, despite the fact that the captive mines were owned by the steel industry and the closed shop for the UMW would pave the way for the SWOC. But formally Murray had to support the miners in the convention, and he and Kennedy had to resign from the Mediation Board.

Roosevelt had threatened to break the strike with troops as in North American, and announced that 50,000 troops were mobilized to maintain "order." But he had to back down when the CIO convention voted full support for the miners. Only the Stalinists, now in Roosevelt's camp, broke the solid front of the CIO and denounced the miners' strike.

All Roosevelt could salvage was a face-saving device. Lewis called off the pickets and agreed to settle the issue by arbitration, but with the decision obviously agreed to in advance. It gave the UMW the closed shop in the captive mines.

The strike appeared at first to be a major blow at Roosevelt's plans. The resignation of CIO officials had put an end to the NDMB. But it was only a temporary defeat for Roosevelt. While supporting the miners the CIO convention in its last days was given over largely to expressing full political support for Roosevelt. The miners' strike proved to be only a momentary interruption in the process of surrender of the CIO officials.

Following the captive mine victory the Congressional anti-labor barrage took on the frenzy of desperation. Roosevelt supporters joined in sponsoring a series of anti-union bills. Poll tax Smith introduced a bill to freeze the open shop in all war industry; a new Vinson bill, supported by the administration, proposed NDMB authority to invoke compulsory arbitration; one bill would have made "fomenting" strikes a treasonable crime punishable by the death penalty. The press attacks were equally violent.

In the midst of this pounding at the CIO, Roosevelt called a conference of Murray and AFL President Green, in an attempt to rehabilitate the NDMB and enforce a voluntary no-strike agreement. Nevertheless, Roosevelt remained without a mediation board supported by the CIO from November 17th until December 18th.

After Pearl Harbor

It was not until formal entry into the war that the CIO leaders went back into the mediation machinery. Following Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt called a conference of business, labor and government on December 18th. His program contained three points: 1. The surrender of the right to strike. 2. All demands to be arbitrated. 3. Acceptance by labor of a War Labor Board.

The CIO entered the conference with a program of its own. It demanded jobs for the priorities unemployed, the Industry Council Plan, and a defense housing plan in military production areas. Not one point proposed by the CIO was accepted by Roosevelt; nevertheless the CIO accepted the set-up.

The employers accepted Roosevelt's program but made the reservation that the War Labor Board should not have the right to hear demands for the closed shop.

The conference which made these decisions met with a strong club held over labor's head. The Smith "Slave Labor" Bill had been passed in the House and was being held in abeyance in the Senate. Should the CIO not agree to Roosevelt's demand, it was threatened, the Smith bill would go through the Senate.

With the strike weapon surrendered, the labor movement now was completely on the defensive. The employers systematically refused to grant any demands, and all major disputes were channelized into the mire of mediation.

The Little Steel workers demanded a dollar a day raise. The General Motors workers demanded the same, as the cost of living spiralled upward. The shipyard workers also demanded a dollar a day increase. All these demands were referred to the War Labor Board. Made up of four representatives from labor, four from industry, and four from the "public," it was obviously a pro-employer board. All the CIO

demands were delayed for many months in this mediation labyrinth.

The surrender of the right to strike soon took a heavy toll from the workers. These results followed in quick succession:

1. Hundreds of thousands of workers were subjected to priorities unemployment, with inadequate relief payments.

2. Upon Roosevelt's demand the CIO and AFL leadership agreed to give up overtime pay for week-ends and holidays, paving the way for the ultimate sacrifice of all overtime.

3. The CIO and AFL leaderships endorsed the speed-up campaign initiated by WPB head Donald Nelson in his labor-management committees.

4. Roosevelt announced that wages should be "stabilized" in order to avoid inflation.

5. The War Manpower Commission was set up to prepare an enforced labor system. *Business Week* of June 6, 1942, explained its function:

"If men were machines, the War Manpower Commission could simply list the specifications and capacities of each, fix a price for its use, and allot them to mines, factories, farms and offices on a priority basis. And ultimately, if the labor force is to be utilized at optimum, manpower will be handled essentially that way, whatever soft words we use to describe the system."

This is the record. This is what the workers have been given during the third term thus far, instead of Roosevelt's pledge of an "America where the workers are really free." The opponent of "sweatshop conditions" became the promoter of the speed-up. The defender of overtime pay himself commanded its surrender.

