

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD
UNITE!**



the new International

CONTENTS

LEON TROTSKY:

- The 7th Congress of the Comintern
- The Italo-Ethiopian War
- The A. F. of L. Convention
- The Real Meaning of the United Front
- Who Defends Russia? Who Helps Hitler?
- Labor and the Wagner Bill
- A Critique of Lewis Corey
- The Socialist Youth at Copenhagen
- The Situation in Cuba
- "Archives of the Revolution"

etc., etc.

15¢

**OCTOBER
1935**

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

(With which is merged *Labor Action*)

A BI-MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM
OFFICIAL THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Published bi-monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 55 East Eleventh Street, New York, N. Y.
Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 for seven months. Canada and Abroad: \$1.75 per year. Entered as Second Class matter January 26, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME II
NUMBER 6
OCTOBER 1935

Editors:
MAX SHACHTMAN
JOHN WEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

On the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, by <i>L. Trotsky</i>	Questions of the Italo-Ethiopian War, by <i>Parabellum</i> . . .	198
1. The Stalinist Turn	177	
2. Russia and the World Proletariat	178	
The Real Meaning of the United Front, by <i>Arne Swabeck</i>	180	
From Atlantic City to Atlantic City, by <i>A. J. Muste</i>		
On the 55th Convention of the A. F. of L.	182	
The Wagner Bill and the Working Class, by <i>John West</i>	184	
Who Defends Russia? Who Helps Hitler? by <i>L. T.</i>	189	
U. S. Capitalism: National or International, by <i>George Novack</i>		
A Critique of Lewis Corey's <i>The Decline of American Capitalism</i>	191	
	ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION:	
	The Struggle for Peace and the Anglo-Russian Committee, by <i>Leon Trotsky</i>	201
	The Situation in Cuba, by <i>R. S. de la Torre</i>	204
	Copenhagen Socialist Youth Conference, by <i>Walter Held</i>	206
	BOOKS:	
	Philosophy of Confusion, by <i>Reuben Grote</i>	207
	An American Germinal, by <i>Gerry Allard</i>	208
	Inside Front Cover: A Bolshevik Fugitive	
	Inside Back Cover: At Home	

A Bolshevik Fugitive

IT WILL BE remembered that a short time before his capitulation to the ruling Soviet machine, Christian Rakovsky made an attempt to flee from his virtual imprisonment in Barnaul and to make his escape across the border. His attempt was finally thwarted by frontier guards, and he was wounded in the encounter. Brought to Moscow to be treated medically, he finally surrendered to the bureaucracy, his spirit completely broken.

Now, however, we are able to announce the first successful escape effected from a Stalinist prison by a Bolshevik-Leninist. Since 1928, the locksmith, Tarov, has been kept to the notorious Verkhne-Uralsk solitary confinement prison. Despite the greatest difficulties and hardships to which the Left wing opponents of Stalin are subjected, and the special persecution for which they are singled out, Tarov has maintained an unyielding position for seven years. Now comes the report that he has succeeded in escaping from the U.S.S.R. at the Eastern frontier and that he is now located in one of the countries of Asia.

The conditions under which the rude and disloyal Stalin régime keeps its Bolshevik-Leninist prisoners and exiles are almost beyond description. There are more of these Left wing Marxists in prison and Siberia today under the present Soviet bureaucracy than there were Bolsheviks under the czarist régime! In Tarov's prison alone there were confined close to five hundred Bolshevik-Leninists, who were dispersed to various other penitentiaries after a heroic hunger strike. They carried it on in protest against the

iniquitous conditions of life imposed upon them—conditions which bear absolutely no resemblance to the inspired stories of "model prisons".

The prisons and places of exile, some of which are located in the most god-forsaken wastes of the Arctic, are filled not only with Bolshevik-Leninists of the early period following their expulsion from the party, that is, from 1928 to 1929, but with opponents of the same persuasion who have been seized in quite recent times. From the Stalinist press itself one can regularly cull reports of the "discovery of a new Trotskyist nest" in this factory or that party or youth nucleus. Old Bolsheviks who have spent all their life in the service of the proletarian revolution, rub shoulders in prison and exile with young revolutionists on whom the internationalist teachings of Marx and Lenin have not been lost. And as a general rule, the treatment accorded them is brutal in the extreme, for Stalin aims at the complete physical annihilation of the only political current that can challenge his destructive course from a Marxian standpoint.

When the full story of the persecution of the Bolshevik-Leninists is told, it will make horrifying reading and offer additional confirmation of the correctness of Lenin's biting characterization of Stalin. A good deal of this story can be told by comrade Tarov, who has in his possession a wealth of detailed data not only about the general situation in the Soviet Union and its communist party, but specifically about the conditions under which the prisoners and exiles live and suffer.

The foreign representation of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists has sent out a world-wide appeal to all revolutionists and Left wing organizations to come to the assistance of the prisoners and exiles. Special efforts are being exerted to make it possible for Tarov to leave the very uncertain environment of Asia and transfer his residence to some country in Europe. For this purpose a fund is being raised, which will be judiciously divided between taking care of the Tarov case and making the prison and exile conditions of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists somewhat easier. Difficult though it is, ways can nevertheless be found to provide these intransigent fighters for Marxian internationalism with funds for themselves and their hard-hit families.

The editors urge all readers of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL to contribute generously and swiftly to this movement of international proletarian solidarity. In this country, all funds contributed should be sent to A. J. Muste, Secretary, 55 East 11th Street, New York City. Moneys marked for this fund will be set aside and transferred to the agency responsible for administering and distributing it.

An elementary duty faces us. The Russian comrades have given evidence of a heroism, courage, determination and steadfastness which inspires us with the conviction that their cause will triumph. Their duty—heavy and replete with the demand for sacrifice—they are discharging with resolute fearlessness. Let us see to it that we discharge ours.

Max SHACHTMAN
John WEST

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A BI-MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME II

OCTOBER 1935

NUMBER 6

On the Seventh Congress of the Comintern

1. The Stalinist Turn

I OWE AN apology to the readers of our international press for not having commented upon the Seventh Congress prior to now, despite several reminders. The causes for this lie beyond my control. On the one hand, the debates at the Congress were extremely amorphous and intentionally diffuse and, on the other hand, they were purely theatrical in character. The questions were discussed and settled behind the scenes, often over the telephone connecting the Kremlin with the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs. There was some semblance of a conflict of opinions within the narrow bureaucratic circle. However, once the decision was finally reached by the Politburo, orators were appointed who were instructed to present the decision in such a manner as would least compromise the upper crust of the Communist International, and, in any case, cast not the slightest shadow upon the infallibility of the Leader. What passed for "discussion" at the Congress amounts, in fact, to a long and, one must add, a frightfully boring comedy, with rôles cast beforehand. Besides, the actors are rotten.

For this reason, the reports of the discussions must be scrutinized in the same manner as one goes over diplomatic documents, asking at every step the questions: What has the orator *really* in mind? what is he slurring over? and why? But diplomatic documents are usually worded succinctly; the speeches of the reporters at the Congress, however, are inordinately long. The wearisome scope of the reports provides an added measure of bureaucratic self-insurance: it is necessary to let loose the greatest possible number of the least precise assertions possible, without getting embarrassed over their contradictory nature. One never can tell precisely which of these assertions will come in handy in the future. Then, add to this the frightfully bad newspaper accounts. Where clear thinking and a political will obtain, when an open ideological struggle takes place, which is always an aid to precision of thought, the form of presentation can be clear, good, and convincing; but when a functionary-orator is busy covering up his own tracks, and those of his superiors, and when the functionary-journalist retails the muddled speech, in constant panic lest he run foul of a submarine reef, then the newspaper reports inevitably amount to a miserable hash of generalities poorly strung together. Such are the reports in *l'Humanité* which I have had to use up to now. When, for instance, I sought on the basis of these reports to determine even approximately what the working class movement in Japan amounts to, under the conditions of the present day Far East crisis, and the rôle played in it by the Communist party of Japan, I was able to establish conclusively only one fact, namely that in Japanese the impassioned love for the Leader is expressed by the word, "*Banzai!*", but I was already equipped with this piece of information, since it is proper to yell "*Banzai!*" in honor of the Mikado as well. Incidentally, at the Congress, Stalin scintillated in silence, also after Mikado's fashion.

The so-called "discussions" revolved around two questions: the policy of the "united front" (today, that is the only policy in existence) *against Fascism*, and the self-same policy *against war*. The speeches of the reporters, the fulsome and flat report of Dimit-

roff as well as jesuitical sophistry of Ercoli, added nothing to those asseverations which during the recent months flooded the press of the Communist International, particularly in France. The experience of the French Communist party occupied the center of the stage, and it was boosted as an exemplar worthy of emulation. But it was precisely upon the basic questions before the Congress that the organizations of the Fourth International had already expressed themselves quite adequately. In the light of the debates at Moscow, we, the revolutionary Marxists, do not have to change a single line in all we have hitherto said on the questions of war, Fascism, the "united front" and the "people's front".

This does not at all mean to say that we can disregard the Seventh Congress. Far from it! Whether the debates be brimful of meaning or hollow, the Congress itself represents a stage in the evolution of a certain section of the working class. It is important if only for the fact that by legalizing the opportunistic turn in France, it immediately transplants it to the rest of the world. We have a curious specimen of bureaucratic thinking in that while granting, on paper at any rate, a liberal autonomy to all sections, and while even issuing instructions to them to do independent thinking and adapt themselves to their own national conditions, the Congress, immediately thereupon, proclaimed that all countries in the world, Fascist Germany as well as democratic Norway, Great Britain as well as India, Greece as well as China, are equally in need of the "people's front", and, wherever possible, of a government of the people's front. The Congress is important because it marks—after a period of acclimation and fumbling—the final entry of the Communist International into its "Fourth Period" which has for its slogan—"Power to Daladier!"; for its banner—a tricolor; for its hymn—the *Marseillaise*, drowning out the *International*.

In any case, the *resolutions* would have provided a great deal more than the verbose discussions toward the appraisal of the depth of the turn and its concrete content pertaining to conditions in different countries. The drafts of the resolutions, however, were not published beforehand upon a single one of the questions that were discussed. The discussions did not take place around definitive documents, but seeped over an illimitable expanse. The special committee busied itself with drafting the resolutions, only after all the orators had bellowed praise to the Leader, and began packing their bags. It is an unprecedented fact: the official Congress adjourned without arriving at any decisions. This job has been left to the new leaders, appointed prior to the Congress (Dimitroff!), who are to take into consideration, in so far as possible, the moods and wishes of the honorable delegates. Thus, the very mechanics of this Congress made it extremely difficult to give any sort of a timely critical evaluation of its labors. Today, at any rate, the principal material of the Congress has been published, and thus there is, at last, a possibility to draw up its theoretic and political balances. I will try to fulfill this task as soon as possible in a special pamphlet, or a series of articles. At this time, I should like to sketch out in advance a few political conclusions in connection with the turn of the Communist International which was sealed at the Congress.

It would be a fatal mistake on our part to think that the theory and practise of the "Third Period" has been entirely and painlessly

liquidated by the "self-criticism" of the leaders, and that the opportunistic and patriotic turn is guaranteed a cloudless future. While the bureaucracy has consigned to the flames all it so highly revered with such scandalous ease, it is otherwise with the masses. Their attitude towards slogans is more serious and genuine. The moods of the "Third Period" are still entirely alive in the consciousness of those workers who follow the Communist International. And precisely these moods were in evidence among the French communists in Toulon and Brest. The leaders were able to curb the opposition of the rank and file for a time only by giving "secret" assurances on their oath that here was involved a cunning manoeuvre aimed to hoodwink the Radicals and the socialists, take away the masses from them, and then . . . "then we will show ourselves for what we are". On the other hand, the pro-coalition and patriotic turn of the communist party is attracting to it the sympathy of new strata considerably removed from the working class, those who are very patriotic and very much dissatisfied with the financial decrees and who see in the communist party only the most energetic wing of the People's Front. This means that *inside the communist party and on its periphery there are accumulating to an increasing degree contradictory tendencies*, which must lead to an explosion, or a series of explosions. From this there flows the duty for the organizations of the Fourth International to follow most attentively the internal life of the communist parties in order to support the revolutionary proletarian tendency against the leading social-patriotic faction, which will henceforth become more and more enmeshed in the attempts of class collaboration.

Our second conclusion touches upon Centrist groupings and their relation to the strategic turn of the Communist International. The Right-Centrist elements will be inevitably attracted by this turn, as by a magnet. One need only read the theses on war by Otto Bauer, Zyromski, and the Russian Menshevik, Dan, to see clearly that it is precisely these consummate representatives of the golden mean who have expressed the very essence of the Comintern's new policy better than Dimitroff and Ercoli. But not they alone. The field of the magnetic attraction also extends further to the Left. The *Neue Front*, the organ of the S.A.P., in its last two issues (16 and 17), while screening itself behind a pile of cautious qualifications and warnings, hails in essence the opportunistic turn of the Communist International, as its emancipation from sectarian ossification, and its transition to the road of "more realistic" policy. How ill-judged are all the discussions on the subject that the S.A.P. is supposedly in agreement with us on all the principled questions, but merely disapproves of our "methods". In reality, every major question reveals the incongruity between their principled position and ours. The impending war danger impelled the S.A.P. to advance immediately, as against our slogans, the demoralizing slogan of "disarmament" which is rejected even by Otto Bauer, Zyromski and Dan as "unrealistic". The self-same clash of positions became manifest in the evaluation of the evolution of the Communist International. In the very heat of the "Third Period" we forecasted with absolute precision that this paroxysm of ultra-Leftism would lead inevitably to a new opportunistic zigzag, immeasurably more profound and fatal than all those preceding. In the days when the Communist International still played with all the rainbow colors of "revolutionary defeatism", we warned that from the theory of "socialism in a single country" there would flow inevitably social-patriotic conclusions with all their treacherous consequences. The Seventh Congress of the Comintern provided a truly remarkable confirmation of the Marxian prognosis. And what happened? The leaders of the S.A.P., who have forgotten everything and learned nothing, hail the new and severest stage of an incurable disease, discovering in its symptoms . . . of a realistic convalescence. Isn't it clear that we have two irreconcilable positions before us?

From the above-indicated point of view, it is in the highest degree interesting what will be the precise reaction to the Seventh Congress of that Left-Centrist party which has been hitherto closest to the Communist International, namely, the I.L.P. of England. Will it be attracted by the vile "realism" of the Seventh Congress ("united front", "masses", "middle classes", etc., etc.) or will it, on the contrary, be repelled by the belated and all the more fatal opportunism (class collaboration under the hollow banner of "anti-Fascism", social-patriotism under the cover of the "defense of the U.S.S.R.", etc.)? The future fate of the I.L.P. hinges upon this alternative.

One may say, in general, that regardless of the isolated partial stages and episodes, the turn of the Communist International sealed by the Congress simplifies the situation in the working class movement. It consolidates the social-patriotic camp, bringing closer the parties of the Second and Third Internationals, regardless how matters proceed with organizational unity. It strengthens the centrifugal tendencies within the Centrist groupings. To the revolutionary internationalists, i.e., the builders of the Fourth International, it opens up all the greater possibilities.

September 7, 1935

2. Russia and the World Proletariat

THE RESOLUTION on Dimitroff's report on Fascism is finally here. It is just as longwinded and diffuse as the report itself. Here we will deal only with the first sentence of the first paragraph of the resolution which takes up a bare dozen newspaper lines of *l'Humanité*, but at the same time constitutes the cornerstone of the whole theoretical and strategical structure of the so-called Communist International. Let us examine a little closer what this cornerstone is like. We quote this first sentence literally: "*The final, irrevocable victory of socialism in the land of the Soviets, a victory of world-historical significance which has enormously enhanced the power and the importance of the Soviet Union as the rampart of the exploited and oppressed of the entire world and has inspired the toilers to the struggle against capitalist exploitation, bourgeois reaction and Fascism, and for peace, freedom and the independence of the peoples.*" The assertions contained in this sentence, however categorical they may sound, are false to the core. What is the "final, irrevocable victory of socialism in the land of the Soviets" supposed to mean? No official theoretician has tried to explain it to us. The resolution too spares itself the slightest hint of the criteria upon which this assertion is based. We must therefore call to mind all over again the A B C of Marxism. The victory of socialism, especially the "final, irrevocable" one, can only consist in this, that the average productivity of every member of the socialist society is higher, even substantially higher, than that of a capitalist worker. Even the most daring Comintern theoretician will not venture such an assertion with regard to the U.S.S.R. We hope to establish statistically in the near future the still very great backwardness of the Soviet Union with respect to both the national and individual incomes. Our present task requires no such proof. The fact that the Soviet government must needs hold fast to the monopoly of foreign trade, represents a sufficient confirmation of the existing backwardness—despite all the successes—of Soviet economy. For, if the costs of production in the country were lower than the capitalist costs, the monopoly of foreign trade would be superfluous. The latest reform of foreign trade, interpreted by many all-too-superficial observers as a surrender of the foreign trade monopoly, is in reality only a technico-bureaucratic reform, which does not in the least infringe upon the basic pillars of the monopoly. Since, on the other hand, the Soviet bureaucracy bases itself upon the nationalized means of production since the introduction of the Five Year

Plan and the collectivization, and on the other hand, the Soviet product is still much dearer than the capitalistic, the Soviet bureaucracy, for the sake of its own preservation, cannot abandon the foreign trade monopoly. This decisive fact—the low productivity of labor power in the Soviet Union—gives the key which puts us in a position to open up all the other secrets.

If the per capita national income were calculated in the U.S.S.R. approximately as high as in the United States of America, and if the bureaucracy were not to squander unproductively and consume parasitically a much too large part of it, then the standard of living of the population would have to be incomparably higher than in the capitalist countries, the United States included. But that is not the case in the slightest degree. The Russian peasant, that is, the overwhelming mass of the population, still lives in deep poverty. Even the position of the majority of the industrial proletariat has not yet attained the American, nor even the European level. The honest establishment of this fact naturally says nothing, in any respect, against the socialist mode of production, for in the case of capitalism we are dealing with a decomposing system and in the case of socialism with one which is just in its incipiency. We ought not, however, content ourselves with the general tendencies of development, but must characterize quite accurately the stage attained, else we lose ourselves in meaningless commonplaces.