Already we have proof that the American workers will not submit passively to the surrender of their living standards and democratic rights. So far pay envelopes, due to working longer hours, still approximate yesterday's standard of living; the real pinch is only beginning now. It is of great significance that the CIO workers, who accepted the sacrifice of the right to strike with hardly a public murmur, voiced strong protests against giving up overtime pay. The 150 delegates who voted against surrendering overtime pay at the UAW conference in Detroit in April 1942 gave notice of future battles. A similar revolt took place at the Steel Workers convention recently. The speed-up campaign is meeting with even more resistance, not only at the conferences but every day in the shops.

As the war takes its inevitable toll of their standard of living the American workers, steeled in great class battles, will rise in an ever increasing wave of struggle. These coming battles will at first be fought for the most elementary economic demands. But they will be met by the full power of the capitalist state apparatus. With the full political solidarity of the ruling class arrayed against them, the workers will necessarily have to forge the instruments to express their own political interests. They will be forced by events to build an independent labor party, and to begin their struggle on the higher plane of politics. Thus will the new epoch of a politically maturing working class be initiated. The formation of the CIO and the launching of the historic battles for industrial unionism marked a great forward step in the development of the American workers; the next stage of struggle will be at least as great an advance beyond the stage of 1935-38. The characteristic militancy and courage which built the CIO will assure the triumph of the workers in the coming political tests.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Ceylon

The Militant recently reported the escape from prison of four leaders of the outlawed Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Ceylon Socialist Party), affiliate of the Fourth International. They are N. M. Perera, D. P. R. Gunawardene (these two elected in 1938 members of the Ceylon State Council), Colin R. de Silva and Edmund Samarakkody. A few additional details are provided by a dispatch from Colombo (Ceylon) to the *Times* of London on April 9. "It is presumed that they left with their jail guard who is missing. . . . They have been in detention since June 1940. . . . Another member of the Party, Leslie Gunawardene, has been evading arrest since 1940." And then this touch of unconscious humor: "Last Thursday the State Council again granted the Samasamajist members three months' leave of absence as it was physically impossible for them to attend the meetings."

The British *New Leader*, Independent Labor Party organ, mistakenly "corrects" the *Times*' account which identified the Lanka Sama Samaja Party as an adherent of the Fourth International. The *New Leader* says the party has no international affiliation. That is not true. Previously unaffiliated, the party declared affiliation to the Fourth International in 1941.

The Anarchists

Rudolph Rocker, principal figure of Anarchism, has led his following into the camp of the "democracies." The "aged theories" of anarchism, he announced in "The Order of the Hour," published here in the Yiddish-language organ of anarchism, the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, do not provide standards for measuring the present war, which he insists is a progressive war on the side of the "democracies." Rocker's chauvinist position is shared by the Yiddish and Russian anarchist language organs in the United States—the latter edited by G. Maximov, author years ago of a sensational book attacking the Soviet government of Lenin and Trotsky.

The present position of Rocker-Maximov is a logical extension of their reactionary policy during the Spanish civil war. They supported the entry of the CNT and FAI leaders into the Stalino-bourgeois government. In accordance with anarchist doctrine, they had made no distinction between a bourgeois government and a workers' state; they ended by giving support to a bourgeois regime in Spain; now they repeat that in the war.

Trotsky on Australia

The present war gives timeliness to a letter from Leon Trotsky to the Australian comrades written several years ago:

Coyoacan, D.F.

December 23, 1937.

Dear Comrades:

You will surely excuse the delay in my answering your so interesting and important letter. We have all been very busy here at this time with the Dewey Commission and other very urgent matters. Now I can answer your letter only briefly.

It is necessary in my opinion to distinguish strictly between two matters: (a) the Chinese-Japanese war, (b) your relationship to your government.

A Japanese victory will serve reaction. A Chinese victory would have a progressive character. That is why the working class of the world supports by all means China against Japan. But this doesn't at all signify that you can trust your government with the mission of supporting China in your name. It is incomparably more probable that the Australian government will use its armed forces against its own toiling masses than against Japan. Even in the case of military conflict between Australia and Japan that Australian government would be glad to arrange the matter on the back of China. It would be a crime for a workers' party to give any political support to a bourgeois government in order to "help China." But from the other side it would be no less a crime to proclaim a working-class organization neutral in face of the Chinese-Japanese war.

We can with all the necessary modifications apply the same reasoning to the question of Australian independence. Naturally no Australian worker or farmer wishes to be conquered and subjected to Japan. For a revolutionary party it would be suicidal to say simply we are "indifferent" to this question. But we cannot give to a bourgeois and essentially imperialist government the task of defending the independence of Australia. The immigration policy of the Australian government furnishes the Japanese imperialists a kind of justification in the opinion of the Japanese people. By its general policy the bourgeois government weakens the Australian people economically, politically and militarily. Finally, in the case of a great social crisis the bourgeois government would be inevitably ready to compromise with the foreign imperialists, sacrificing the vital interests of the country, in order to have the possibility of preventing the social revolution. All these reasons are more than sufficient to justify our irreconcilable politics towards the bourgeois ruling class in every capitalist country. But there is not the slightest reason to proclaim our indifference on the question of the national independence.

I will add an important practical consideration already expressed in my other letters in the last period.

We cannot, as stated above, entrust the bourgeoisie with the necessary means for helping China. But our policy would differ

in these cases depending on whether Australia intervened in the war on the side of Japan or on the side of China. We would naturally in both cases remain in the sharpest opposition to the government. But at the same time as we boycotted with every means the material help to Japan, we would on the contrary accuse the government of not sufficiently supporting China, that is, of betraying her ally and so on.

I must limit myself to these short remarks. In connection with the last articles and letters I wrote on this matter they can, I hope, sufficiently explain my point of view.

With my best comradely greetings,

Leon Trotsky

Stalinism in Australia

A disgusted member of the Communist Party recently brought our Australian comrades a secret party document entitled "Decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia regarding a maximum war effort for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany."

The document is particularly cynical, as one can judge from the following quotations:

"Many Party members see our part in the war against Hitlerism as a matter of 'Aid to Soviet Russia.' Some of our union comrades say: 'If we had a "tanks for Russia week," or if we were sure that what we produce would go to Soviet Russia, we would have good grounds to increase production.' Such an approach is quite wrong. . . . Australia's main job, and the best contribution we can make to the Anglo-Soviet cause, is to aggressively develop the war against the Axis forces. This means that arms and equipment for the Australian forces, and the maintenance of reinforcements for the Army is essential. Hence we need greater production and more attention to the Australian war effort.

"It must be pointed out that in our propaganda many comrades devote their attention to the great struggle of the Red Army, but neglect to deal with the grim, courageous struggle of our Australian forces at Tobruk, who are also in the thick of the struggle against the Axis. *This must be rectified.* We must give every attention to the battles of the Australian forces and to seeing that they are properly equipped and supplied and reinforced. . . .

"We adhere firmly to the principle of ability to pay, and although sharp increases in taxation of high incomes and company profits are expected, we cannot ignore the fact that sooner or later taxation of the workers will of necessity increase. . . .

"We have drawn attention to the fact that monopoly control, red tape and 'cost plus' are some of the main factors disorganizing the war effort, and some comrades take the stand that these are the only factors, and that the workers have no responsibilities other than exposing the monopoly control.

This is wrong. Our committees must take steps to arouse in the workers a consciousness of the need for greater production. . . .

"State and district leaders must quickly intervene where strikes are threatened, or have broken out, with the object of getting a satisfactory settlement without stoppage of work or in quick time so that no lengthy hold-up of production will take place. We must overcome economist tendencies in the Party, and where comrades say that the workers will strike whatever we may do, it is necessary to explain that it is the duty of Communists to lead the masses, not tail behind them.

"Committee leaders will understand that very skillful handling is required to give effect to these tactics, otherwise many of our comrades may be isolated from the workers and this will be very bad indeed. . . .

"REFORMIST OFFICIALS.—Our present policy involves for us a change in the approach to the reformist trade union officials. Many of our trade union comrades do not seem to understand this fact and continue to fight the officials in the old way. Committees must re-assess the work of trade

union fractions and set tasks in accordance with our policy for establishing working-class unity."

Australia

The Australian Trotskyists write:
Dear Comrades:

We received regularly *The Militant* covering the trial in Minneapolis. You acquitted yourselves admirably in this action and provide an inspiration for us here.

Sydney and Melbourne account for about half the population here and there is a group in each. I have just visited Melbourne and their group is the stronger at this time. They are settling down to regular fortnightly publications. They have connections with the Trades Hall Council (central labor body) and others wielding good influence in industry. In Sydney likewise we now have contact with the Trades and Labor Council and three others with good influence in important industries here. Stalinism is very strong here in unions and union official positions.