If the socialist society gave its members a half-way assured well-being with the perspective of an uninterrupted improvement of the position of everyone, then the burning worries about individual existence would begin to vanish, covetousness, anxiety and envy would make their appearance merely as increasingly rare remnants of the old state of affairs, economic solidarity would pass from a principle into the daily customs. That this is not the case in the least, hardly needs to be proved: the creation of a semi-privileged labor aristocracy under the fully-privileged Soviet bureaucracy; the endeavors to translate all relationships of man to man into the language of money; the draconic laws for the protection of state property; finally the truly barbaric law against "criminal" children, all these prove in the most striking, the most irrefutable manner that socialism has yet been far from "irrevocably" assured in that field which is decisive precisely for socialism: *in the consciousness of the people.*

If socialism has "finally, irrevocably" triumphed, as the revolution dares to assert, then why does the political dictatorship continue to exist? Still more, why does it congeal with every passing day into a bureaucratic-Bonapartist régime of insufferable harshness, arbitrariness and rottenness? A guaranteed, an "irrevocably" rooted socialism cannot possibly require an omnipotent bureaucracy, with an absolute ruler on top of it, for the dictatorship in general is after all nothing but a state means of preserving and protecting the *menaced* and not the *assured* foundations of the socialist state. The intrepid attempt of many "theoreticians" to refer to *external* dangers, is much too absurd to be taken seriously. A society whose socialist structure is assured, whose internal relations thus repose upon the solidarity of the overwhelming mass, does not require an internal dictatorship for protection from external foes, but only a technico-military apparatus, just as it requires a technico-economic apparatus for its welfare.

Also the fear of war in which the Soviet bureaucracy lives and which determines its whole international policy, can only be explained by the fact that the socialist construction, upon which the Soviet bureaucracy bases itself, is, historically speaking, not yet assured. The struggle of the workers' state against an imperilling capitalism is—at least it should be—a component part of the class struggle of the international working class. *War* thus has—at least it should have—the same significance for the workers' state as *revolution* has for the proletariat of the capitalist countries. We are of course against any "premature", artificially evoked revolu-

tion, because, given an unfavorable relation of forces, it can lead only to defeat. The same holds true of war. A workers' state should avert it only if it is "premature", that is, if socialism is not yet finally and irrevocably assured. The current view that, internally, socialism is assured but that it may be crushed by military force, is senseless: an economic system which effects a higher productivity of human labor, cannot be overthrown by military measures. The victory of the semi-feudal European coalition over Napoleon did not lead to the destruction of the capitalist development of France but to its acceleration in the rest of Europe. History teaches that the victors—should they be situated on a lower economic and cultural plan than the vanquished—take over the latter's technique, social relationships and culture. It is not military force as such that menaces Soviet socialism, but *cheap commodities* which would follow on the heels of the victorious capitalist armies. Moreover, if socialism were really assured in the Soviet Union in the above-described manner, that is, higher technique, higher productivity, higher well-being of the whole population, higher solidarity, there could be no possible talk of a military victory of the internally torn capitalist states over the Soviet Union.

We thus see how thoroughly false is the most important, the really decisive contention of the Seventh World Congress. Revolutionary Marxists should have said: the technical successes in the U.S.S.R. are very significant; the economic successes lag behind. To guarantee even that "well-being" which obtains in the advanced capitalist countries and to reeducate the population, many years are still required, even if one disregards the internal contradictions and the increasingly destructive rôle of the Soviet bureaucracy, that is, two factors which are, by themselves, capable of exploding into the air the not yet assured social achievements. The decomposition of capitalism, the thrust of Fascism, the growing war danger, all these processes stride forward much more rapidly than the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. Only narrowminded fakers and bureaucratic pietists can think that this candid and honest putting of the question will dampen the "enthusiasm" of the international working class. Revolutionary enthusiasm cannot be permanently nurtured on lies. But lies form the basic pillar of the strategical system of the Comintern. Socialism is irrevocably assured in the U.S.S.R., on one-sixth of the world's surface, if only the world proletariat will help along to leave the Soviet state in peace. Thus the slogan is, not preparation for the international revolution, but the *assurance of peace.* Thence the alliance with the "friends of peace", the substitution of class collaboration for class struggle, the creation of the People's Front with the Radical parties of finance capital, etc., etc. All these means are, already in themselves, incapable of prolonging the peace, to say nothing of assuring it. Yet the whole peace program of the Comintern is strategically built upon the premise of an internally "assured" socialism. With this premise, the Seventh World Congress stands and falls, and it is, as indicated above, irrevocably false.

September 14, 1935

Leon TROTSKY

We call the attention of our readers to the announcement that appears on the back cover of this issue. We ask you to read it carefully and act as the announcement requests. It is a request to you to participate in a subscription campaign to extend our circulation and thus insure the regular monthly appearance of our magazine. This campaign is not to be of the usual kind in which merely a few active enthusiasts compete to show the best results. It is to be based particularly on the idea that *all of our readers* will take part in the solicitation of new subscriptions. What do you say?

The Real Meaning of the United Front

DIMITROFF'S declaration to the Seventh Congress of the C. I. in support of "united front governments", we are informed, was greeted by a stormy ovation from the assembled delegates. Speaking for a "bold and determined course toward a united front of the working class", the "helmsman of the Comintern" gave an unequivocal answer to the question he posed in his report:

"If we Communists are asked," he said, "whether we advocate the united front only in the struggle for partial demands, or whether we are prepared to share the responsibility even when it will be a question of forming a government on the basis of the united front, then we say with a full sense of our responsibility: yes, we recognize that a situation may arise in which the formation of a government of the proletarian united front, or of the anti-Fascist People's Front, will become not only possible but necessary in the interest of the proletariat. And in that case we shall declare for the formation of such a government without the slightest hesitation."

Dimitroff laid down one condition, which he considered essential for the support of such a "united front government" posed by him concretely for France: namely, that it will "carry on a real struggle against French Fascism—not in word but in deed—will carry out the program of demands of the anti-Fascist People's Front." (Emphasis mine. A.S.)

What we have presented here is not the slogan of the workers' government as a consequence of the united front policy in a revolutionary situation. It is not the idea of Soviets as the highest form of the united front under the conditions in which the proletariat enters the stage of struggle for power. No! What we have presented here is the idea of support of coalition governments. Dimitroff understood it in that sense; all the delegates to the Seventh Congress understood it in that sense; and support of coalition government has now become the declared policy of the Comintern. Wherein does this differ in content from the social democratic concept of coalition governments, aside from its form of presentation? Now it is called a "bold and determined course toward the united front of the working class".

What could then be more natural than for Dimitroff to declare also that "the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and the success of the proletarian revolution make it imperative that there be a single party of the proletariat in each country"? Only yesterday we were told by the same authors that social democracy is the main enemy, in fact it is social-Fascism; today, the success of the proletarian revolution depends on the extension of the united front into organic unity between the two Centrist parties of Stalinism and of social democracy.

Taking his cue from the report of the "helmsman", and carrying the treacherous opportunism of the Seventh Congress to its extreme absurdity, Earl Browder found an answer to the question of welding together a "broad people's movement" in the United States. It is to extend far indeed. His only fear was that "the bourgeoisie, the top A. F. of L. bureaucracy, the Right wing socialists, many liberal bourgeois politicians, not to speak of the Hearsts, Coughlins and Longs, will do everything possible to exclude the communists from such a movement". But casting all caution aside, Browder went on to explain this new line for the United States.

"We must say clearly," he exclaimed in a vigorous outburst of his own inner conviction and enthusiasm, "yes, we will fight together with all those in the united front, for a majority in all elective bodies, local, state and national. We will support such a party

whenever and wherever it wins a majority, in taking over administrative powers, so long as it really uses these powers to protect and extend democratic liberties and advance the demands of the masses. But the masses will ask us: What will be your rôle? Will you stand aside as critics, preaching merely for a Soviet power, for which we are not ready to fight? We answer: *The communists are even prepared to participate in such a government.*" (Emphasis mine. A.S.)

All that now remains to be done by Browder's chimerical "American People's Front" is to furnish the mandate.

And what sort of a "broad people's party" does Browder propose to create? Dimitroff assures us that it will be "neither socialist nor communist". Of that we never had any doubt. But then, what will it be? Browder gives us his definition as a "lasting coalition of workers, farmers, and city middle classes, to fight against threatening economic catastrophe, against political reaction and Fascism, and against the threatening war". To be sure, this is expecting a lot from a "people's party".

Such are the estimates of the tasks of the communists, outlined by both the "helmsmen", for the present conditions of threatening economic catastrophe, political reaction, Fascism and war: Support of coalition governments and the welding together in the United States of a "broad people's party . . . a lasting coalition of workers, farmers and city middle classes". Dimitroff described these to the Seventh Congress as "cardinal questions of the united front". Cardinal questions indeed, not, however, of the united front but of the opportunist degeneracy and decomposition of the Comintern.

From its original concept, the united front as a means of proletarian unity at any given moment in the struggle against capitalism, has been perverted by the present Comintern leadership into a means of an opportunist coalition with the bourgeoisie. This is the cardinal difference between the united front policy as formulated by the Bolsheviks during the period covered by the first four Congresses and the interpretation given to it at the Seventh Congress. Fundamentally it represents a cardinal difference between the Comintern of Lenin and the Comintern of Stalin.

Not the communist parties but social democracy will be the real beneficiaries of this 180 degree turn. An enormous contribution has been made toward its further rehabilitation. What stands now in the way of the justification of all its policies and all its betrayals? Nothing so far as the Comintern is concerned. Drawing their comfort from the slogan of organic unity the leaders of the socialist parties may now appear before their own working class following as fully vindicated in all their charges against the "communist splitters". For Bolsheviks, however, the question of unity or splits is subordinated to political policy. Bolsheviks do not fight only for ideas and programs. They also draw organizational conclusions from their policy. Had not the communist party under the leadership of Lenin broken definitely and irrevocably with social democracy it could never have become the party of proletarian revolution. This was the cardinal difference with social democracy. For the revolutionary party this difference remains in full force today, only it is necessary to add, that it applies with equal potency to the Comintern of Stalin.

Nevertheless the united front policy remains as valid today as when first formulated. It takes as its point of departure the fact that in the every-day struggle against capitalism, and in so far as the vital interests of the working class are concerned, the masses realize the need for united action. If their political consciousness would develop on an even and uniform scale there would be far less difficulty in solving the problem of unity. Unfortunately that

is not the case. The class itself is not homogeneous. In the course of the class struggle, political consciousness develops unevenly; large working class sections support the bourgeois political parties, support the social democracy, or remain politically indifferent. While the revolutionary party has no interests separate and apart from the class as a whole, it can fulfill its tasks only by maintaining correct relations within the class. From this flows its duty to provide the means whereby, at each given moment, joint action against the common enemy may be made possible.

These simple objective facts present the premise for the united front policy. In no sense can it be considered a mere manoeuvre that is not meant seriously or honestly, or that is to serve as a cloak under which the party snatches leadership over masses not otherwise merited by its accomplishments. Reprehensible as this would appear, it has nevertheless been the practise of the little American Stalinists. Creation, artificially, of "rank and file committees" to give the appearance of speaking officially for the trade unions in support of the party's aims was not at all beneath them. But even more despicable and more futile—if it is possible—were their many attempts to palm off as a genuine united front a mere combination of the communist party and its auxiliary organizations, most of which represented absolutely nobody not already directly under its influence. Such practises could never win over the majority of the working class; they did not win anybody at all.

So long as the revolutionary party and its direct supporters remain a minority force within the class, even if a substantial one, the party faces the problem of connecting itself with the masses. It must turn not only to the masses but also to their organizations—especially the trade unions. Any attempts to ignore the mass organizations are ludicrous. The united front, if it is to have real meaning, must extend from organization to organization. Only agreements, mutually arrived at between the organizations, can guarantee the necessary organizational points of support and make united action possible at any given moment. Mutual agreements in struggle for specific aims presuppose also equal rights and common duties. By their very nature these aims are of a limited character for the reasons that the various organizations involved have different political programs. But they must, of course, be in accord with the historical development of the proletariat. With a correct tactic the revolutionary party has everything to gain from the united front policy. Its possibilities to win over to its side the majority of the working class become greater.

From the Stalinist zig-zags on the united front we have witnessed the exact opposite both in theory and practise, and with disastrous consequences to the working class. Most outstanding are the lessons of the terrible German débâcle, that is, for those who have the capacity to learn. As lessons they are equally devastating to the impotent theoreticians who were then, and still are today, the real "helmsmen" of the Comintern, regardless of which one of the henchmen holds the official title. In its deadly crisis the working class was told that the united front, although permissible before, had now become counter-revolutionary. "A bloc, or even an alliance, or even a temporary joint operation in individual actions between the communist party and the social democratic party in Germany against National-Socialism", the C.P. leaders declared to be impermissible, for had not the social democrats been pronounced to be "social-Fascists"? Stalin's definition of social democracy they held to be "unexcelled in its exactness and incisiveness". Stalin had declared to the Comintern: "The social democracy is objectively the moderate wing of Fascism. These organizations do not negate one another, but rather supplement each other. They are not antipodes but twins."

The fate of the German working class, however, depended at that crucial hour on the ability of the workers' organizations to hammer together a united front of defense against Fascism. Social

democracy was still the largest working class party; it also exerted the decisive influence in the trade unions. Of course, its leadership had betrayed the workers. But to the workers, who followed them, this had not yet been made sufficiently clear, nor were they ready to entrust their fate to the communist party leadership. With its criminal attitude and viciously false policies, how could this be expected? The ultimatic demands by the latter, that the workers desert their organizations and accept in advance the communist party leadership, which was put forward as a substitute for the united front by mutual agreement, only made matters worse. It had in no way demonstrated its right to leadership. And thus, to the betrayals of the social democratic leaders, it could only add its own criminal capitulation to Fascism—an equally dastardly betrayal.

The rôle of social democracy and of its leadership was perfectly well known when the united front policy was formulated. It was taken into account in a very direct sense. But the accredited officials of the various workers' organizations, whether reformist or outright reactionaries, cannot be ignored or excluded at will so long that they are recognized by the masses as their leaders. Were it possible simply to unite the masses around the banner of the revolutionary party, regardless of their organizations and without their leaders, there would be no need of presenting the united front in this form. But that is not possible; and the revolutionary party must therefore turn also to the leaders in order to confront them with the real issues of the class struggle. Even negotiations with them become obligatory. To bring them out into the open and oppose them under equal conditions of the struggle before the eyes of the masses is one important purpose of the united front. Given a correct tactic, all the advantages belong to the revolutionary party. A movement in action affords the best possibilities to reveal to the masses, by their own experience, the real character and the downright sabotage of the struggle by the reactionary leaders.

Such an attitude was called counter-revolutionary during the crucial hours in Germany. A few years before, the Stalinist bureaucrats had burned their fingers on the Anglo-Russian Committee, which they palmed off as a united front. Secretly it was conceived as a lasting coalition, which would guarantee peaceful relations with British imperialism while building socialism in the Soviet Union. Thus falsely motivated, on purely pacifist grounds, it could not serve as means to confront the leaders of the British Trade Union Congress with the real problems of imperialist aggression. It turned out to be a bloc pure and simple with the top leaders and not with the mass organizations, the trade unions, for they were engaged in a general strike and betrayed by their leaders. The mutual agreement in the bloc served to bolster up these leaders acting as agents of the British government against the masses. The British Trade Union Congress could turn its weapons with redoubled force against the general strike. But the discipline and "unity" of the bloc remained after the betrayal. Therein lay its real crime.

The united front, when correctly carried out, imposes, of course, a certain discipline of action on the revolutionists. But woe to them if this discipline takes on an absolute character. It is always essential for the revolutionary party to maintain its political and organizational independence. It must reserve for itself the right of criticism and freedom of action which must be mutually guaranteed for all participants in the united front.

For social democrats this problem resolves itself into non-aggression pacts, that is when they cannot escape the pressure for united action. Otherwise they have consistently rejected the idea of fighting alongside of revolutionary workers, for the sake of maintaining their coalition with the bourgeoisie. Non-aggression pacts they construe to mean cessation of all attacks upon their position and actions. In reality such a concept flies in the face of the very

principle of mutual rights of criticism and freedom of action. It becomes a cheap subterfuge for the united front under cover of which they aim to keep the revolutionists within certain bounds while they may continue unhampered their deception of the masses.

Revolutionists cannot bind themselves to such agreements. Moreover, once the united front is established and any of its participants, especially the reactionary leaders, take a position detrimental to the movement or its objectives and contrary to the desires of the masses, the revolutionary party can no longer consider itself bound by its discipline. In that event it reserves for itself the right to break off all relations and carry the struggle to its conclusion regardless of these participants. The failure to break off relations with the British trade union leaders in the Anglo-Russian Committee, after the general strike betrayal, was the cardinal mistake of the Stalinists in this episode.

The Seventh Congress policy, submitted in the name of the united front, is similar in its pacifist motivation to that of the Anglo-Russian Committee, but much more full blown in its social democratic objective consequences. Let us consider the proposals for a "lasting coalition of workers, farmers and city middle classes" in a "People's Front" party, and of one single proletarian party for each country. Assuming that the one single party of the proletariat is established, what will be the need of the "broad people's party"? What duty is it to perform? We are not informed at all by the authors of the proposals. For revolutionists these two kinds of parties would be mutually exclusive. Granting the possibility of the former, there would be no need of the latter. But to the authors of the proposals they evidently mean the same thing; not a united front, not a revolutionary party at all, but a complete dissolution into one "broad people's party". Social democracy, even in its palmy days, could go no further along the road of opportunism.