Defeatism was developing before the Americans arrived. Now people are buoyed up

again. But only the imminence of Japanese threat holds the workers who are not at all happy. Opposition is growing to the forced labor camps under military discipline to be sent to work all over the continent. The coal miners surrounding Sydney are the hardest to get into line despite repressive laws. The boss is going on the offensive all along the line but we are quite optimistic about the proletariat.

Labor is in force in the Federal Parliament, but all signs are present that a split will occur any time now, which may result in a coalition government developing to bonapartism, with a new labor leadership in opposition in Parliament, swinging the workers behind it and using much more radical talk—a development from liberal labor to social-democracy. Stalinism with its opposition to strikes has been the greatest help to the boss, but now the signs are developing that it is encountering heavy weather and approaching big events will further its disintegration. Just now we have hard times and quite likely they'll be harder, but we feel quite happy to follow with you Trotsky's advice to go forward. N.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

EDITOR'S NOTE: This article was written by Trotsky in the early summer of 1923, during the Ruhr crisis. It was officially adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist International shortly afterward, against considerable opposition. "It was no mere accident," wrote Trotsky in 1928, "that despite all prejudices the slogan of a Soviet United States of Europe was adopted precisely in 1923, at a time when a revolutionary explosion was expected in Germany, and when the question of the state interrelationships in Europe assumed an extremely burning character. Every new aggravation of the European and indeed of the world crisis is sufficiently sharp to bring to the fore the main political problems and to invest the slogan of the United States of Europe with attractive power."

The slogan appeared in Comintern literature as late as 1926, but Trotsky was its foremost proponent and it was soon dropped by the Stalinist bureaucracy. Nor was this merely in spite against Trotsky, but flowed from Stalinism. "We have today," wrote Trotsky in 1928, "a 'theory' which teaches that it is possible to build socialism completely in one country and that the co-relations of that country with the capitalist world can be established on the basis of 'neutralizing' the world bourgeoisie (Stalin). The necessity for the slogan of a United States of Europe falls away if this essentially national-reformist and not revolutionary-internationalist point of view is adopted. But this slogan is, from our viewpoint, important and vitally necessary because there is lodged in it the condemnation of the idea of an isolated so-

cialist development. For the proletariat of every European country, even to a larger measure than for the USSR—the difference, however, is one of degree only—it will be most vitally necessary to spread the revolution to the neighboring countries and to support insurrections there with arms in hand not out of any abstract considerations of international solidarity, which in themselves cannot set the classes in motion, but because of those vital considerations which Lenin formulated hundreds of times—namely, that without *timely* aid from the international revolution, we shall be unable to hold out." (The Third International After Lenin, p. 16.)

The article was first published in English in *International Press Correspondence*, weekly organ of the Communist International, on July 12, 1923.

The United States of Europe

By LEON TROTSKY

I think that in conjunction with the slogan "A Government of Workers and Peasants," the time is appropriate for issuing the slogan "The United States of Europe." Only by uniting these two slogans shall we get a definite, systematic and progressive response to the most urgent problems of European development.

The last imperialist war was essentially a European war. The incidental participation of America and Japan did not

alter its character. Having secured what she required, America withdrew her hand from the flames and returned home.

The motive power of the war consisted in the fact that the capitalist forces of production had outgrown the boundaries of the European national states. Germany had set herself the task of "organizing" Europe, i.e., of uniting economically the European continent under her own control, in order then seriously to set about contending with Britain for world power.

The aim of France was to break up Germany. The small population of France, her predominantly agricultural character and her economic conservatism, make it impossible for the French bourgeoisie even to consider the problem of organizing Europe, which indeed proved to be beyond the powers of German capital, backed though it was by the military machine of the Hohenzollerns. Victorious France is now maintaining her mastery only by Balkanizing Europe. Great Britain is inciting and protecting the French policy of dismembering and exhausting Europe, all the time concealing her work under her traditional mask of hypocrisy. As a result, our unfortunate continent is disintegrated and dismembered, exhausted, disorganized and bankrupt—transformed into a madhouse. The invasion of the Ruhr is a piece of violent insanity accompanied by far-sighted calculation (the final disruption of Germany)—a combination which is not unfamiliar to the psychiatrist.

Behind the war lay the need of the forces of production for a wider field of development, unhampered by customs barriers. Similarly, in the occupation of the Ruhr so fatal to Europe and to mankind, we find a distorted expression of the need for uniting the coal of the Ruhr with the iron of Lorraine. Europe cannot develop economically within the state customs frontiers created at Versailles. She is compelled either to remove these frontiers, or to face the prospect of complete economic decay. But the methods adopted by the ruling bourgeoisie to overcome the frontiers it itself created are only increasing the existing chaos and accelerating the process of ruin.

To the toiling masses of Europe it is becoming ever clearer that the bourgeoisie is incapable of solving the basic problems of European restoration. The slogan "A Workers' and Peasants' Government" is designed to meet the attempts of the workers to find a way out by their own efforts. It has now become necessary to indicate this issue more concretely, namely, to assert that only in the closest economic cooperation of the peoples of Europe lies the path to the salvation of our continent from economic destruction and enslavement to American capitalism.

America is standing aloof from Europe, patiently waiting until her economic agony has reached such a pitch, that it will be easy to step in and buy up Europe—as Austria was bought up—for a mere song. But France cannot stand aloof from Germany, nor can Germany stand aloof from France. Therein lies the crux, and therein lies the solution, of the European problem. Everything else is incidental. We asserted long before the imperialist war that the Balkan States are incapable of existing and of developing except within a federation. The same is true of the various fragments of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and of the western portions of Czarist Russia now living outside the Soviet Union. The Appenines, the Pyrenees and Scandinavia are limbs of the European body stretched out towards the seas. They are incapable of an independent existence. The European continent in the present state of development of its productive forces is an economic unit—not a close-locked unit, of course, but one possessing profound internal ties—as was proved in the terrible catastrophe of the world war, and again revealed in the mad adventure of the Ruhr occupation. Europe is not a geographical term; it is an economic term, something incomparably more concrete—especially in the present post-war conditions—than the world market. Just as federation was long ago recognized as essential for the Balkan Peninsula, so now the time has arrived for

stating definitely and clearly that federation is essential for Balkanized Europe.

There remain to be considered the question of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and that of Great Britain, on the other. It is obvious that the Soviet Union will not be opposed either to the federative union of Europe, or to its own admission to such a federation. Thereby, too, a bridge will be created between Europe and Asia.

The question of Great Britain is much more uncertain; it depends on the pace at which her revolutionary development proceeds. Should the "Government of Workers and Peasants" triumph on the European mainland before British imperialism is overthrown—which is extremely probable—then the European Federation of Workers and Peasants will of necessity be directed against British capitalism. And, of course, the moment the latter is overthrown the British Isles will enter as a desirable member into the European Federation.

It might be asked: why a European Federation and not a World Federation? Of course, as the world develops economically and politically it will tend to become a world economic unit, and to become more and more centralized, depending upon the level of technical development reached. But we are now concerned not with the future socialist economy of the world, but with finding a way out of the present European impasse. We have to lay a solution before the deceived and ruined workers and peasants of Europe, quite independently of how the revolution develops in America, Australia, Asia, or Africa. Looked at from this point of view, the slogan "The United States of Europe" has its place in the same historical plane with the slogan "A Workers' and Peasants' Government"; it is a transitional slogan, indicating a way out, a prospect of salvation, and furnishing at the same time a revolutionary impulse for the toiling masses.

It would be a mistake to measure the whole of the world revolution with the same footrule. America came out of the war not enfeebled, but strengthened. The internal stability of the American bourgeoisie is still very considerable. It is reducing its dependence upon the European market to a minimum. The revolution in America—considered apart from Europe—may thus be a matter of decades. Does that mean that the European revolution must proceed step by step with the American revolution? Certainly not. If backward Russia did not, and could not, await the revolution in Europe, all the more will not and must not Europe await the revolution in America. Workers' and Peasants' Europe, blockaded by capitalist America (and at first, perhaps by Great Britain), will be able to maintain herself and develop as a closely consolidated military and economic union.