A united front of correct relations with the middle class for specific and limited aims can, of course, not be ruled out in advance. It is possible and necessary under certain conditions; but it can advance the interests of the working class, and the interests of humanity, only when the proletarian foundation is guaranteed and its leadership made possible. Between the two decisive classes in bourgeois society the petty bourgeoisie vacillates and is unable to play an independent rôle. At best it swings, according to its own economic fortunes, to the support of the one or the other. Naturally it constitutes a reservoir of potential proletarian allies, especially as its economic rations, due to the decline of capitalism, get reduced to the proletarian level. But this also presupposes the condition of a firm leadership given by the proletariat in showing the petty bourgeoisie the socialist way out of its dilemma.

A united front with the petty bourgeoisie on any other basis would be a grotesque absurdity, if not actually disastrous in objective consequence.

Is this absurdity to be repeated on a grander scale in the projected "broad people's movement" in the United States—a purely Third party movement? If so, and no other construction can be

put upon it, we repeat it will have far more disastrous consequences to the American working class. In its further advance to revolutionary consciousness, aided by the maturing of capitalist contradictions, it will face the Third party as an obstacle, whose historic rôle can be none other than to pacify, to deceive and to disintegrate the advancing working class movement.

Nothing need now stand in the way of organic unity between the two Centrist parties of Stalinism and social democracy. Fundamentally their position is the same. But what new possibilities would this offer to the working class, if any? This is the essential question. Of course, a revolutionary basis of unification between two Centrist parties is precluded in advance. The mere unification solves nothing and carries rather the danger of stifling and crushing a very promising Leftward development under the juggernaut of the combined bureaucracies.

At the present moment this question is presented concretely in France where it runs through the "People's Front" to the proposed coalition government so vociferously acclaimed in Moscow. Essentially all rests on the same foundation. Its foundation is not distinguishable by a hair's-breadth from that of social democracy on its fatal August 4, 1914. That day is marked in the pages of working class history in bold letters—betrayal. With the crucial hour nearing, the hour of Fascism and war, which puts all political groups and parties to their supreme test, the question of policy pursued becomes the basic consideration. And while Fascism is marshalling its forces, the Stalinists, in harmony with the social democratic leaders, are preparing to cement a united front, not of the working class, but with the bourgeois political state in the form of a coalition government. The position of both parties is "civil peace"; not "battles between Frenchmen", but the "union of France"; not the struggle for the death against Fascism, which means the struggle for power, but "national recovery". This, in essence, is already the program of the "People's Front", which the Seventh Congress insisted be the condition for support of a coalition government in France. Such are the fruits of Stalinism today: misleading, disorienting, disarming and paralyzing the working masses.

Neither party finds the enemy in its own country. Both are committed to the policy of national defense, the defense of French imperialism, as summed up in the Franco-Soviet pact. On the occasion of affixing the signatures to the pact, *l'Humanité* wrote: "What could be more natural than the fact that our comrade Stalin, upon the request of Laval, should have declared his approval of France's military measures?" This is Stalin's political solidarization with the brigands of imperialism. And upon this basis organic unity is to be consummated and is to find its synthesis in the projected coalition government.

From its original concept, the united front, as a means of proletarian unity at any given moment in its struggle against capitalism, has been perverted by the degenerate policy of Stalinism into a coalition with the bourgeoisie.

Arne SWABECK

From Atlantic City to Atlantic City

On the 55th Convention of the American Federation of Labor

AS THE 1935 Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor approaches, one recalls that a decade ago an A. F. of L. convention of decisive importance was held at the same place. During the year preceding this earlier convention William Green had been chosen president to fill the unexpired term of Samuel Gompers. He was by no means as yet secure in the saddle

nor fully trusted by the office-holding elements in the great international unions who dominate the federation conventions. He was, in fact, suspected by many of them of having "radical leanings". If he were elected to the presidency for a regular one-year term by the delegates at this convention, his position would become relatively secure. The chances were that he would then be elected

year after year as Gompers had been. If, on the other hand, Green were defeated it would indicate confusion and instability in the official family and perhaps a number of years of internal strife.

By liberal elements in the labor movement and among its sympathizers Green was generally thought of as the progressive candidate who might inaugurate a new and better era in the A. F. of L. He was from the fighting (?) industrial United Mine Workers Union, not from the building or printing crafts. He had served in the Ohio legislature and sponsored there a model workmen's compensation act. He was interested in the workers' education movement, then largely in the hands of the progressive elements in the unions. If any candidate opposed Green it would probably be Matthew Woll, who had been regarded as Gompers' choice for his successor, "the crown prince", closer to the craft unions, more militantly conservative than Green.

Those were the days of the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee, the period which in Great Britain culminated in the General Strike. The leading fraternal delegate from the British Trade Union Congress to the convention was A. A. Purcell, at that time president of the B.T.U.C. and prominent in the activities of the A.-R. C. Purcell's speech to the convention was a ringing challenge. He argued for militant unionism, the building of a Labor party in the U. S., the recognition of the Soviet government by the U. S. government, and close fraternal relations between the trade unionists of the Soviet Union and of the United States. It is the custom for the president of the A. F. of L. to reply to the speeches of fraternal delegates. Frequently these replies furnish an opportunity for important political pronouncements. Purcell's speech presented Green with his first test.

His reply to Purcell was in substance this: "The great American Federation of Labor is the most militant trade union movement in the world. As for a Labor party, we don't need instruction on such subjects from our sister body. A Labor party may be good for the British workers, we don't need it or want it here. We have just had another illustration [the LaFollette campaign] of the fact that independent political action does not suit the needs of American workers. We are opposed to the recognition by the United States of the Soviet government which does not observe its international obligations, which is out to wreck civilization and morality, etc. As for friendship with the Russian trade unionists, we feel an ardent affection for the Russian people. We hope that some day there will be a real trade union movement in Russia. We are, however, determined to stamp out every vestige of communist influence in the trade union movement and we will have no truck with the C.P.-dominated trade union movement of the Soviet Union."

After the session a group of delegates and visitors was discussing the speeches on the boardwalk. John P. Frey, then editor of the *Molders' Journal*, now head of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., a conservative of conservatives in his philosophy but personally honest, idealistic and well-read, was the center of the group. Frey rubbed his hands in glee: "That speech," he said, "elects Green to the presidency. It has made him. The A. F. of L. is safe. We know now that we have a strong man who is worthy to stand in Samuel Gompers' shoes."

Thus with appropriate ceremony, so to speak, began the undisputed reign of William Green and the great turn to the Right which characterized the A. F. of L. from that year to 1933. For, of course, Green was not and did not prove to be a progressive though quite possibly he still thinks of himself as a "constructive radical". The doctrine that workers should be organized by employers who were to be persuaded that their production would be made more efficient if they put their workers into A. F. of L. unions; that strikes were relics of the earlier barbaric era of employer-employee relations; political support of big capital repre-

sented by Coolidge and Hoover; the ruthless suppression of even the mildest opposition so that for years no opposition vote was recorded on any resolutions in A. F. of L. conventions, and along with it the degeneration of many of the unions which constituted the backbone of the A. F. of L. into racketeering outfits, marked this period. Monotonously Green was reelected to the presidency each year. Some were boom years, some depression. In any case membership fell consistently. Strikes were consistently lost. Yet they were comfortable years for the bureaucracy. There was enough per capita tax to keep them going; they basked in the sunshine of capitalist favor; internal opposition had been clubbed into submission or with the C. P. was on the outside pursuing the futile "Third Period" "dual union" tactics.

With the advent of the Roosevelt administration came an increase in union membership and a tremendous stepping up of activity, and with new members and open and bitter labor conflicts came trouble for the bureaucrats in the A. F. of L. Fundamentally, of course, the crisis developing in the Federation results from the fact that American capitalism is entering on a new phase and that in this phase pure-and-simple, class collaborationist, craft unionism can no longer obtain concessions from the employing class.

Thus Green comes to the 1935 Atlantic City convention having failed to date to compose the conflict which is threatening to tear asunder the important Building Trades Department of the A. F. of L.; with the campaign against "Reds" in the unions on the whole a failure; and having suffered open rebuffs at three successive conventions—automobile workers, teachers and rubber workers—within a month.

It is by no means a foregone conclusion that Green will be faced with an open contest for the presidency at this convention. Undoubtedly the fact that he cannot handle jurisdictional conflicts with the political finesse of a Gompers, that he appears not to be the "strong man" to guard the citadel of craft unionism against the new union members from the big industries and to put down the "Reds", greatly disturbs the heads of the craft groups and the reactionary elements in the Federation generally. They are not, however, going to jump from the frying pan into the fire if they can help it. Before they put Green out they must be sure that they have a better man to take his place. The only serious contender who has appeared is John L. Lewis, to whom more than any one else Green has owed his position thus far. It is quite possible that Lewis, who is nothing if not a clever and resourceful politician, on the one hand thinks that he can still use Green, and on the other hand may prefer to see Green further discredited by his failure to dispose of the numerous perplexing problems facing the Federation before he openly runs against him.

For militants and progressives the important point so far is that there is instability and conflict within the A. F. of L. bureaucracy and that the leadership is not now able to dispose of opposition in an off-hand manner. Militants and progressives must take advantage of this condition and press the offensive. In no situation is this a time for retreat or compromise.

Above all, however, it is necessary to understand the real character of the present conflict in the A. F. of L. officialdom. It is not a contest between reactionaries and genuine progressives, between class collaborationists and advocates of class struggle. Leaders of the "opposition" are Lewis of the miners, Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers and Gorman of the United Textile Workers. Behind them are ranged the lesser officials in the unions led by them and in some of the other unions. These men are led to seek a new course for the Federation, of course, under the pressure of their rank and file who in turn suffer under the impact of the crisis. It does not follow that they are interested in leading the

rank and file to victory in genuine struggles against employers; the exact opposite is in fact the case.

Lewis, Hillman and Company stand for efficiency and up-to-dateness in union administration; for "aggressive" organization work and strikes (if strikes are necessary as a "last resort"); for "industrial" or vertical unionism. Some of them openly advocate a Labor party; others are willing to play around with the idea. Their basic concept, however, is that of class collaboration and their strategic aim is to develop a kind of unionism which can ectively, from their and the employers' point of view, carry on class collaboration under present conditions.

The unions in an earlier period, whether under Gompers' or Green's leadership, operated within the framework of the capitalist system. The idea was that unions must be there to bring pressure on the bosses who in the absence of them might take not only a "fair profit" but an unfair share which would result in the workers being deprived of a "fair day's pay for a fair day's work". Strikes might be resorted to on occasion in order to test out the relationship of forces. But eventually, and preferably sooner than later, a "bargain" was struck.

Now Lewis, Hillman and Company want to continue this game. But in the first place employers in the basic industries cannot get any results by dealing with craft unions. These do not "take care" of the mass of unskilled and semi-skilled workers who are most likely to make trouble for the employers. Unless, therefore, they can be provided with "industrial" unions which, having a semblance of independence from the employer, can more effectively keep workers in line than out-and-out company unions, these employers will resort to the latter and root out so-called independent unionism altogether. Lewis, Hillman and Company want the A. F. of L. to build efficient vertical unions which can keep the workers in line and with which employers will make "collective bargains".

Above all, these leaders are aware that in the present phase of capitalist development the government will intervene more and more extensively in industry, that it is in effect the administration as the agency of the employing class with which, via Labor Relations Boards, etc., the collective bargain must be made. Having no faith in the masses and no concept of class struggle against the government they are convinced that unions in the present period have no chance to exist at all save on government sufferance and indeed with positive government protection. They want to build, therefore, an A. F. of L. which finally abandons the anti-government, "syndicalist" leanings of Gompers and the craft unionists, which makes itself useful to the government in preventing and settling strikes, and which consequently receives administration favors.

It will be recalled that the most enthusiastic defender of the N.R.A. was the Lewis-Hillman outfit, that Lewis has obtained a "little N.R.A." for the coal industry (in exchange for repeated postponements of a strike struggle) and that Gorman is campaigning for a similar "little N.R.A." for the textile industry. On the

other hand, Roosevelt's support has been most consistently given to these same elements, a support which the administration could well afford to give in exchange for assistance in keeping down revolt in steel, automobiles, rubber, etc.

So far then from being progressive, the Lewis-Hillman outfit is to be more feared by progressives and militants today than the other elements in the A. F. of L. leadership. The old-timers cannot possibly handle the situation any longer. Their bungling attempts are bound to play into the hands of the militants. Lewis, Hillman and Company are the agents of the capitalist class who might be able to fasten a class collaboration trade unionism on the masses generally and especially the membership of the new unions, for a period. That John L. Lewis in the face of his atrocious record in his own union and his present philosophy should today be thought of by many honest workers as a progressive and as the hope of the workers in the developing crisis is indeed ominous. When the Stalinist party today encourages or permits steel workers, teachers and others to think that in Lewis they may find a real ally who will help them in organizing campaigns or in defending trade union democracy, the C.P. is simply carrying out its job of undermining and betraying the mass organizations by new means suited to the new conditions.

The same holds good in relation to the Labor party question. Objectively, even when there is not direct collaboration, the C.P. encourages the Labor party propaganda of such figures as Dubinsky, Gorman, etc. It is represented as an evidence of progressivism in the A. F. of L. But in the first place, no matter what some of these men may say under the pressure of the restlessness of their own rank and file, they will not only not give real support but they will definitely sabotage any concrete steps for the building of a Labor party so long as the Roosevelt administration gives them any crumbs from its table, in other words, so long as liberal capitalists can make use of them. In the second place, if and when they do support a "Labor party" it will be when it is safely under their own control and on a social-patriotic, social-pacifist basis. Not to see and expose this is to sabotage the building of a genuine revolutionary party and therefore to sabotage political unification of the American workers on the only basis which can possibly lead to the solution of their problems.

Against Lewis-Hillman as much as against Green the progressives and militants in all the unions must build their forces on a program of class struggle, trade union democracy and genuine industrial unionism. As the A. F. of L. convention will demonstrate, only the merest beginning has as yet been made in the building of such a Left wing. The recent developments, however, in the Local 574 situation in Minneapolis, in the automobile, teachers' and rubber workers' conventions, etc., demonstrate that a beginning has been made. As the economic crisis deepens and the threat of war draws nearer, the masses will be helpless and the unions will be crushed unless the work goes steadily and rapidly forward.

A. J. MUSTE

The Wagner Bill and the Working Class

THE SIGNING of the Wagner Bill, after a three year Congressional struggle, focuses a series of problems important to American Marxists, and illuminates the present phase in the development of class conflicts in this country. Moreover, it poses once again, in a new form, puzzling aspects in the general theory of the nature and functioning of the state. Careful analysis is deserved.

It is necessary, first of all, to review certain facts:

1. For nearly three years the Wagner Bill pursued a weary

course through the Congressional committees and sub-committees. In March of this year it was but little more advanced than when first introduced. Then came the Supreme Court decision in the Schechter Case, invalidating the N.R.A. Shortly thereafter the Wagner Bill sped through both Houses like a good horse which has rounded the turn into the stretch, was passed by overwhelming majorities had no organized opposition, and was signed by the president with a flourish of a new gold pen.

2. Since its introduction, labor has been unevenly but deeply

divided against itself in its attitude toward the Wagner Bill. This was dramatically brought out in the May Day parades of last spring. In the same parade, one contingent, marching with featured placards demanding and hailing the Wagner Bill, would be followed by another concentrating its slogans on violent denunciation of the Bill. The bourgeois press justifiably recorded its pleasure in this cross purpose.

3. By far the most ardent supporters of the Bill, from any camp, have been the officials of the American Federation of Labor. They campaigned for it by constant public propaganda, and by determined lobbying in Congress. They have greeted it, since its enactment, as the "Magna Charta of Labor", and have held victory mass meetings in many large cities. All those who opposed the meetings were termed saboteurs.

4. The socialist party is divided on the question of the Bill: the Old Guard supporting it as ardently as the A. F. of L. officials, the Center shilly-shallying as usual, and the Left trying to formulate some kind of opposition that will not commit them too much. The communist party is outspokenly opposed to "the strike-breaking Wagner Bill", and demands that it be "smashed".

5. The great majority of the bourgeoisie is, from all indications, against the Bill, and strongly against it. This was statistically revealed by the trade magazine *Newsdom*, which conducted a survey of more than a thousand of the leading newspapers of the country. *Newsdom* found them 80% opposed; and of the remaining 20%, less than half unequivocally in favor.

6. Meanwhile, though the Bill has now been law for several months, it has not yet played a prominent part in any labor dispute, in spite of the fact that a number of disputes have offered what would seem to be ideal opportunities.

I.

In recent years spokesmen of the communist party seem to depend more and more upon what might be called a "theory of deceptions" to explain away difficult historical problems. With the help of this theory, the Franco-Soviet Pact and the accompanying memoranda were passed off with a gesture. The Soviet Union once more had "deceived" the bourgeoisie. Dull-witted Laval was no match for Machiavelli-Stalin. This is reminiscent of the way in which the C.I. deceived Chiang Kai-Shek. Or, again, the whole Labor party business is being conducted with the aid of the theory of deceptions. The masses, unwilling to follow the communist party, will be deceived into following it when it loses its own name and re-appears as the leadership of a respectable mass-class party of workers and farmers. Indeed, some effort is made to use the theory to lead workers to believe that the C.I. is still the leader of the world revolution.

This theory comes in handy whenever there seems to be a peculiarity in the behavior of the bourgeoisie. And it is by this theory that the communist party explains bourgeois opposition to the Wagner Bill. The capitalists and their newspapers are "really" in favor of the Bill; they "pretend" to be opposed in order to make it easier to deceive the workers. In this naïve and mechanical fashion the Stalinists hope to save the face of the Marxian theory of the state; but they succeed only in making clear their own failure to understand the theory in its dynamic application.

There is a conflict, and a "real" conflict on the question of the Wagner Bill, both between sections of the bourgeoisie, and between the majority of the bourgeoisie and the Roosevelt Administration. Politics is not a masquerade, nor a melodramatic plot. Conflicts of this kind are not to be explained away in the childish terms of maneuvers and "deception".