It must not be overlooked that the very danger arising from the United States of America (which is assisting the destruction of Europe and is ready to step in subsequently as its master) furnishes a very substantial bond for uniting the mutually destructive peoples of Europe into a "European United States of Workers and Peasants." This orientation, of course, proceeds from the differences in the objective situations in the European countries and in the mighty Transatlantic Republic, and is not directed against the international solidarity of the proletariat, or against the interests of the revolution in America. On the contrary, one of the obstacles to the development of the revolution throughout the world lies in the futile European confidence in the American uncle (Wilsonism, the charitable feeding of the worst famine districts of Europe, American "loans," etc., etc.). The sooner

the masses of the nations of Europe recover the confidence in their own powers which was destroyed by the war, and the more closely they are rallied around the slogan of a "Union of the Workers' and Peasants' Republics of Europe," the more rapidly will the revolution develop on both sides of the Atlantic. For just as the triumph of the proletariat in Russia furnished a mighty impulse to the development of the communist parties of Europe so, and even to an incomparably greater degree, will the triumph of the revolution in Europe furnish an impulse to the revolution in America and throughout the whole world. Although, when we abstract ourselves from Europe, we are obliged to peer into the mists of years to perceive the American revolution, yet we may safely assert that by the natural sequence of historical events the triumphant revolution in Europe will serve in a very few years to shatter the power of the American bourgeoisie.

Not merely the question of the Ruhr, i.e. of European fuel and iron, but also the question of reparations is envisaged in the scheme of "The United States of Europe." The question of reparations is purely a European question, and can be solved in the near future only by European means. The Europe of Workers and Peasants will have its reparations budget—as it will have its war budget—as long as it is menaced by dangers from without. This budget will be based upon a graduated income tax, upon levies on capital, upon the confiscation of wealth plundered during wartime, etc. Its incidence will be regulated by the appropriate bodies of the European Federation of Workers and Peasants.

We shall not here indulge in prophecies as to the speed at which the union of the European republics will proceed, in what economic and constitutional forms it will express itself, and what degree of centralization will be obtained in the first period of the workers' and peasants' regime. All these considerations we may safely leave to the future, remembering the experience already gained by the Soviet Union constructed on the soil of former Czarist Russia. What is perfectly obvious is that the customs barriers must be thrown down. The peoples of Europe must regard Europe as a field for a united, and increasingly schematic economic life.

It might be argued that we are in reality speaking of a European Socialist Federation as part of a World Federation, and that such a regime can be brought about only by the dictatorship of the proletariat. We will not stop to answer this argument, since it was refuted by the international analysis made during the consideration of the question of a "Workers' Government." "The United States of Europe" is a slogan in every respect corresponding with the slogan "A Workers' (or Workers' and Peasants') Government." Is the realization of a "Workers' Government" possible without the dictatorship of the proletariat? Only a conditional reply can be given to this question.* In any case, we regard the "Workers' Government" as a *stage* towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therein lies the great value of the slogan. But the slogan "The United States of Europe" has an exactly similar

*This question is more adequately clarified by Trotsky in the following words in the 1938 program of the Founding Conference of the Fourth International:

"The central task of the Fourth International consists in freeing the proletariat from the old leadership, whose conservatism is in complete contradiction to the catastrophic eruption of disintegrating capitalism and represents the chief obstacle to historical progress. . . . Under these conditions the demand, systematically addressed to the old leadership: 'Break with the bourgeoisie, take

and parallel significance. Without this supplementary slogan the fundamental problems of Europe must remain in suspense.

But will not this slogan play into the hands of the pacifists? I do not believe that there exist such "lefts" nowadays as would consider this danger sufficient grounds for rejecting the slogan. We are living in 1923 and have learnt a little from the past. There are the same reasons, or absence of reasons, for fearing a pacifist interpretation of "The United States of Europe" as there are for fearing a democratic-Social Revolutionary interpretation of the slogan "A Workers' and Peasants' Government." Of course, if we advance "The United States of Europe" as an independent program, as a panacea for achieving pacification and reconstruction, and isolated from the slogans "A Workers' Government," the "United Front," and the "Class Struggle," we shall certainly end in democratized Wilsonism (i. e., in Kautskyism). But I repeat, we live in the year 1923 and have learned a little from the past. The Communist International is now a reality, and it will not be Kautsky who will initiate and control the struggles associated with our slogans. Our method of posing the problem is in direct contrast to the Kautsky method. Pacifism is an academic program, the object of which is to avoid the necessity of revolutionary action. Our formulation is an impulse to fight. To the workers of Germany, not the communists (it is not necessary to convince them), but to the workers in general, and in the first place to the social-democratic workers, who fear the economic consequences of a fight for a workers' government; to the workers of France, whose minds are still obsessed by the questions of reparations and the State debts; to the workers of Germany, France and of all Europe, who fear that the establishment of the workers' regime will lead to the isolation and economic ruin of their countries, we will say: Europe, even if temporarily isolated (and with such a powerful bridge to the East as the Soviet Union she will not be easily isolated), will be able not only to maintain herself, but to consolidate and build herself up, once she has broken down the customs barriers, and has united herself economically to the inexhaustible natural riches of Russia. "The United States of Europe"—a purely revolutionary perspective—is the next stage in our general revolutionary perspective. It arises from the profound differences in the situations of Europe and America. Whoever overlooks these differences, which are of such vital significance at the present time, will, willy-nilly, reduce a true revolutionary perspective to a mere historical abstraction. Naturally, the Workers' and Peasants' Federation will not stop in its European phase. As we have said, by our Soviet Union an outlet has been obtained into Asia, and from Asia into Europe. We are, therefore, here envisaging only a stage, but a stage of great historical importance, through which we must first pass.