Since there is a real conflict, an apparent contradiction follows: the state, the instrument of the bourgeoisie, whose rôle it is to maintain the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, operates in this case against the will of the bourgeoisie. However, such a conflict and

"contradiction" is both possible and at the same time entirely consistent with the Marxian theory of the state. Moreover, this is not a minor matter. Such conflicts, and they cannot be avoided, are a source of weakness in the bourgeoisie, and therefore of decisive importance to the workers in their struggle against the bourgeoisie as a whole. They constitute gaps in the bourgeois line of defense, thus permitting the workers to drive successful salients.

We are confronted with two different types of conflict: (1) a conflict between one section of the bourgeoisie proper (the majority, opposed to the Wagner Bill) and another (a minority, in favor of it); (2) a conflict between the bourgeoisie, speaking as a whole through its majority, and the "government" (strictly, the executive branch and a majority of the legislative branch of the government).

The first type of conflict is familiar throughout the history of capitalist society. It follows from the competitive nature of capitalist economy, from the differing stages of development of various branches of industry, from geographical distribution of raw materials (whether or not a given natural resource is found within the national boundaries), etc. These conflicts are exemplified, for example, in the high and low tariff battles in American history, the struggles over banking and monetary legislation, and the differing farm programs. The bourgeoisie does not, of course, constitute a "homogeneous" class, any more than does the proletariat. Capitalist economy functions in such a manner that all members, even the big bourgeoisie, cannot uniformly prosper. A high price for rails means more profit for the steel companies but less for the railroads. And such conflicts, taking shape in the economic battles of the market, are the objective basis for the existence of two or more bourgeois political parties, and of groups and factions within these parties contending for leadership.

These conflicts, it is true, all take place necessarily within the basic framework of the capitalist structure of society. However bitter the struggle between opposing groups becomes—and it is often extremely bitter—no side directs itself against the foundation stones of capitalism itself. The struggle revolves always within an orbit fixed by the fundamental social relations of capitalism. It is in this sense that the class conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie differs not merely in degree but in kind from any possible intra-bourgeois conflict. And this difference in kind is exactly the point that all shades of reformism are so concerned to obscure.

Nevertheless, the intra-bourgeois conflicts should never be passed over as mere shadow-boxing. They are of the utmost importance in estimating the precise stage of historical development, and in assessing the strength of the position of the class enemy. Moreover, they disclose a great historical weakness of capitalism which gives promise to the revolutionary movement. It is not differing opinions and ideas that cause these conflicts, but the material nature of capitalist society. They are inherent in capitalism. Both nationally and internationally capitalism is by its nature divided against itself, is continuously engaged in poisoning its own nest; and in the advance of history the pressure of its inner conflicts increases always rather than lessens. The proletariat, however, though likewise far from homogeneous, is placed in a position where it is driven together, rather than further apart, by the advance of history; and socialism, the historical answer to the problems of the proletariat, requires objectively the solution of difficulties by coöperative endeavor, not by internecine struggle. Thus, *potentially*, the proletarian united front, correctly achieved, is far stronger, because more firmly based, than any possible bourgeois united front, which is always rotten at the material core.

To return to the Wagner Bill, the bourgeois support which the Bill receives is a real support, and is to be discovered primarily in the industries already considerably unionized by the A. F. of L.

To take a concrete example: the big clothing manufacturers support the Bill strongly. Their factories are for the most part closed shops in the hands of the A.C.W. They have discovered that they can work harmoniously with Hillman—that, in fact, the troublesome personnel difficulties, layoffs, etc., are much easier when Hillman is there to help them. But their businesses are threatened by the non-unionized sweatshops. They want the sweatshops either eliminated or put on the same labor basis as their own plants. Therefore they supported the N.R.A. genuinely, and for all it was worth; and with the N.R.A. dead, they turn to the Wagner Bill.

II.

The majority of the bourgeoisie is opposed to the Wagner Bill. In this opposition they are in conflict with the Administration and with the majority of Congress. This conflict is more interesting and much less usual than the first type. How can it be?

Often such a conflict simply announces the fact that the political relationships in the Administration and in Congress, established some years previously, no longer express the relationship of forces within the bourgeoisie. Thus such a conflict heralds an overturn in the next Presidential elections, and a re-alignment of the parties in Congress. To some extent this is true in the present instance, as is shown even more clearly in the opposition to the Utilities Holding Company Bill and the new Tax Bill. However, there is more to it than this—particularly when it is kept in mind that Roosevelt will in all probability be reelected.

When we say that in class society the state is the political instrument of class domination, we do not mean anything so simple as that U. S. laws are written in the offices of Morgan & Co.—though that may at times be the case. Fundamentally we mean that, on the whole, the state functions in practise to uphold and if possible strengthen existing social relations, above all existing property relations; and that the state acts to suppress any serious threat to these relations. Now in certain countries at certain times the government has been in fact the personal servant of a small, closely united clique of the ruling class (e.g., bankers, railroad owners, big landlords or what not). But in large, industrially advanced nations, especially during the decline of capitalism, this is not ordinarily the case. To an increasing extent, of which Fascism is the most extreme example, the state tends to represent the interests of the big bourgeoisie as a whole, rather than the interests of any single group or clique of the bourgeoisie.

But to speak of "the big bourgeoisie as a whole" is ambiguous, since the bourgeoisie, like any other class, is composed of individual men. What this means, then, is that the state tends to represent the basic historical interests of the bourgeoisie—i.e., the maintenance of existing property relations—rather than the immediate interests (and conscious wills) of any individual capitalist or group of capitalists. This leads to somewhat surprising conclusions. Because of this rôle, which the state must play, the state may well be in conflict with the immediate interests and conscious wills (the conscious will, in the case of most individuals, is fixed on immediate interest) not merely of a minority of the bourgeoisie—which would be expected on any account—but even of a majority; in fact, theoretically, even of *all* individual members of the bourgeoisie taken as individuals. At the same time, historically, the state could nevertheless be serving the fundamental interests of "the bourgeoisie as a whole".

There is no assurance whatever that the interests and desires of a given capitalist at a given moment will correspond with the historical interests of his class. For example: it is rumored that Ford is soon to start mass production of a Diesel engine for automobiles. Whether or not true, it is clear that the economic dislocations this would cause, when done in Ford's "individualist" manner, might well be against the best interests of U. S. capitalism; whereas, granted the proper technical basis, it would certainly

ly be for the best interests of Ford. Again, it is obviously against the individual interests of *entrepreneurs* when their businesses are driven bankrupt by a trust; but it is often a necessary part of the development of capitalism as a whole.

More pertinently: The *x* steel company may rightly feel that it can handle its own labor problems by itself, with intra-company propaganda, spies, barbed wire, employee picnics, deputies and machine guns. But, since its management will reason primarily with reference to their own plants, they will underemphasize (a) the effect of such methods on labor elsewhere; (b) the problems of other industries; (c) the effect on their own workers of labor disputes not handled so "well" by other plants. Thus, the management of *x* company will oppose the Wagner Bill even though not only others but perhaps they themselves may, in the long run, need it.

There is no difficulty either in logic or in dialectics (which is, of course, never inconsistent with logic) in the possibility of such a situation—namely, where the interest of the whole differs from the summation of the interests of the parts. A coach in any sport knows the difference between a good team and a team made up of good players; and knows, too, that the interest of the team as such may be against the immediate interests even of every player in it.

Now, an able and healthy "government" is, in many respects, in the best position to estimate the historical interests of the dominant class as a whole. This is true because the government is not tied down to the viewpoint of any particular industry or group of industries; because, in the modern advanced nation, its activities put it into intimate contact with every industry, and, further, because it is composed of individuals skilled in the broad knowledge of social movements.

There are additional bases for conflict between the government and a majority of the bourgeoisie. Chief among them is the fact that the "state", as concretized in a given institutional set-up and a given personnel, though always the political instrument of class domination in the historical sense above outlined, is not a "pure" instrument, even in that sense. The government, instrument with respect to the dominant class, has yet a life of its own, has its own interests as well as, and at times in opposition to, the interests of its master. True enough, the peculiar interests of the government as such cannot come into *fundamental* conflict with the interests of the dominant class (that is why a workers' economy can be built only by a workers' state, taking power over the destruction of the old state), but the conflicts can be nevertheless genuine.

Modern governments are gigantic bureaucracies, comprising hundreds of thousands of individuals. These too have a voice and a will, and do not want to lose their salaries. Modern government is itself the largest of giant modern industries. And modern administrations, in democratic nations at any rate, must be elected in order that they and their followers shall remain in office. Moreover, unless it makes widespread and constant use of open force—and perhaps not even then—a government cannot continue long in power without holding the support or at least the sufferance of a substantial majority of the population.

These conditions define *special* problems and interests of the government in fulfilling its rôle within class society. These problems and interests are more immediate and therefore more conscious for the politicians than for the active capitalists; they occupy a place, for the politicians, above and in addition to the general problems of renewing prosperity and profits. The bourgeois politician has a complicated double task, with reference to the masses: he must first of all maintain the support or sufferance of the masses for capitalism; but, secondly, he must maintain it for himself and his followers as the approved political agents of capitalism. In both divisions of his task he may well run into conflict with the majority of the bourgeoisie. In the second, sources of conflict are sufficiently obvious: the politician will want government money

for his followers, the capitalist, "economy in government"; the politician will wish to reward *his* friends, whereas the given capitalist may have different friends; the politician will want to plan the order of his governmental acts to guarantee reelection, whereas this may interfere with the most desirable order from the standpoint of the capitalist; the politician may even wish to make a bid for a large bloc of votes (e.g., a large construction program or the TVA) when this directly injures the profits of certain capitalists.

But even in his first task, that of maintaining mass support or sufferance for capitalism, the politician may run into serious conflict with many or most capitalists—even, that is, when the politician is protecting the historical class interests of the capitalists. This results from the different perspective toward his class duty forced on the politician by his special tasks. The capitalist normally underestimates the rôle and importance of the masses; the politician must make the needed corrections. The typical capitalist accepts with regret the necessity for the politician. He chafes under the requirement of elaborate state machinery, expensive governmental apparatus, the time "wasted" in political machinations, the need to make occasional "concessions" to the politician or through him to the masses. The early capitalist ideal is a kind of political vacuum, where the search for profits can proceed "naturally", without "interference".

With increasing complaint, during the advance, maturity, and decline of capitalism, the capitalist sees the rôle of his politician become ever larger, and watches the monster state spread its dark wings over all the nooks and crannies of society. Unwillingly he accepts "governmental regulation", "public ownership", "federal control"; and, at the last, unwillingly indeed he turns to Fascism. For Fascism, historically required to uphold bourgeois society during the decline of capitalism, is nevertheless the grossest form of the conflict I have been studying. Fascism exacts material and moral sacrifices, often grievous ones, from all or almost all individual capitalists, in order to ensure the class domination of the capitalists as a whole. The fate of capitalist society is a dead end, forced upon even those who accept it, unwillingly adopted as a "judgment of history" by those who do not understand the historical process which enmeshes them.

The normal American capitalist, enjoying an upturn in profits, at present feels confident that he can handle his own workers, settle his own "labor troubles"; he is not worried over the troubles of others, and, since he is not running for office and is not trained in the ways of the masses, he underestimates such factors as "mass discontent". Why, thinks he, should we make concessions to labor when I can handle labor without concessions? Above all, why make concessions to the A. F. of L., which proves its impotence every day? No Labor Boards for me. I will defeat them by lobbying in Congress, with the help of my press; and, if that fails, I will disregard their findings, and smash them in the courts.

But his political servants, in these matters, are wiser than their master. Yes, they can agree, we will "handle labor", but what is a government for if not to handle labor in the most effective manner? If labor got the idea clearly that the state was its enemy, not its representative, where would we all be then? No, we will handle labor by tangling it up, ideologically as well as practically, in the state apparatus. And besides, we want to keep labor votes for 1936.

The A. F. of L.? True, its bureaucracy is "impotent" so far as the threats and thunderings go. But the A. F. of L. has also a membership, and the membership includes many fighting workers ready to struggle at the drop of a hat, if given the lead. What do you rugged individualists wish? Do you want us to discredit the A. F. of L. officials by refusing their "demands" and denying them a platform in Congress and the White House? If that happened, if we showed workers openly where the government stands with

respect to labor, what then would be left for the A. F. of L. membership but to repudiate the ways of their leaders and set out to gain their ends in direct class struggle? Reflect, gentlemen capitalists: How did we break the 1934 auto strike? the general textile strike? How have we been handling the threatened coal strike? No. Labor laws, government boards, arbitration committees, these too have their uses; and the National Guard is not always more effective. Section 7a is gone. For a time, then, the Wagner Bill must take its place. When the courts throw it out, or the workers become disillusioned by it, we will find an adequate substitute. Meanwhile, do not fear that its nominal provisions will be enforced. We will take care that it is used to break strikes, not to make them, that it transfers labor struggles from plant gates to arbitration boards or the courts, that it aids the A. F. of L. officials in their drive against militants. And in any case, you have your tear gas, your deputies, your injunctions, and always the National Guard in the background.

III.

In the January NEW INTERNATIONAL I pointed out that Roosevelt's task with his new Congress, the reverse of his task with his first Congress, was the complex one of acting in effect as a brake on Congress while at the same time continuing to give the appearance of liberal leadership and "social-mindedness". The Administration had to give the nation the form of a Leftward movement and the substance of reaction. Only so could *both* the economic *and* the political requirements of the situation be met. Roosevelt has performed his task with brilliance and with as much success as such a task could meet: his gradual loss of prestige could not have been prevented, since the gap between words and deeds must gradually become obvious, apparent in the "inconsistencies", "changes of mind", etc.—themselves no accidents but forced on him by the nature of his task—which the opposition now makes so much of. Roosevelt delayed the bonus in a bitter fight. In a rapid offensive he sabotaged social security plans by introducing his own pretense of a Social Security Bill—thereby retaining public "leadership" of the social security movement. He struck at relief, and more important, at wage standards, by the skillfully ballyhooed W.P.A. program. Then, after avoiding the rocks of all genuine or half-genuine "Left" legislation, he managed to regain at least part of his "Left" prestige by a series of clever moves during the last months of the session. His championing of the Wagner Bill, the Utilities Bill, the absurd Tax Bill, permits him to keep something of his standing as the bulwark against the Tories, the banks, the industrialists, the die-hards, and the courts; and provides him with campaign issues in plenty.

In this way Roosevelt seems to have headed off the Third party moves to his Left, forcing the liberals, Farmer-Laborites, Progressives, however unwillingly, to stay with him, and consolidating a reactionary opposition to his Right. This opposition he feels confident of defeating; and, unless a business upturn increases and broadens between now and November, 1936, he is justified in his confidence. It is a narrow tightrope he is walking, but for Roosevelt there is no other. There is a biting irony in the fact that on the same day (August 9) Roosevelt received his Social Security Bill, promising comfort to all, from Congress, and ordered relief cut off from the striking New York W.P.A. workers—the form and the substance again jarred each other. But, while the masses continue to believe that their choice is between Roosevelt and the reactionary opposition to his Right, he can still afford the contradiction.

In sustaining this belief the Wagner Bill plays its essential part. Roosevelt, so reads the Bill and so echo Green and Lewis, offers the workers full and free unionism. If the industrialists and courts smash the Bill, it is not Roosevelt who is to blame. Look at the record: he fights alongside, against the common enemy.

IV.

The Wagner Bill shows, more clearly than it has been shown before, how integral a part of bourgeois class domination the A. F. of L. bureaucracy has become. The relationship is mutual: the government is necessary to the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy is necessary to the (present form of) government. The governmental labor machinery and the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, operating integrally together, have become the chief means for preventing the development of independent working class activity and independent working class consciousness. This is what Roosevelt and Green understand, and what the majority of industrialists and bankers do not so clearly understand. The A. F. of L. bureaucracy maintains its prestige only with the help of its parliamentary and semi-parliamentary activities, with the help of governmental "favours" and "concessions"—sections 7a, Wagner Bills, Guffey Bills. But, equally, the government maintains its prestige with large sections of the working class only because the A. F. of L. lends the government a pseudo-labor covering. In the links of this interrelationship lie the dangers and possibilities for both sides.

If a break occurs between the government and the bureaucracy, for whatever reason, only one result is possible: the bureaucracy, having lost the liaison upon which its leadership depends, will lose its hold on its own rank and file (whether or not it loses nominal office), and the membership will go more and more directly to independent class business, breaking with increasing rapidity, in idea and in act, from class collaboration through the government. And, likewise, the government will be faced with a working class rapidly awakening to class consciousness under the spectacle of an openly hostile state. Since these results would follow from a break, we may conclude that, until the time for Fascism is much nearer, such a break is most unlikely, no matter what the provocation.

The objective rôle and function of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy in the present stage must be understood in this light.

The naïve conclusion is—a new Federation of Labor. If the A. F. of L. is as you say, then it is no good to the working class, is in fact a major enemy, and we should start a new Federation. But this naïve conclusion by no means necessarily follows, and certainly does not at the present time. It is not the A. F. of L. in the abstract, but its bureaucracy which is allied with the enemy, which is indeed in the front rank of the enemy's forces. The government needs the bureaucracy; but the bureaucracy can do no good to the government unless it has a rank and file. Therein lies the weakness from the point of view of the bureaucracy, the government, and the government's master: The bureaucracy cannot alienate its rank and file too widely, for it would thus prepare itself for the dust pile, being of no further use to the government. But, on the other hand, it *must* smother the upsurge of its rank and file, or else equally fail to serve the needs and purposes that lead the government to make use of it. In this way, the bureaucracy is caught in a squeeze pressed ever tighter by the progress of events: it is required both to keep control over its rank and file and to use that control to strangle class struggle. The deepening of the internal contradictions of American capitalism, however, poses a dilemma to the bureaucracy in carrying out this necessary double aim: to keep control, some apparent response must be made to the Leftward movement; but to use that control to smother struggle, more and more openly brutal and high-handed reactionary methods must be employed.

The interrelationship between the government and the bureaucracy, and the dilemma faced by the bureaucracy, far from being without possibilities, enables a conscious Left wing within the A. F. of L. to utilize the A. F. of L. structure for the broadest and most intense struggles, every one of which squeezes the bureaucracy tighter, undermining its position and its relations with the government. Such tactics exploit to the full what prestige the A.

F. of L. has and avoid the "illegality", both within and outside the labor movement, of operations by an independent Federation. The last two years have demonstrated in embryo the possibilities there are in this strategy; to reach maturity an organized Left wing, itself led by members of the revolutionary party, is required.

V.

From many points of view, the Wagner Bill, even if it is kept in the background or crushed in the courts upon its first application, is one of the two or three most important acts of legislation of the late Congress. It is so because it characterizes so exactly the present stage of the development of the Roosevelt Administration and of the opposition to it, and because it concerns so directly the working class—much more directly than, for example, the nebulous Social Security Act.

It is not necessary to examine at length its probable working out in practise. This is sufficiently obvious. The first attempt to invoke it to gain union recognition, majority rule, or any of the other "rights" which it nominally guarantees, will be blocked in the courts. The Bill may be sustained finally, by virtue of the clause restricting its application to industries engaged in interstate commerce—though thus greatly narrowed in even nominal range—but in any case it will be effectively prevented from doing any "protecting".

Meanwhile, Marxists must be vigilant with respect to it. An attitude of simple denunciation of the Bill as a strike-breaker is not sufficient, and would serve only to confuse union workers and to isolate the Marxists. It must be connected with the lessons of Section 7a, which might be summarized: Take anything it offers, but never depend on it; depend only on independent class activity. To the extent that this approach—an approach which says to the workers, in effect, "Act as if the 'rights' defined by the Wagner Bill were actually yours, but do not count on the Wagner Bill to get them for you", rather than the simple denunciation, is made clear, two great gains are possible. First, the Left wing can force a recruiting drive of large proportions during the Autumn and Winter, a drive which the bureaucracy, unpresured, will never undertake; and, second, the workers will learn in experience, in action, the real significance of the Bill itself, a lesson that abstract analysis will never effectively teach and which will be a decisive step toward the central lesson, the lesson in the nature of the state.

In this process Marxists must be on guard, naturally, against the dangers of the Bill. Two of these are familiar, though none the less dangerous on that account; the third is a comparatively new departure and particularly difficult for that reason.

First, the Bill will of course be used to remove labor disputes from open class struggle to arbitration boards and the courts. In this it will have the support of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, and this must be resisted at each step.

Second, the Wagner Bill is one more notch in the general preparation for compulsory arbitration. This must always be remembered.

Third, the new departure: A late amendment to the Bill authorizes the Board or Boards set up under its provisions to determine whether a craft, plant, concern, or industry shall be taken as the unit of collective bargaining. It is hardly necessary to point out the potential dangers of this amendment. It can readily be used to aid Green in resisting the developments toward industrial unionism. It can prevent the building of industry-wide unions. It can become a most effective wedge dividing the workers in different plants of the same concern from each other, thereby permitting what in actuality would be scab settlements in single plants, and reducing the effectiveness of union locals almost to that of company unions. The settlements of the lumber strike, though not invoking the Wagner Bill itself, employed some of these methods:

the agreements were made in each case with plant locals. This amendment and the principle which underlies it must be fought openly and vigorously from the start.

* * * *

The passing of the Wagner Bill was neither a victory for labor,

as Green hails it, nor a defeat, as the *Daily Worker* insists. Its significance depends on what is done with it. Properly utilized it can play its part in a notable advance.

John WEST

Who Defends Russia? Who Helps Hitler?

JAQUEMOTTE, the pathetic little leader of the Belgian Stalinists has asked Walter Dauge, leader of the Left wing of the Belgian socialist party, if he would "march" in the event of a Hitler attack on the Soviet Union. At one stroke the whole shallowness of this philistine mind is laid bare. What does "to march" mean in this connection? If Belgium, in alliance with France, advances on Germany—certainly not for reasons of democracy or of friendship for the Soviets but for purely imperialist purposes—and if Dauge is eligible for military service then he *must* march along. He will also have to march, however, should Belgium decide to adhere to an anti-Soviet war coalition. Should Belgium remain neutral Dauge will not be able to march. The very wise Jaquemotte and his followers and co-workers in France, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere, simply forget that it is not for the oppressed workers but for the oppressing bourgeoisie to decide when and under what circumstances the dogs of war shall be unleashed.

Vaillant-Couturier sought to settle this "small" point by advancing the thesis: "We are a realistic party, a government party." It is quite true that we are not anarchists. But it is necessary to make a distinction between a proletarian and an imperialist government. To become the government party in reality, it is necessary to overthrow the powers that be by revolutionary action and to organize our own Red army. Then and only then, will we be able to decide if, and for what purpose we shall "march". The Stalinist "theoreticians"—permit us to call them that—obscure more and more the main question of the conquest of power. More and more they place the defense of the Soviets in the hands of the deadly enemy of the working class—the national bourgeoisie. That is the betrayal in its final theoretical implications.

If we continue to push the class struggle in France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, etc., answer the Stalinists and their worshippers, we will weaken the allies that the Soviet Union has made and so harm the Soviet Union itself. Hitler will, as a result, be strengthened whether we like it or not. We cannot tell when the class struggle will lead to the conquest of power. Hitler, however, may have won his war before that time has come. Hitler as the ruler of Europe would delay or smash our fight altogether (in France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, etc.). To continue our class struggle activities, would actually strengthen Hitler.

This explanation—logical as it would like to be—is nothing else than a repetition of the arguments the imperialists and social-patriots (i.e., social-imperialists) always and invariably invoked against their revolutionary opponents. Was not Liebknecht a lackey of the Czar and Lenin an agent of the Hohenzollerns? And so forth without end.

You will remind me that there was no Soviet Union at that time and you are quite right. That fact proves only that the ideology of social patriotism existed *before* the October revolution and that the greatest historical events have produced no change in the specious shallowness of the social-patriots.

German social democrats—not only the mercenary scoundrels, but honest workers—said during the war: victory for the Czar means that his Cossacks would dissolve, devastate, destroy our party and our unions, papers, and halls. The average French worker likewise listened trustingly to the appeals of Renaudel, Cachin, etc.,

to keep the Republic and democracy out of the hands of the Kaiser and his Junkers. The Soviet state, on its side, did not fall from the heavens. It came into existence only because of action by the proletarian vanguard. To defend the Soviet Union—and rightly—we must defend the organizations of labor in capitalist lands. These two tasks are politically the same, in any event closely connected. It is our undeniable duty to defend the Soviet state *as it is* (with the theories of Doriot, Treint, etc., we have nothing in common), just as we defend *any* labor organization, though led by the worst reformists, against Fascism and military reaction. The whole question is however—*how and with what methods?*

Marxists say: Only with those means which we have at our disposal, which we can consciously utilize, that is, with the methods of the revolutionary class struggle in all belligerent countries. Whatever the fortunes of war, the revolutionary class struggle will, in the last analysis, yield the best results to the workers. This applies to the defense of labor organizations and of the democratic institutions of capitalist lands, no less than to the defense of the Soviet Union. Our methods remain basically the same. Under no circumstances or pretext can we transfer our revolutionary task into the hands of our national bourgeoisie.

All this—the wise Philistine retorts—may be very well "theoretically". But who will disagree that the carrying on of the class struggle in France will strengthen Hitler's position and will increase the possibility of a war outbreak and Hitler's chances of victory in such a war? And is not Fascist Germany the chief danger for the Soviets? And would not the defeat of the Soviet Union paralyze the development of the world revolution for years?

This argument—again a slavish repetition of the old arguments of Scheidemann, Wels, Vandervelde, De Man, Cachin and consorts—is false all the way through. Touched by the wand of Marxian criticism it falls to pieces.

Fascism is nothing else than the idea of the identity of interest of the classes, brought to its highest power and invested with mysticism. If the French, Belgian and Czech workers ally themselves with "their" bourgeoisie, the German workers are inevitably driven thereby to rally around the Nazis. Social-patriotism can only be water in the mill stream of racialism. To weaken Hitler, the fire of the class struggle must be set blazing. A mighty movement of the workers in any nation of Europe would do more to cripple racially insane militarism than all kinds of combinations between the powers and with the Soviet Union. Every alliance thus formed against Germany gives the race fanatics more ammunition and drives antagonistic imperialist states to Germany's side, especially since they are not concerned with democracy or the Soviet Union but with the notorious balance of power (Poland, Japan, England, etc.).

If the proletariat of those lands allied with the Soviet Union (for how long?) is to support its bourgeoisie in war, that political line must begin in time of peace. For before it can be hoped to prevent Hitler's victory, efforts must be made to ward off the war itself. This means support of the anti-Hitler imperialist powers in peace-time to sway the balance of power against him early enough. This, however, signifies nothing more or less than the complete abandonment of the class struggle. This was also the

purpose of the infamous declaration of Stalin. He approves, now, in peace-time, the military crimes of the French—naturally also of the Belgian and the Czechoslovakian—bourgeoisie. And how could it be otherwise?

If we are to do nothing to weaken the imperialist allies of the Soviet Union through the class struggle, that means naturally that we must strengthen the confidence of the people in their rule. What will we do then, when French, Belgian, Czechoslovakian militarism, buttressed by its own proletariat, turns, in the course of the war—a perfectly understandable and possible development—to direct their weapons against the Soviets? To delude ourselves with the idea that, in such a case, we can strongly oppose them, is madness. The great masses do not make such sharp turns. The power which we have helped militarism to gain, will not be so easily wished away. In such a case, we would have put ourselves into the position of being not only passive but active agents in the destruction of the Soviet Union.

The Stalinists hesitate, however, to draw the final conclusions from their premises. In order to maintain their status in at least a fake parliamentary opposition, they cry that there are Fascists among the army officers. Such an argument testifies only to the entire hollowness and stupidity of Stalinist social-patriotism. As far as the argument of utilizing the antagonisms between the imperialist powers goes, it is quite as feasible to play one group of Fascists against the other. As an ally of France, Mussolini now also becomes an ally of the Soviet Union. The contradiction between Germany and France is by no means that of democracy vs. Fascism, but rather that between a hungry and a sated imperialism. This contradiction will remain, even should France become Fascist itself.

The readiness of the Communist party of France to vote for the imperialist army if only it is "cleansed" of Fascist elements, proves that they, no more than Blum, have any concern about the Soviet Union, but that their only worry is about French "democracy". They have set themselves a lofty goal—to implant pure democracy in the officer corps of the Versailles army (Versailles—in the sense of the Commune as well as of the Versailles peace). How? Through a government of Daladier. "*Les Soviets partout!*" "*Daladier au pouvoir!*" [Soviets everywhere! Daladier to power!] Why however did the great democrat Daladier who was War Minister for two years (1932-34) do nothing to purge the army of Fascists, Bonapartists and royalists? Could it be because Daladier had not at that time been purified in the magic waters of the People's Front? Could perhaps *l'Humanité*, with its depths of profound wisdom and honesty, clarify this riddle for us? Could it also answer: why did Daladier capitulate at the first sign of pressure from the forces of armed reaction in February 1934? May we answer for them? It is because the Radical Socialist party is the most wretched, cowardly and servile of all the parties of finance capital. It is only necessary for Messrs. de Wendel, Schneider, Rothschild, Mercier and company to put their foot down. The Radicals will *always* bend the knee. Herriot first, then just a little later, Daladier.

Let us assume that the People's Front should come to power and as a demonstration (that is, for purposes of duping the masses) should succeed in ousting some second-rank reactionaries from the army and should dissolve (on paper) some of the organized bandit gangs. What, fundamentally, would be changed? The army—then as now—would remain the chief imperialist weapon. The general staff of the army would continue to be the staff of the military conspiracy against the toilers. In war-time the most reactionary, determined and most ruthless elements in the officer corps would gain the upper hand. The Italian and German examples show that imperialist war is an excellent school of Fascism for army officers.

Further, what of those lands whose position toward the U.S.S.R. is not yet known, whose war stand is still a secret? The British labor and trade union movement is already paralyzing the fight against its own imperialists on the ground that Great Britain *may* be forced to come to the defense of the Soviet Union. These political jugglers naturally refer to Stalin, not only successfully but properly. If the French Stalinists can promise "to control" the foreign policy of their own imperialists, the British laborites can play the same game. And what is the Polish proletariat to do? The Polish bourgeoisie is bound to France by an *alliance* and entertains the closest *friendship* to Germany.

Whatever the pretext may be, civil peace (*union sacré*) always means the basest servility of the socialists to imperialism, just at the time when it is performing its bloodiest and most horrible work. The last war showed the results of patriotic belly-crawling. The leaders of the social democracy came out of the school of "civil peace" completely crushed, politically annihilated, without faith or courage, honor or conscience. The workers of Germany had seized power after the war. But the leaders of the social democracy gave the power back to the generals and the capitalists. Had the leaders of French labor not come out of the war as wretched political invalids, France would today be a land of socialism.

The civil peace of 1914-1918 did not merely sentence the people of the world to unheard-of sacrifices and burdens. It gave a rotting capitalism a new lease on life for decades. The civil peace of 1914-1918 in the interests of "one's own nation" only prepared the new imperialist war which threatens the complete extermination of the nations. Under whatever slogans the social-patriots may prepare for a new "civil peace" ("Defense of the Fatherland", "defense of democracy", "defense of the U.S.S.R.") the result of this new betrayal will be the collapse of all modern culture.

* * * *

Naturally, the Soviet bureaucracy wants to defend the U.S.S.R., as well as to build socialism. This it wishes to do, however, after its own fashion, which is in gross contradiction to the interests of the international and thereby also of the Russian proletariat. This bureaucracy does not believe in the international revolution. It sees only the dangers, difficulties and drawbacks, not the tremendous possibilities. Nor have Stalin's miserable yes-men in France, Belgium, and the whole world, one bit of faith in themselves or in their parties. They do not regard themselves—and rightly so—as the leaders of the rebellious masses, but only as the agents of Soviet diplomacy, before the forum of these masses. With this diplomacy, they stand or fall.

The Comintern bureaucracy is, therefore, organically incapable of opposing the bourgeois patriots in time of war. That is why cowardly wretches like Cachin, Jaquemotte, Gottwald, cling to every miserable excuse to hide their capitulation to the unleashed floods of patriotic "public opinion". Such a pretext—a pretext, not a reason—they find in "defense of the Soviet Union". Doriot is of the same political physiognomy as Cachin and Duclos—a product of the same school. It is interesting to see, therefore, how easily he breaks with the idea of the defense of the Soviets and substitutes for it "understanding with Hitler". It should be clear to every St. Denis youngster that an understanding between the French bourgeoisie and Hitler must be directed against the Soviet Union. Such a gentleman has only to dump the Stalinist bureaucrats overboard immediately to turn his back on the U.S.S.R. These politicians lack only the minor matter of a backbone. Crawling on their bellies before the Stalin clique was only training for their obeisance before their own bourgeoisie.

With that amazing lack of decency that characterizes them, these people turn promptly to the attack on the revolutionary internationalists and accuse us—of supporting Hitler. They forget that

Hitler can be conquered only by the German working class, at present unorganized and crushed by the crimes of the Second and the Third Internationals. But it will rise again. To help it to its feet again, to invigorate it, the international revolutionary movement, especially in France, must be developed.

Every patriotic declaration of Blum, Zyromski, Thorez, etc., is new grist for racial theory (nationalism) and, in the last analysis, aids Hitler. The uncompromising Marxian, Bolshevik line of the world proletariat—in peace as in war—will scuttle the race fanatics, for it will prove in action that the fate of mankind is determined by the struggle of the classes and not of the nations. Is it really necessary to prove this? The Third International—walking in the footsteps of the Second—has finally sidetracked the class struggle for the “general” offensive against Hitler. Hitlerism has only been helped by this retreat. Undeniable facts and figures prove it: the growth of National Socialism in Austria, the Saar plebiscite, the elections in Bohemia (German Czechoslovakia). To fight Fascism with nationalist weapons is but to throw oil on the flames. The first real success for the forces of proletarian revolution in France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia or any land, will sound in the ears of Hitler like the tolling of the death bell. This A B C must be understood by anyone who wishes to deal with the problems of socialism.

What the result of war may be—should the weakness of labor permit its outbreak—we cannot say in advance. The fronts will shift, national boundaries will be shattered. At the present stage of development of aviation, all borders will be violated, all na-

tional territories will be laid waste. Only the most outspoken reactionary (who often goes by the name socialist or even communist) can, under these conditions, call upon labor to join with “its” bourgeoisie in defense of “its” frontiers. The real task of the workers is to use the war difficulties of the bourgeoisie in order to overthrow it, abolish national boundaries which stifle industry and culture.

The bourgeoisie is strongest in the first period of the war. But with every month of warfare, its strength diminishes. Labor’s vanguard, on the other hand, if it has taken care to maintain its independence from the patriotic jackals, will grow firmer and stronger not only every day but every hour. In the last analysis, the fate of the war is not determined on the military front, as much as by the relationships of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Only the victorious revolution can mend the cares, the woes and the disturbances of war. Not only Fascism, but imperialism will thus receive its death-blow. Not only the external foes of the Soviet Union will thereby be defeated but the internal contradictions, which engender the barbarous dictatorship of the Stalin clique, will be overcome. The proletarian dictatorship will unite our dismembered, bloodless continent, will rescue a culture threatened with ruin, will establish the Soviet United States of Europe. It will penetrate America and bring into motion the oppressed masses of the East. All mankind will be brought together into a socialist society and a harmonious culture.

L. T.

July 29, 1935

U. S. Capitalism: National or International?

A Critique of Lewis Corey’s “The Decline of American Capitalism”

IN THE COURSE of its development every class creates a view of the historical process corresponding to its own fundamental interests, a world outlook which does not remain constant but changes in accordance with the development of the class itself. This can be clearly seen in the careers of the two great classes of modern society, the capitalist and the working classes.