the power!' is an extremely important weapon for exposing the treacherous character of the parties and organizations of the Second, Third and Amsterdam Internationals. The slogan 'Workers' and Farmers' Government' is thus acceptable to us only in the sense that it had in 1917 with the Bolsheviks. . . .

"Is the creation of such a government by the traditional workers' organizations possible? Past experience shows that this is to say the least highly improbable. . . . In any case one thing is not to be doubted: even if this highly improbable variant somewhere at sometime becomes a reality, and the Workers' and Farmers' Government' in that sense is established in fact, it would represent merely a short episode on the road to the actual dictatorship of the proletariat."

BOOK REVIEWS:

Property versus Liberty

Reviewed by *William Lane*

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY, by Alfred Winslow Jones. J. B. Lippincott Company. 392 pages. \$3.50.

Dr. Jones' survey set out to answer this question: What is the attitude of the American public towards the conflict between personal rights and property rights? More specifically, their attitude toward the modern corporation.

To 1,705 citizens of the industrial city of Akron—to farmers, CIO workers, non-union workers, capitalists, technicians, etc., went trained interviewers, who told these people seven true stories involving conflict between personal and corporate rights. For instance here, in substance, is one of the stories:

In 1938 a union struck against the Consumer Power Co. in Michigan. The strikers took possession of the company's power plant, expelling the superintendent. But this was not a "sit-down" strike. The workers continued to operate the power plant for the public. After a while the strike was settled in the workers' favor.

The person interviewed was asked to express himself fully on this question: "What do you think of what the workers did in this case?"

To Marxists the main results will not come as a surprise. It was found that the attitude towards corporate property of business leaders and members of the working class correspond to their different economic positions. The workers, whether in unions or non-union, tended to stand for the rights of the workers against property rights.

The middle class presented a confused picture of two main tendencies: 1. conformity with a compromising position as between

the contending workers and corporations, and 2. a tendency towards placing personal rights higher than corporate rights.

Dr. Jones concludes:

"The population as a whole, in its attitude towards corporate property, shows a marked trend towards sharp cleavage to the two extremes and [in the middle class] towards intermediate conformity with a compromising morality, in which, however, the attitudes are considerable 'left of center.'"

Many of the secondary findings are worthy of close study by Marxists.

For instance, there is widespread a confused fear that the abolition of corporate private property in the means of production would be a threat to small property, especially the individually-owned home.

Another significant finding is the reactions of the managers. The managers, says Dr. Jones, are almost always fairly wealthy men and stockholders themselves. No cleavage of any dimension is noticeable between "managers" and "capitalists"; in fact, in their dogmatic allegiance to corporate property, the managers are the most unified, class-conscious class in the community.

Introducing this survey, a third of the volume is devoted to the presentation of the background. A concise history of Akron is given: The development of the giant rubber industry, the rise of the Akron labor movement, and the story of the intense union struggle. One of the chapters, "The Labor Movement—Success," is a short history of the great 1936 strikes, especially the Good-year strike.

This book deserves wide reading.

Aviation and the War

Reviewed by *Jack Ranger*

VICTORY THROUGH AIR POWER, by Major Alexander P. de Seversky. Simon and Schuster. 354 pages.