As soon as the bourgeoisie has attained a consciousness of its aims and begins to struggle for political power, historians spring up within the nation and take the field in its behalf. These historians are important agents in awakening bourgeois class consciousness and stimulating national pride in the lower classes who follow the lead of the bourgeoisie and share its prejudices. Wherever the bourgeoisie has consolidated its power, this school of nationalist historians become the celebrators of its achievements and official spokesmen for its régime. Thus the most popular of contemporary American historians, James Truslow Adams, author of *The Epic of America*, voices in every essential respect the viewpoint of the capitalist masters of the United States.

Consciously or unconsciously, the bourgeois historians limit their horizon to the classic framework of bourgeois rule, the national state. They adopt an internationalist point of view only incidentally and occasionally, in the same abstract fashion and with the same obscuring of the real state of affairs, as a bourgeois politician advocates entry into the League of Nations. This school of historians seeks an understanding of their national history, not in its development as an integral and subordinate part of a world-wide social system, which is governed by its own general laws of development, but somewhere within the sacred body of the nation itself, in its political institutions, laws, racial composition, material resources, or in an ensemble of these elements called “the national spirit”. They regard the national state not as a transient form of

social organization, the product of a particular social order, but as the inevitable and final form of human society. In their investigations these scholars treat the nation as an independent organism, bearing within itself the forces of its own development and having only casual relations with the outside world.

In the eyes of these historians their own nation has not only an exceptional character but a special destiny or mission, which fundamentally distinguishes it from all other nations. Whatever the particular character of this mission, which has ranged from the conversion of the infidels to Christianity in the early days of capitalism to the bringing of “civilization” to backward colonial peoples in the imperialist fashion of Mussolini, it will be found to coincide in content with the material interests of some section of the ruling class.

Frederick Jackson Turner, the author of *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, was the father of the present school of nationalist historians in the United States, a school which includes among its ideological precursors Hegel and Lamprecht in Germany, Taine in France, and Macaulay in England. Although Turner himself had the mind of a petty bourgeois of the period of capitalist expansion, his ideas have been taken over and are used today as protective coloration by the big bourgeoisie. Today the Turner school reigns in the universities, the schools and the popular press. Its ideas have seeped into the minds of the American people through a thousand different channels. Our two historian-presidents shared Turner’s ideas. Woodrow Wilson was Turner’s close friend and avowed disciple; Theodore Roosevelt’s *Winning of the West* was a contribution to the Turner-esque history of the frontier. So pervasive has Turner’s influence been upon the present generation of historians that Benjamin Stolberg has denominated the American Historical Society a “Turnerverein”.

To Turner the United States is originally and essentially a nation of pioneers, and a pioneer among nations, the standard-bearer of progress in Western civilization. His philosophy of American history rests upon two main conceptions, the frontier and the section. These two categories account for all the peculiarities of American life from the character of its people to the character of its conflicts. Although the frontier is a cause of the distinctive character of American development only until its disappearance at the end of the nineteenth century, while the section continues to shape our national life thereafter, the frontier remains the key concept of the Turnerites.

The frontier is an extremely vague and confused category, which Turner himself never clearly defined. Theoretically, it covers a diversity of economic relations; historically, it included numerous different forms of civilization. In the main, when the Turnerites speak of the frontier, they have in mind a society of independent and democratic freehold farmers, such as existed in many Middle-Western states during the last century.

The Turnerites, however, fail to analyze or to understand the economic character of this pioneer agricultural society, or the economic causes of the westward movement of the frontier. In the first place, the frontier was not simply the expanding edge of American capitalism; *it was one of the primary factors in the expansion of world capitalism.* In the second place, *more than any other agriculture the world has ever seen, American agriculture has been a commercial capitalist agriculture.*

When the frontier "moved forward", that meant that agriculture was expanding in response to the pressure of the world market. From the days of the first tobacco plantations in Virginia and Maryland until the present century commercial agriculture has played the leading rôle in the development of American economy and has been the principal source of its peculiar social, political and economic traits. It is impossible to explain the development of American society without a correct appraisal of the economic character and function of American agriculture on both a national and international scale.

The Turner school is materialistic in so far as it recognizes that the unique qualities of American civilization have a material origin and basis in the conditions along the frontier. But they do not understand the economic character of these conditions, since their materialism is not historical-economic but territorial. Even this half-hearted materialism is discarded for an idealistic standpoint when they come to consider latter-day America. Turner quite correctly holds that (bourgeois) democracy in the United States had its economic basis in cheap land and its social support in the small farming class. But what becomes of such democracy when the free land is gone and the farmers fall under the domination of industrial and financial capital? Turner's only answer was to exhort his countrymen to remain true to the democratic ideals of their pioneer forbears in the same futile manner as the earlier school of New England historians begged their contemporaries to adhere to the faith of the Puritan fathers.

At the opposite pole to the bourgeois historians are the Marxists, who place themselves at the standpoint of the international working class. They realize that American history and world history are inseparable in actuality, although they may be considered separately in thought. American society is the offspring of European society, economically, politically, and culturally; it has never been isolated or independent from Europe.

This does not mean that the Marxists deny or ignore the peculiarities of American development. These indubitably exist and it is the task of the historian to explain them. But how? Bourgeois historians seek their explanations in the nation alone and its unique character. Marxists on the other hand locate them in the world historical process of which American history is a component part*.

Between the bourgeois nationalists and the Marxist historians

stands a third grouping which we may call the liberal school. This school, which reflects the ideas of the middle classes, attempts to combine eclectically the viewpoints of the two chief historical tendencies. As might be expected from the variegated nature of the middle classes, the representative productions of this school exhibit the most diverse qualities. On many questions it is difficult to distinguish any differences between them and their bourgeois-nationalist brethren. On the other hand, the best of the liberal historians frequently approximate the Marxian position in their historical analyses.

Charles Beard is the acknowledged leader of the liberal school, and his book, *The Rise of American Civilization* is the greatest American historical work of our time. These liberal historians often adopt a materialist point of view. The chapters on the Civil War in *The Rise of American Civilization*, which are the high water mark of American historiography, constitute almost a complete Marxian analysis. But these liberal historians recognize the reality of class antagonisms only in the past, over their shoulders. Even James Truslow Adams had a keen eye for the workings of the class struggle in his excellent earlier books on revolutionary New England. But their vision dims as they approach the present, and, like the other bourgeois historians, they ultimately take refuge in an idealistic point of view. Thus Beard puts individual ideas on the same plane as class interests, and has recently, quite logically, written two big books, embodying his ideas of what "the national interest" should be and recommending his program to the political representatives of the ruling class. Since his ideas flagrantly contradict the interests of that class, we may rest assured that, although President Roosevelt has read them with interest, they will not be put into practise.

Out of the Left wing of the liberal school there has recently emerged a new group of young historians, who are endeavoring to pass beyond the limitations of the bourgeois historians and to assimilate the Marxian method. They inaugurated their theoretical work by attacking and criticizing the prevailing ideas of the Turner and Beard schools, but they have not yet had time to rid themselves completely of the preconceptions inherited from their old teachers. When this necessary stage of mental moulting is over, there should be many full-fledged Marxists among them. The ablest of these younger historians is Louis Hacker and his remarkable pamphlet, *The Farmer Is Doomed*, is its finest production to date.

Unfortunately, the United States has not yet given birth to a school of Marxian scholars and historians whose work is at all comparable to that of the bourgeois historians. We have only the scanty, isolated productions of an A. M. Simons, DeLeon, Schlüter, etc. The backwardness of the American labor movement (one of the most important of its peculiarities from the standpoint of revolutionary strategy!) is reflected in the ideological, as well as the political, sphere.

Recently, however, under the influence of the same general social causes that are removing the backwardness of the American working class and educating it politically, Marxian works are beginning to appear which herald the approach of a renaissance of Marxian scholarship in the New World. Such a work is Lewis Corey's *The Decline of American Capitalism*. It is an interesting commentary on the theoretical backwardness of the American labor movement, that, whereas Lenin's work on *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* appeared in the youth of Russian capitalism, the first extended survey of the evolution of American capitalism

*"It is false that world economy is simply a sum of similar national parts. It is false that the specific features are 'merely supplementary' to the general features, like warts on the face. In reality, national peculiarities

are a unique combination of the basic features of the world process." (Leon Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution*, p. xi, preface to the American ed. The entire work is a classical discussion of the question.)

was not written until the colossus of capitalism had already passed its prime. The very title suggests its belated appearance.

Corey's book is an important addition to the treasury of Marxian literature and merits the closest critical study from every thinking revolutionist. It is the first comprehensive treatment of the development of American capitalism, particularly in its later stages. In scope, it towers above the other productions of American Marxists like a giant sequoia. It is especially valuable for its graphic and statistical demonstrations of the general laws of Marxian political economy as they have actually worked themselves out in the course of American capitalism.

We do not propose to discuss the many merits of Corey's book in this article. These have already been pointed out in the November 1934 issue of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL* and the reader will discover them for himself in its pages. We wish rather to consider some serious errors in Corey's theory of the development of capitalism, and of American capitalism in particular, and to show how Corey's mistaken conceptions lead him into error and confusion when he comes to deal with the most important problem in the development of American capitalism, the question of imperialism.

These errors spring from two different but closely related sources. In the first place, Corey takes a wrong methodological approach to the subject, abandoning the international standpoint of Marxism for a "nationalist" point of view. In the second place, his mind retains residues of some incomplete and erroneous notions popularized by Turner. While Corey recognizes the inadequacy of these ideas, he inclines to return to them, whenever he is confronted by a particular difficulty in the development of American capitalism. This can be seen in his reliance upon "the frontier", that philosopher's stone of the Turner school, in order to explain the specific peculiarities of nineteenth century American capitalism.

Corey's Theory of Capitalist Development

Corey's theory of capitalist development is weakened in essentials by a false dichotomy between the "inner" and "outer" forces of capitalist expansion. This distinction is untenable. It is theoretically impermissible to take the boundaries of the national state as the limits of the productive forces of capitalist economy. The national state is the political instrument of bourgeois rule, not its exclusive economic basis. According to Marx, "the expansion of foreign trade, which is the basis of the capitalist mode of production in its stages of infancy, has become its own product in the further progress of capitalist development through its innate necessities, through its need of an ever-expanding market". (*Capital*, Vol. III, p. 278.) In other words, capitalism had an international foundation from its very beginning. From their first appearance and in all the subsequent stages of their development, the economic forces of capitalism transcend local and national boundary lines.

This is apparent the moment we consider the history of English capitalism, not to speak of the other continental countries whose economy assumed an international cast in proportion as capitalism made inroads upon feudal society. English commercial capitalism rested upon the colonial system, which was not only world-wide in extent but was established only as the result of a long series of commercial wars with other European powers, fought all over the globe. The dependence of English industrial capitalism upon the world market is too obvious to dwell on.

It is too often forgotten that commercial and industrial capitalism were, no less than the present monopoly capitalism, international in scope. Monopoly capitalism, of course, binds the world together more tightly in imperialist chains. One of the great differences between the earlier forms of capitalism and monopoly capitalism lies in the superior mechanisms of exploitation developed by the latter. Although this difference is of extreme importance, it should not obscure the fact that capitalism, from its very beginnings, is an international form of economy. The transition

from feudalism to capitalism was made possible only through the development of commercial capitalism: i.e., the creation of the world market.

The distinction between the "inner" and the "outer" forces of expansion has an important function to perform in Corey's account of American capitalist development. It opens the door to a theory of American exceptionalism. While the European nations were compelled to turn early in their history to "the outer long-time factors of expansion", American capitalism, according to Corey, pursued a different course and developed on a different basis. Thanks to its rich natural resources and vast continental areas, American capitalism had a relatively autonomous and self-contained character in the early stages of its development, and did not have to acquire an international foundation and join the main stream of capitalist development, until it had reached the stage of monopoly capitalism.

As a matter of historical fact, the truth lies in the opposite direction. From its origins American economy has either been capitalist in character, or an outlying part of capitalist economy. American capitalism, no less than European capitalism, had an international foundation throughout all the stages of its evolution. It is fundamentally wrong to regard it as economically independent or self-sustaining.

Let us take a look at colonial economy. "From the huge agricultural area already occupied in 1765 flowed annually an immense stream of produce. All the sections save New England raised more provisions than they could consume. The middle colonies sent to port towns for shipment mountains of corn, flour, salt pork, flax, hemp, furs and peas, as well as live stock, lumber, shingles, barrel staves, and houses all shaped for immediate erection. Maryland and Virginia furnished the great staple, tobacco, the mainstay of their economic life—an article for which the planters had a steady demand unhampered by competition. . . . North Carolina offered farm produce and some tobacco in the market, but paid its London bills mainly in tar, pitch, and turpentine. South Carolina and Georgia furnished rice, shingles, bacon, and salt beef to the Atlantic and Mediterranean trade, and later added indigo to their profitable staples." (Charles and Mary Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, pp. 89-90.) New England ships carried fish and lumber to England, Spain, and Italy; went whaling through the seven seas to get oil and candles for Europe; sailed to Africa and the West Indies in the slave, rum, and molasses trade; and competed with French and English bottoms for the lion's share of the carrying trade in all the principal ports of the western world. One single fact will illumine the colonial scene. As early as 1740, taxes in the colonies were no longer paid in kind (produce) but in money, i.e., there existed a money economy based on production for the international market.

Let us view the matter from another angle. While it is true that America possessed richer natural resources than Europe, it lacked the most important of all productive forces—and the indispensable element of capitalist production—a supply of living labor power. Labor had to be imported from Europe by immigration or indenture, or from Africa through the slave trade, before this natural wealth could be exploited. This fact alone disproves any theory, like Corey's, which makes the early development of American economy depend primarily on its internal natural resources.

The dependence of American economy upon the world market increased, rather than diminished, after the colonies had achieved political independence from England (incidentally, only by means of the decisive intervention of French money and French arms). The whole development of American economy from the War of 1812 to the Civil War was largely a product of European large-scale industry, and of English industry in particular. That agriculture was the predominant part of American economy during this period

should blind no one to the fact that this agricultural industry was not the subsistence farming of isolated pioneers, but was in the main a capitalist cash-crop production. The principal crops, cotton in the South and foodstuffs from the West, were shipped not only to the North but to Europe to provide raw materials for its textile mills and food for its laboring population.

The main features of American economy during this period were shaped, not simply by the richness and diversity of the resources to be found upon the continent, but by the demands imposed upon these internal economic factors by the world market, and above all by the more highly developed countries across the Atlantic. Europe was the sun, America the earth, of the capitalist system. The orbit of American economy was fundamentally determined by the attraction exerted upon it by the economic mass of Europe. American agriculture and industry grew, not only because of the richness of the earth, but according to the amount of energy radiated from the solar center of the capitalist system. The direction and the degree of development of the productive forces within America were determined by the economic needs of the parent body.

The fountainhead of Corey's errors is his habit of treating the development of American capitalism, not as an integral part of the evolution of world capitalism, but separate and apart from it. He first abstracts American economy and its main attributes from world economy and then views it as an isolated, self-contained entity, evolving according to a preconceived pattern, for the most part out of its inner forces alone, until these inner forces were exhausted. For Corey, world economic forces play a decisive rôle in American economy only in its imperialist stage.

This "nationalist" point of view is maintained throughout the work and is the underlying tendency of its thought. The organic connections between American and world economy are touched upon as an afterthought and in the most eclectic and abstract fashion. In Corey's survey of the major aspects of capitalist development in the United States from the Civil War to the World War (Chap. II), for example, he hardly casts a glance at world economic conditions. The national and international processes of capitalist development are considered separately and apart from each other, as though they were parallel, and not interpenetrating processes.

One of his few extended references to the part played by foreign trade in the expansion of American economy (contained, significantly enough, merely in a *footnote* on p. 278) confirms this judgment.

"It must not be assumed that foreign trade was not an important factor in American economic development. It was. The United States, *in spite of its peculiarities* [italics ours], was inseparably bound up with the world market. Agriculture exported its surplus to Europe, without which its expansion would have been limited. Capital, raw materials, and manufactures were imported, accelerating industrial development. After the 1870's, the American scale of production was enlarged by an increasing cultivation of export markets, particularly for textiles, meats, boots and shoes, petroleum, and metal products, including agriculture machinery."

In the first place, it must be observed that foreign trade was far more than "an important factor" in American economic development. It was the *decisive* factor. In the second place, although Corey *abstractly* recognizes the inseparable connection between American economy and the world market, he does not grasp the effects of this on America's *concrete* peculiarities. For him these evidently originated and existed apart from the world market.

In reality, the special peculiarities of American capitalism were a product of the given constellation of economic forces constituting the world market, in which the economic forces of the United States were throughout this period a subordinate factor. American capitalism has always been an organic part of world capitalism.

The peculiarities of its economic development were not spontaneously generated from within itself alone, but were the outcome of the interactions between the intra-national and the international productive forces and relations. This we hope to make clear when we consider the peculiarities of American imperialism.

Corey's Theory of the Development of American Imperialism

We shall not linger over Corey's general theory of imperialism, except to observe, in passing, that it shares the same defects, since it is based upon the same false antitheses, as his general theory of capitalist development. Instead, we shall pass on directly to the concrete application of his theory in the case of American imperialism, where he is led astray by his false methodological approach.

According to Corey, there have been two distinct phases in the evolution of American imperialism, an earlier and a later, an inner and an outer. The first or "inner imperialist" stage was concentrated within the borders of the United States. The economic relations between the more highly developed Northeastern section and the inner continental areas reproduced *within* the United States the relations of exploitation that existed *between* the European nations and the colonial countries. The industrial and financial region (!) exported goods and capital to the frontier in the same way and with the same results as the highly industrial nations exported goods and capital to the colonial regions. "The inner continental areas were the American equivalent of Europe's overseas markets." (P. 278.) Corey develops the parallel to the point of identifying the relative economic decline of New England agriculture and textile industry with similar phenomena in imperialist England.

Upon examination, Corey's evidences for the existence of an "inner imperialism" in the United States turn out either to be unfounded, or to be nothing else than the "normal" conditions and consequences of capitalist development under assumed names. In both cases, the peculiar characteristics of imperialism are conspicuously absent.

Just as there have been two stages of "imperialism", so, Corey informs us, there have been two stages of "colonialism" within the United States, an earlier phase from 1820 to 1850 and a later phase from 1860 to 1890. In the first colonial period the "East" exploited the "West" commercially by exporting settlers and manufactures in exchange for foodstuffs and raw materials. But where are the specific characteristics of imperialism in such normal capitalist relations? If Corey is looking for "imperialists" before the Civil War, he will find them, not in the Northeast, but among the slave-owners of the South, who instigated the war of 1812 with England and the war of 1845 with Mexico *against* the violent protests of the Northern capitalists.

Corey is hopelessly at sea by the time he reaches the second stage of "colonialism". Here he also finds that the major colonial relation was the exploitation of the agricultural West by the capitalist East. Betrayed again by his fatal theory, he speaks of the struggle between the Western farmers and the Eastern capitalists as a sectional struggle, or as a struggle between agriculture and industry, instead of as a class struggle. Yet, elsewhere in his book, he specifically states that the so-called struggles between the East and West, and the North and South, were fundamentally class struggles.

As additional proof of the "inner" imperialist character of American capitalism after the Civil War, Corey cites the exploitation of immigrant and Negro labor by monopoly capital. But surely, the exploitation of the proletariat by industrial capital, no less than the exploitation of the lower orders of the bourgeoisie by their capitalist superiors, is a general characteristic of capitalism, and cannot be considered the distinctive mark of its imperialist stage.

The whole fabric of Corey's theories of "inner colonialism" and "inner imperialism" is woven from such superficial and misleading

analogies, which serve only to conceal the genuine differences between disparate phenomena and different stages of capitalist development. The common traits which Corey discerns, for example, in the economic decline of New England and old England are the results of the same general processes of capitalist development. But there their resemblances end and their all-important differences begin. They cannot be considered identical in kind, as the results of two forms of "imperialism", without causing the greatest confusion. The lion and the mouse are both products of biological evolution and members of the animal kingdom. But what would we say of a biologist who contended that the mouse belonged to the same species as the lion?

Nothing is gained by quarreling over words. No one can deny Corey his right to use the word "imperialism" to denote two different kinds of phenomena. But Marxism also has its rights, in this particular case the right of priority. When a specific term is stretched to include its opposite within its own meaning, it is useless for scientific purposes. The terms "colonialism" and "imperialism" have precise and scientifically restricted meanings in the vocabulary of scientific socialism. Instead of limiting himself to those single clear concrete meanings, Corey uses them in a double sense. This abuse of the established terminology introduces the utmost confusion into the subject under investigation.

It is not difficult to understand why Corey violates the customary terminology of Marxism and invents a new species of "inner imperialism". He is genuinely puzzled by an important peculiarity of American imperialism. Monopolies took possession of American economy more rapidly and to a greater extent than in any other capitalist country. Nevertheless, the United States did not pursue an aggressively imperialist policy until the end of the nineteenth century, and did not join the front rank of imperialist nations until the World War. How shall we explain this apparent contradiction between the domestic development of American capitalism and its foreign policy? Why did the United States enter the imperialist arena so much later than the European powers?

Corey answers the problem in the following manner. "American imperialism lagged behind the European . . . [because of] an inner imperialism, or in other words to conditions whose economics resembled that of the export of capital." (P. 421.) The great opportunities for exploitation and the high rate of profit obtainable within the United States absorbed surplus American capital and made its export unnecessary. As soon as "the short-time internal factors" began to be exhausted, American capitalists were compelled to turn, like their European rivals, to "the long-time outer factors" beyond their borders. At this point, the sham phase of American imperialism dissolved and the real era of American imperialism began. "The real outer imperialism was only emergent at a time, when, from the 1880's to 1910, it was being consolidated in the economy of the highly industrial nations of Europe." (P. 422.)

What has Corey done here? Troubled by the fact that the United States, despite the predominance of monopoly capitalism, trailed far behind the European nations in its imperialist policy, he attempts to cover up the contradiction by giving the United States an imperialist uniform, too. Unable, however, to outfit it in full imperialist regalia, he clothes it in a juvenile imitation, made of homespun, which it soon outgrew and discarded. Corey, himself, should discard it along with his other analogies. It is both false and unnecessary, and serves only to obscure the real processes of the economic and political development of American imperialism.

Although Corey's answer is unsatisfactory, the problem is a real one and demands an answer. The answer can be obtained in only one way. Not by relying upon analogies derived from some general scheme of imperialist development, but by a concrete analysis of the peculiar conditions of American capitalist development.

The Delayed Development of American Imperialism

The United States entered upon its imperialist career later than the European powers because industrial capitalism held the center of the stage much longer here than in England, France or Germany. Although the concentration of industry began relatively earlier and proceeded at a more rapid rate in the United States than in Europe, and trustification was more highly developed, finance capital did not begin to shoulder aside industrial capital in the sphere of monopolized industry until the close of the century, and did not completely control the strategic centers of national economy and the state until the World War. Since imperialist policies are an outgrowth of the domination of finance capital, the key to the relatively slow development of American imperialism is to be found in the late blooming of finance capital.

We need hardly go outside the pages of Corey's book to collect the evidence for this thesis. Corey himself informs us that: "In the United States, before 1898, trustification was primarily industrial concentration, under control of industrial capitalists; after 1898, trustification was primarily financial combination under control of financial capitalists, promoters, and bankers." (P. 374.) "The 1860's-1890's was the epoch of the industrial capitalist, who participated directly in production. . . . By 1900, the industrial capitalist was swiftly receding into the limbo of small-scale industry, or was becoming a financial capitalist, with interests in a multitude of enterprises, promoting, speculating, financing, *not* engaged directly in production." (P. 360-361.)

Industry, then, was trustified after the Civil War under the supervision of industrial, rather than financial, capital. The giant monopolies of the period, Standard Oil, Carnegie Steel, Armour & Co., the American Sugar Refining Co., were organized and controlled by industrial capitalists like Rockefeller, Carnegie, Armour and Havemeyer, and the new capital poured into them came from reinvested profits or from foreign capital directly invested in the industry, rather than from the flotation of bond and stock issues by banks and investment houses. The outstanding exception to this rule was the railroads, because of their greater capital requirements.

Finance capital began to supersede industrial capital and take the initiative in forming monopolies about the beginning of the century. The organization of the Steel Trust in 1900 by the House of Morgan was the first large-scale operation in this field by finance capital. When Carnegie, the ironmaster, sold his steel companies to the banking syndicate headed by Morgan and retired to his philanthropies, he symbolized the retreat of the industrial capitalist before the invasion of the financier. It is equally significant that Carnegie was, politically, an outspoken anti-imperialist and one of the chief financial backers of the Anti-Imperialist League, which organized the opposition to the Republican imperialist policies—until the Morgan partners forced him to withdraw by pointing out that such propaganda was jeopardizing McKinley's reelection and the tariff essential to the Steel Trust.

While Morgan and Company were preparing to launch the Steel Trust in 1899, they floated the first important foreign loan issued in this country, the bonds of the Mexican Republic. This was followed two years later by a fifty-million dollar loan to Great Britain to help pay the costs of the Boer War, the father of the Morgan war-loans to England that helped suck the United States into the World War.

But although financial capital began to get a foothold before the World War, it did not become the absolute governor of American economic and political life until the war. The transformation of American capitalism from the commercial-industrial (colonial) stage to the industrial-financial (imperialist) stage was accomplished in two separate steps. The period from the Civil War to the turn of the century completed the transfer of American econ-

omy from a predominantly agricultural to an industrial basis. The period preceding the World War marked the beginning of its transformation from an industrial capitalist into a financial capitalist, imperialist nation.

Economically speaking, the United States did not shed all its colonial characteristics until the World War. It was a debtor nation and imported tremendous quantities of capital from Europe. Throughout the nineteenth century foreign capital poured in an unending stream into the United States and was one of the most potent factors in its rapid economic development. Canals and railroads, extractive and manufacturing industries, Southern plantations and Western ranches as big as baronial domains sprang into being at the touch of the magic wand of foreign capital, and English capital in particular. The New York money market was but a satellite of the London and continental money markets.

Before the World War the United States was an industrial rather than a financial competitor of the European powers. This can be seen in the comparatively small part played by American capital in the transformation of Japan from a tiny feudal island empire into a world power, although the guns of the United States navy first battered down the gates of Japan and opened them to foreign trade. The United States remained in the ranks of the second-rate powers until it appeared on the scene of military operations in Europe to save the Allies—and its own investments.

The diplomatic policies of the United States before the World War had a provincial stamp and limited objectives, corresponding to the degree of its internal economic development. The ambitions of American imperialists did not extend beyond the domination of the Western hemisphere and free trade with the Far East. The Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door in China were its guiding lights; "America for the Americans" its slogan. Hawaii furnished the typical example of imperialist penetration by American capital during this period; "the bully little war" against the decrepit Spanish empire the extreme limit of its military operations; the islands of Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Phillipines, and Guam the petty extent of its colonial acquisitions. Although Theodore Roosevelt was the most conscious and aggressive imperialist among the American Presidents, his private schemes were limited by the objective development of American capitalism. He could seize the Panama Canal and wave "the big stick" at England and Germany over Venezuela, but remained nothing more than the watchdog of the Western hemisphere for American interests.

The decisive qualitative change in the character of American capitalism occurred during the war, which reversed the political and financial relationships between America and Europe, and transformed the United States from a provincial parvenu in the society of the Great Powers into the colossus of the capitalist world. Today, when American capital has taken the whole world for its province, the tasks of Roosevelt II are correspondingly greater.

The relatively meagre development of finance capitalism in the United States compared to European finance capitalism before the war, and its gigantic strides forward after the war, is shown by the following statistics of the export of capital, taken from Corey's book. By 1900 only \$500 millions of American capital were invested abroad, including government loans (p. 424), compared to England's \$20,000 million, France's \$10,000 million and Germany's \$5,000 million (p. 419). The export of capital from 1900 to 1910 was "almost negligible" (p. 425), although "by 1913 American foreign investments amounted to \$2,500 million, mainly the direct investments of dominant combinations" (p. 427). By 1932, however, America foreign investments had mounted to \$17,967 millions (excluding the extremely important inter-governmental loans), of which more than one-half represented direct investments of monopolist combinations (p. 428). What a tremendous leap forward!

The Delayed Development of Finance Capitalism

American imperialism lagged behind European imperialism, therefore, owing to the delayed development of finance capitalism. But what retarded the growth of finance capital and the export of large quantities of surplus capital, which paves the way for imperialist politics? Obviously, the high rate of profit obtainable within the United States. But why did capital, and especially monopoly capital, continue to command a high rate of profit during this period?

In his discussion of "the law of the falling tendency of the rate of profit" in *Capital*, Marx singles out six causes which counteract the effects of this general law of capitalist development. These are: 1. Raising the intensity of exploitation; 2. depression of wages below their values; 3. cheapening the elements of constant capital; 4. relative overproduction; 5. foreign trade; 6. the increase of stock capital. All of these agencies were at work to a greater or lesser degree in the United States after the Civil War, checking the falling tendency in the rate of profit. Corey systematically ignores one of the most important factors precisely because it is not "internal", that is, foreign trade.

According to Corey, the cause of the progress of American capitalism and the source of its peculiarities lie, not in the organic connections between American economy and the world market, but in Turner's universal solvent, "the frontier". "While it existed, the frontier was one of the major peculiarities of American capitalism. Its conditions of life renewed economic opportunity and progress. It provided almost unlimited possibilities for industrialization and the accumulation of capital and created constantly larger mass markets. The industrial Eastern states exported manufactures to the newly settled regions and imported raw materials and foodstuffs. This permitted an enlargement of the scale of production and an increasing realization of profit and accumulation of capital. . . . The expansion of the frontier was a perpetual rebirth of capitalism, energizing its upward movement, strengthening capitalism economically and ideologically; and its continental area and resources performed, up to the World War, the same economic function that colonialism and imperialism did for the industrial nations of Europe." (P. 51.)

But what is the economic character of this bountiful frontier, from which all blessings flow? "The expansion of the frontier depended upon the development of agriculture (mining), which in turn depended upon the markets of the industrial Eastern states and Europe." (P. 50.) We have already pointed out that Corey fails to understand the important function of foreign trade in the development of American capitalism. Here he fails in a test case. By putting the markets of the industrial East on a parity with the European, that is, the world market, he completely misses the significance of "the frontier", that is, American agriculture, in the expansion of American capitalism.

Again, there is not simply one, "there are really two frontiers. The older frontier, before the 1850's, built up an essentially self-sufficing agricultural economy . . . the newer frontier, after the 1850's, was increasingly dependent upon the market and price" (p. 518).

The existence of two different kinds of frontier is as imaginary as Corey's two different stages of imperialism. There has always been a peripheral class of self-sufficient farmers in the United States. But by their very nature this class could have little or no effect upon the *expansion* of American economy, since they bought and sold almost nothing on the market. But, unlike the isolated farmers in the Kentucky and Tennessee hills, even the self-sufficing farmers on the very fringe of the frontier performed important economic functions in the expansion of commercial agriculture. They were the advance scouts of the agricultural army, clearing the forest lands and preparing the soil for the oncoming wave of

permanent settlers, the producers for the market. As the main army advanced, the frontier farmer often sold his improvements to them and moved to new lands, where he repeated the operation. It must be remembered, however, that the center of American agriculture before the Civil War was in the Cotton Kingdom of the South. The Wheat Kingdom of the West was just beginning to arise.

Even so, was it true, as Corey claims, that the Western frontier agriculture was essentially a self-sufficing agriculture before 1850? Let us turn to Turner himself for information on this particular period. "The surplus of the West was feeding the industrial Northeast and finding an urgent demand in Europe. In 1830, breadstuffs to the value of only \$7,000,000 were exported; but, in 1847, they had risen to over \$50,000,000. This was exceptional due to the European crop failures and the opening of English ports, and the figures dropped in 1848 and 1849 to \$22,000,000. But the capacity to supply such a relatively large surplus of breadstuffs indicated the new resources of the West, *and its need of a market*. Even the lower figures represent threefold the export of 1830." And Turner goes on:

"Cotton had risen from a production of less than 800,000 bales, around 1830, to over 2,000,000 bales, in 1850. As over two-thirds of the crops was exported, this furnished the most important single factor in our foreign exchange and an essential basis for the use of bank credit in domestic business. The value of the cotton export, was, by the close of the period, over three times the value of the exports of foodstuffs. In short, *during these two decades* an enormous and transforming increase took place in the agricultural production of the interior of the United States, due to the opening of virgin soils in regions equal in size to European countries, and furnished new *exports, new markets, new supplies to the manufacturing cities, and new fields for investment to the capitalists* of the coast." (*The United States, 1830-1850*, by F. J. Turner, pp. 586-587. My italics. G.N.)

So much for the period before 1850 on the Western frontier.

If we analyze the movement of American economy from 1850 to the World War, we see that commercial agriculture remained the mainspring of the movement. American capitalism expanded and contracted in response to the impulses of American agriculture, which expanded and contracted according to the demands made upon it by industrialized Europe. American industry was able to keep operating and extending itself behind high tariff walls and American capital to enjoy a high rate of profit, thanks, above all, to the position occupied by American agriculture in the world market. Cotton from the South and foodstuffs from the Middle West were the principal American exports during this period. American manufacture and American capital did not displace agricultural commodities from this position until the World War.

The leading rôle of American agriculture is demonstrated by the fact that American capitalism was enabled to emerge from its periodical crises mainly by virtue of the restoration of the European market to agriculture. In one such specific case, Corey himself informs us that "in 1879 the large exports of wheat, the result of a serious grain shortage in Europe which created an increased demand for American wheat, played an important part in the renewal of the upward movement of prosperity". The extraordinary burst of prosperity that followed the Spanish-American War was caused by the failure of the wheat crop in Russia and Australia, resulting in heavy exportations of wheat and a rise in price. With wheat at a dollar a bushel, the farmer could pay his debts and spend money to start the wheels of industry and finance whirling again. This is only one side of the picture.

Until the World War a three-cornered relationship existed between the advanced industrial countries of Europe and the United States, whereby the European countries exported capital to finance

American railroads and industries (and labor to operate and build them), while American financiers loaned money and American industrialists sold manufactures and services to the farmers, who shipped their products abroad to pay off the debt charges on the capital borrowed from Europe. As usual, the middlemen in this chain of transactions, the strategically located financial and industrial capitalists, harvested the major share of the profits. Thus the two decisive factors in the period which really saw the development of American capitalism to its present estate—import of capital from Europe and export of agricultural commodities to Europe—depended upon European capitalism and its needs.

This triangular exchange relationship produced an economic balance between agriculture and industry within the United States, and between the United States and Europe. The relatively proportionate development of American capitalism was but the reverse side of the uneven development of European, and, in particular, English capitalism. English capitalism had been forced to sacrifice its agriculture to the Moloch of the falling rate of profit with the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. Free trade with England, on the other hand, opened up an extensive foreign market to American agriculture, enabling it to march forward at the head of American economy until it was overtaken by American industry, and, later, by American capital. The equilibrium between American industry and agriculture was maintained until the international post-war agricultural crisis ruptured it beyond repair.

The basis of American prosperity, that is, the high rate of profit obtainable by American capital, therefore, lay in the continual expansion of American agriculture, which was a product of the world market. The internal relations of American capitalism, out of which its peculiarities arose, were fundamentally shaped by international economic conditions.

Theoretical errors take their revenge all along the line. It is a cardinal principle of Marxism that national peculiarities are "a unique combination of the basic features of the world process." Corey, however, forsakes the Marxian position for a "nationalist" standpoint. Instead of regarding American economy as a component part of world economy, he views it as a microcosm, mirroring within itself all the economic relations of the world outside. Except in the imperialist stage of its development, this self-enclosed organism has for him only external and incidental contacts and connections with the rest of the world and its internal relations are self-determined. Consequently, Corey is prevented from seeing the primary cause of the expansion of American capitalism, since it lies outside his field of vision in the world market. He can explain the peculiarities of American capitalism only by resorting to a theory of American exceptionalism, which discovers in Turner's unique frontier the solution of all its problems. If Corey had purged his mind of such limited conceptions, which conceal more problems than they explain, and consistently adhered to an international standpoint, his work, valuable as it is, would have been considerably more valuable and penetrating.