When the October revolution erupted, Alexander de Seversky, Chief of Pursuit Aviation of the Baltic Sea in the Czarist army, deserted his native land and became an aeronautical engineer and test pilot for the United States government. That is a measure of the man's social understanding and sympathies. The highest future he can envision for mankind is a world where each great power will command thousands of giant bombing planes capable of striking suddenly half way around the world and laying waste a hundred cities like Coventry, achieving total destruction of an entire nation from the air without deigning to occupy the stricken country. Even today, claims Seversky, that awe-inspiring picture of im-

perialist warfare is unrealistic not because of aeronautical limitations but only because of military shortsightedness.

If the social revolution that will wipe out the possibilities of such warfare is beyond the ken of Major Seversky, the military revolution brought about by the emergence of air power is completely grasped by this brilliant air pioneer and talented designer.

By now it is a commonplace that aviation has altered the traditional conceptions of military strategy and tactics. What is still little understood, says Seversky, is the emergence of aviation as the *decisive* factor in warmaking. The author shows how, in every battle of this war, the victory has gone to the nation which controlled the air. Hitler's victory in Norway; the successful evacuation at Dunkirk; the failure of Hitler to win the Battle of Britain in 1940; the

conquest of Crete; the changing fortunes of the war in North Africa; the Japanese victories against its Dutch, British and American rivals—all were decided by the factor of supremacy in the air. Once a nation dominates the air, land and sea operations have only a secondary and subordinate character. Armies and navies are destined to play only an auxiliary role in modern warfare.

Hitler's air machine, says Seversky, was designed primarily to answer the tactical demands of *land* operations. Hitler, while he saw more clearly than his imperialist rivals that air power was decisive, yet failed to build an instrument capable of gaining air supremacy over England. Germany's air force lacks range, load-carrying capacity, armor and armament. The most serious handicap of the German bombers was insufficient defensive fire power. They met an eight-gun assault from a British pursuit with only one gun.

Germany's conquest of Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and the Balkans, he says, was dictated primarily by the tactical necessity of acquiring bases for military action against Great Britain and its Mediterranean life line. The Germans could be ruthless in visiting destruction. But Hitler's primary objective in Russia is to take control of Russia's natural resources and large industries. Therefore he has aimed to conquer Russia with as little economic destruction as possible, and thus has deliberately held back the striking force of his air power. He aims to eliminate England. He aims to possess Russia.

If what this pioneer ace and designer says is true, the United States is as backward as was France in its failure to appreciate air power. American planes are underarmed, ill-constructed, obsolete, and have a ridiculously short fighting range. "Only 25 per cent of our aircraft could be considered equal to the best foreign models." Instead of following the already outdated plan of seeking to build a bigger and better Blitz machine than Hitler's, argues Seversky, Washington should adopt his plan of undertaking immediate construction of a fleet of superbombers with a range of 8,000-15,000 miles, base them upon the American mainland and Alaska, and bomb Japan into the dust, then do the same with every other rival of the United States.

It is difficult to estimate what percentage of Seversky's military criticisms are colored by inner-army politics, by business rivalries, and by the author's failure to appreciate the political motivations for some of Roosevelt's moves on the chessboard of war. That a good deal of his arguments have touched the military leadership in tender spots is indicated by a careful reading of the current press; many army and navy leaders and columnists are writing and speaking as though they were polemicizing with Seversky, without of course mentioning him by name.

BUILD YOUR MARXIST LIBRARY NOW!

Lessons of October

by LEON TROTSKY

125 PAGES

- Regular price
75c cloth-bound
50c paper covers

- Now selling at:
50c cloth-bound
35c paper covers

Special Combination Offer

FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS

by DANIEL GUERIN

337 pages, paper covers List price....\$1.00

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN

by FELIX MORROW

202 pages, paper covers List price.... .50

TOTAL LIST PRICE....\$1.50

SPECIAL COMBINATION PRICE...75c

Now Published as a Pamphlet

Their Morals and Ours

By LEON TROTSKY

- His famous polemic against the 'moralist' critics of Bolshevism

48 pages — 20c per copy

The pamphlet includes Trotsky's article, "The Moralists and Sycophants Against Marxism," which Trotsky considered the second part of "Their Morals and Ours"

Documents of the Minneapolis Trial

In Defense of Socialism

by ALBERT GOLDMAN

The official court record of his final speech for the defense in the Minneapolis "Sedition" trial

100 Page Pamphlet.....Only 10 Cents!

Socialism on Trial

by JAMES P. CANNON

The official court record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet.....Only 10 Cents!

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK CITY