George NOVACK

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKERS SCHOOL

New York readers are advised that the Winter 1935 term of the International Workers School will open the week of October 21. The curriculum includes 5 regular classroom courses, several lecture series in political, philosophical and cultural subjects as well as symposia and debates. Sidney Hook, James Burnham, James Rorty, Charles Malamuth and other prominent speakers will deliver lectures for the school.

Questions of the Italo-Ethiopian War

EVERY WAR confronts the revolutionary Marxists with the question of what attitude to take towards it. This distinguishes them in the very first place from the bourgeois or "socialist" pacifists who reject war "as such" and therefore face every war quite helplessly. It distinguishes them, further, from the pseudo-radical ideologists of reformism, who promise to reply to every war, after it has broken out, with revolution or a general strike, and thereby subserve social-chauvinism, as these promises hold back the proletariat from any real preparation for the war. Finally, the revolutionary Marxists are distinguished from those Marxists who set up the schematic contention that in our epoch there can be no other wars than imperialist wars and therefore the proletariat must come forward actively and in a revolutionary manner against every war.

Mussolini is preparing war against Ethiopia. Nobody can dispute that Italy will conduct an imperialist war: it is an attempt to annex a country, to convert it from an independent state into an Italian colony. Whatever the immediate causes may be that drive Mussolini to this war of conquest, that is to say, if it is the internal contradictions of Fascist Italy that have become intolerable and have imposed a military adventure as a distraction, or the mechanics of imperialism alone which are driving towards new conquests in Africa—what is involved is not some peculiarity of the Fascist régime but rather a feature common to all imperialisms: the world must be repartitioned, the imperialist power of third rank which Italy is, is seeking to force an advance in rank through new robberies, by utilizing the imperialist antagonisms of the powers of first and second order.

In such a war, the attitude of the revolutionists of Italy is quite unambiguously prescribed. Defeatism, that is, the work for the defeat of their own government and thereby the preparation for converting the imperialist war into the civil war—there lies the task of the Italian proletariat in the event of war. There is no doubt on that score, and the revolutionary proletariat will be in solidarity on it. As is seen, this task is in no way posed by the fact that a special kind of régime, the Fascist, exists in Italy. The task is posed because Italy pursues an imperialistic policy, and the Fascist régime is only one of the possible state forms of imperialism, which appears likewise in democratic-republican forms and which, in the event of war, must be combated by revolutionary Marxists with just the same slogans and aims. This—for the purpose of underlining the fact that the superstructure, the state form of sovereign power, the dictatorship of capital in its imperialist phase, is entirely a derived phenomenon and that the basic position of the proletariat in the main questions does not depend upon this derived phenomenon, upon the state form of the capitalist dictatorship.

Already in this second point, there exists no unity with the conception of such "Marxists" who revise Marx and Lenin, in that, like the Stalinists, they invent "good" and "pacifist" imperialists, and "bad", bellicose imperialists who must therefore be fought (whereas the others—which?—are "good" friends). This revision of Leninism is equivalent to a flat betrayal of Marxism, and the practical application of this Stalinist "principle" leads to ordinary social-chauvinism, however much it may be more or less garnished with sophistic phrases. But also with "Marxists" of the stripe of the S.A.P., nothing can be found in common on the question of war, inasmuch as this party, true to its natural history and origin, represents in the question of the attitude towards war two entirely different, mutually incompatible and moreover—both of them—false standpoints. One, set down in the incredibly confused

and hollow declaration of this party on the war question, preaches an amorphous, worthless "peace conference" of the bourgeois-pacifist type, of which nobody can say what it is actually to be. It is a hodge-podge of social democratic phrases about disarmament and the general ruinousness of war, and agitational methods such as have been pursued by the Comintern through its auxiliary organizations—all the Alliances, Societies, Committees "against war and Fascism"—with the success which is so well known. The other current in the S.A.P. is that of the "preventive war" of French imperialism against "Fascist Germany". Thus, the same distinction is made here between "good" and bad imperialists that Stalinism makes. This position, despite all the phrases about the "revolution" being made inside the army, in the midst of the war—because, you see, the imperialists are "after all" not sincerely "good"—is only a shabby fig-leaf for ordinary social-chauvinism, for it represents distinctions between the "good" democratic imperialist states and the bad Fascist imperialists. Within the S.A.P., the theoretical representative of this anti-Marxian confusion is none other than Fritz Sternberg, although he himself has apparently published nothing about the war question itself. But his works on imperialism and above all his book *Der Faschismus an der Macht*, with their flat vulgarization of the theoretical errors of Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation, and their arrogant "refutations" of Lenin, delivered with aplomb and without a trace of conviction, and of Lenin's profound theory of imperialism which has been astonishingly and thoroughly confirmed by the events of the last twenty years in all its details—these works of Sternberg, this lamentable eclecticism, form the "foundation" of the political resolutions and contradictions of the S.A.P., so far as it deals with politics in general, and especially with the politics of war.

II.

Now, the Italo-Ethiopian war conflict has two sides. Seen from the Italian side, everything is extraordinarily simple, or everything seems to be extraordinarily simple.

But what the revolutionary proletariat must do is to see and to answer the question of this war, like every war, from the international standpoint. That means: if it is true that the Italian proletariat must strive towards the defeat, the overthrow of its government—a work in which a large part of the bourgeois anti-Fascists will concur with it—and if it is true that it must convert the imperialist war of Italy into a civil war for the overthrow of capitalism, in which only the Leninists will concur in principle with the Italian revolutionary vanguard—if all this is true, then what must be the attitude of the revolutionary proletariat towards Ethiopia?

Here we will find an agreement between the Leninists and quite a number of bourgeois and even imperialist politicians, yet for entirely different reasons and with quite different aims.

In the first place: has Ethiopia any prospect of carrying on this war without losing it immediately? Yes, these prospects exist. They exist, because, first, Italy's strength, in consequence of the colossal contradictions of this Fascist "communality", is a fiction; because the class contradictions within the army cannot, in all likelihood, hold up under any great burdens; because the whole country can be aroused in the shortest period of time by this onerous and risky war. The other reason is: likely though it is that the Ethiopian war can first be localized, there is little prospect of the imperialist big powers leaving Italy a free hand. English imperialism is not interested in letting Italian influence in Africa extend to the Red Sea and in conceding her power and further lust for expansion out of the Gulf of Aden and the Straits of Babel Mandeb down to the headwaters of the Nile region; nor will the

"selflessness" of the present-day French imperialist seconds of the Italian pirates go so far as to look on while Italy's positions penetrate further into Central Africa.

These are just the international circumstances that make possible Ethiopia's resistance. Precisely these circumstances will also engender an apparent similarity between bourgeois, even imperialist individuals and groups, perhaps even states, and the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, expressing itself in the slogan: Aid for the victory of Ethiopia.

It might be asked: what interest has the international proletariat in the victory of Ethiopia, a backward, feudal, barbaric state? And in fact, this is the question that is put by bourgeois "pacifists", by imperialists who would themselves like to swallow Ethiopia, by allies of Italy. Hasn't Ethiopia even failed to abolish the slave trade? ask righteous English Christians, in whose empire, as is well known, there is no trading in slaves and who have justice triumphing everywhere, in both India and Africa and everywhere else where hundreds of thousands of natives die of hunger or perish in plagues under the British flag or are dispatched into the beyond by good English bombers.

The interest that another imperialism may have in the defeat of Italy need not be examined here. There will be time for that when the war has actually broken out. But the interest that the revolutionary proletariat has in the victory of Ethiopia must be investigated right here and now.

III.

We have put it pretty crassly: in the victory of Ethiopia. Yet that is only the positive formulation of the defeat of Italy. By that is actually already said, in abbreviated form, what is involved. But just because this abbreviation might lead to misunderstanding, to the idea that it is only a question of a general "anti-Fascist" wish, it is necessary to speak in greater detail on this point.

The position of neutrality of the international revolutionary proletariat we dismiss with a wave of the hand: if it is true that the revolutionary proletariat is for the defeat of Italy, when it is not neutral, then it is for the victory of Ethiopia. If it desires the victory of Ethiopia, then it must help to produce it. This means that it does not remain "neutral", but that it actively intervenes for Ethiopia.

Why? Naturally, not because it likes the social structure of Ethiopia. Ethiopia is indeed a backward country. But just because of that, this topical war conflict offers a practical occasion not only for the practical struggle against imperialism but also for the struggle for the theoretical clarification of the war question in a field which does not simply signify the counterposing of two belligerent imperialist state groups.

In one of his especially brilliant works (*Results of the Discussion of the Right of Self-Determination*, October 1916), Lenin accurately examined the question of what distinctions exist—so far as is concerned the question of a "just" war—between the epoch in which Marx wrote and our epoch. He declared that

"... the interests of the emancipation of several great and very great peoples of Europe stand higher than the interests of the movement of emancipation of the small nations"

—this, for the purpose of showing why Marx and Engels, before the year 1848, were against the national movement of the Czechs and the Slavs, but in favor of the independence of Poland. This shows, Lenin emphasizes,

"... that Marx and Engels at that time clearly and definitely counterposed 'entirely reactionary peoples', who served as Russian advance posts in Europe, to the Germans, Poles and Hungarians. This is a fact and this was indubitably established at that time: in 1848 the revolutionary peoples fought for freedom, whose main enemy was Czarism; the Czechs and others, however, were in actuality reactionary peoples and advance posts of Czarism".

This is necessary for the purpose of concrete analysis; the example is supposed to show and does show that it is not at all a question of an abstract or sentimental principle of national "freedom" or independence, but of inserting and subordinating the question of the emancipation of the "great" nations. But a fundamental change has taken place within imperialism:

"A system of a small number of imperialist 'great powers' (of which there are five or six) has now been formed, in which each one suppresses other nations, and this suppression serves to retard artificially the overthrow of capitalism and to support artificially the opportunism and social-chauvinism of the world-dominating imperialist nations."

Thence "results the concrete alteration in the application of these socialist principles: at that time it was applied primarily 'against Czarism' (and against the movements of the small nations exploited by it in an anti-democratic direction) and for the revolutionary peoples of the West, who belonged to the great nations. Now it is applied against the united, serried front of the imperialist powers, of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the social-imperialists, in order to utilize all the national movements against imperialism, and in favor of the socialist revolution. The purer is the fight of the proletariat against the common imperialist front, the clearer emerges the international principles: 'a people that oppresses another cannot emancipate itself.'"

This lengthy quotation offers material for other observations which must, however, be omitted at this point; let us point only to the fact that herein lies the complete rejection of the shameless falsification of Marxism and Leninism which the Stalinists have introduced with their distinctions between two sorts of imperialists.

IV.

Now what connection is there between this observation of Lenin and the Ethiopian question?

As a matter of fact, the connection is clear. Ethiopia has up to now been a more or less independent country. The attempt to annex it encountered (a) a national Ethiopian defense movement which will express itself in a national war which is to that extent a "just" war, quite regardless as to whether the social form of Ethiopia is backward; and (b) the will of Italy to annexation accentuates the antagonisms within the "common imperialist front" of which Lenin speaks; for—this is known from his countless, fundamental works on imperialism and specific war problems—he does not of course employ this term in order to describe a sort of "super-imperialism" but, on the contrary, in order to say: the world is already so partitioned among the imperialist great powers that every non-imperialist nation faces the common front of the imperialist oppressors; but every attempt to divide the world differently among the imperialist robbers, sets the thieves of this "common front" of robbery against each other, therefore facilitates the task of the international proletariat—the socialist revolution—and by virtue of the rupture of the "common front" of the temporary *status quo* of the last piratical partition of the world among the imperialist robbers, it promotes the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

In a work which is closely connected with what was quoted above, his criticism of the Junius pamphlet of Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin says:

"As a continuation of the national emancipation policy of the colonies, national wars against imperialism will be inevitable. Such wars may lead to the imperialist war of the present imperialist 'great powers'. But this case may also not occur, and that depends upon many circumstances."

In the case of Ethiopia, it is a question of precisely such a situation, for it is not necessary for this country to be already annexed; it is to be annexed. That such national wars are possible, even inevitable, is not only posited by the theory of Leninism, but

it is also shown in practise. But such

“ . . . national wars against the imperialist states are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable and both progressive and revolutionary, even though, of course, their success requires either the unification of the efforts of a vast number of inhabitants of the oppressed countries, or else a specially favorable constellation of the international situation (e.g., the paralyzing of the intervention of the imperialist states as a consequence of their weakness, their wars, their antagonisms, etc.), or the simultaneous uprising of the proletariat in one of the great states against the bourgeoisie (this point, last in our enumeration, is first in desirability and beneficialness from the standpoint of the victory of the proletariat)”.

This is precisely the situation in the Italo-Ethiopian conflict. It is not, in truth, a question of the Ethiopian slave trade nor of the social structure of this feudal monarchy. It is a question of a situation in which the antagonism of the imperialist great powers is strong, so that an intervention in this war may at first be obviated. The miserable attitude of the leaders of the Third International, if this name is still to be used for the society of Stalin's employees, in this conflict, shows the mongrel's fear of the Stalinist national reformists of the progressive and revolutionary war: just because this Ethiopian war breaks the front of the imperialists, that is, the front of the *status quo* of imperialist robbery, this band of lackeys, which prepared the Seventh Congress of the International founded by Lenin, goes ahead without saying a word about the questions which are agitating the world.

On the other side, the League of Nations reveals itself anew to be what it was from the beginning: a consortium of thieves, but a disunited one. The president of the Council of the League of Nations at the present time, bears the name of Litvinov. This ex-Bolshevik will have to solve the traitor's task of stifling, by means of imperialist chicanery, the progressive, revolutionary war of Ethiopia which will not let itself be annexed (and which, by its resistance, offers the proletariat revolutionary, progressive possibilities; that and only that is why Ethiopia's war is progressive and revolutionary), and of handing over the country to the imperialist robbers.

V.

It can be said without exaggeration that a defeat of Italy and a revolution on the Apennine peninsula can have unforeseeable results. The whole European system of alliances and states would fall apart. The proletariat in Germany, Austria, Spain, on the Balkans, and not least of all in France, would receive an enormous impulsion; and the face of Europe would be altered. That lies in the direct class interests of the international proletariat. But still more. A defeat of Italy in Africa, a victory of Ethiopia, might deliver the imperialist bandits a terrific blow in Africa. Should Ethiopia's national war be crowned with success, why shouldn't there be repercussions to this victory of the backward country in the form of uprisings in Egypt, in the large French and English colonies of Central and Eastern Africa, in South Africa? And might not victorious uprisings in Africa be implanted, repeated, and extended in Asia?

Were it only a question of dreams here, then these dreams themselves would be useful, educational, internationalistic. But far more real possibilities are involved than the philistine, the “socialist” philistine included, who always boasts of his *Realpolitik*, allows himself to imagine. The capitalism of our time is far shakier and far more thoroughly doomed to ruin than these “socialists” believe. Even an occasion like the Ethiopian conflict may throw the rotten edifice of imperialism into its death-throes.

That is why it is the elementary duty of the international proletariat to do everything to drive in this direction. This “everything” is, in the concrete case: a goal-conscious, hate-filled cam-

paign against Italian imperialism; prevention of troop transports, and of arms and munitions supplies for Italy; reinforced agitation among the Italian troops; sabotage, if possible and necessary, of Italian war preparations, munitions production, food provisioning. And on the other side: support for arms supplies to Ethiopia (this goes for those who are against arms production and transportation “as such”); unambiguous, loud, fearless propaganda of the justness of this war from the Ethiopian standpoint; tireless denunciation of the League of Nations and its imperialist hypocrisy as well as of the imperialist governments who bargain with Italy; fearless denunciation of the treacherous rôle of the Second International, and also of the directors of the Third International, who objectively support the allegedly combatted Fascism (we say nothing of imperialism in general, for Stalinism no longer speaks of that at all); denunciation of Stalin's foreign politicians who, for the sake of a dubious “friendship” with Fascist Italy, betray—in this case too, short-sightedly and opportunistically—the revolutionary perspectives and possibilities which rise out of the war of Italian imperialism for the international proletariat, in order thoughtlessly to counterpose the alleged interests of the U.S.S.R. to the general interests of the international proletariat. And as a consequence, reinforcement of the propaganda for the need to create the Fourth International which applies the Leninist teaching—Marxism—in this concrete case of a war in Africa as in every other case, in the interests of the entire international proletariat.

PARIS, September 1935

PARABELLUM

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., DEQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF MARCH 3, 1933,

Of the New International, published bi-monthly at New York, N. Y. for Oct. 1, 1935. State of New York, County of New York.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Arne Swabeck, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the New International and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher: New International Publishing Co., 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; Editor: Max Shachtman-John West, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; Managing Editor: Max Shachtman-John West, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; Business Manager: Arne Swabeck, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) New International Publishing Co., 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; Max Shachtman, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; John West, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.; Arne Swabeck, 55 E. 11th St., N.Y.C.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

ARNE SWABECK, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of Sept., 1935,
[Seal.] CELIA KASS.

Form 3526.—Ed. 1924 (My commission expires March 30, 1936)

Archives of the Revolution

DOCUMENTS OF THE HISTORY AND THEORY OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

The Struggle for Peace and the Anglo-Russian Committee

THE WHOLE international situation and all the tendencies of its development make the struggle against war and for the defense of the U. S. S. R. as the first workers' state the central task of the international proletariat. But it is just the tension of the situation that demands clarity, a precise political line and firm correction of the errors made. . . .

1. War is the continuation of politics by other means. The struggle against war is a continuation of revolutionary policy against the capitalist regime. To grasp this idea means to find the key to all opportunist errors in questions relating to war. Imperialism is no external factor existing by itself; it is the highest expression of the basic tendencies of capitalism. War is the highest method of imperialist policy. The struggle against imperialist war can and must be the highest expression of the international policy of the proletariat.

Opportunism, or radicalism that is turning to opportunism, always inclines to estimate war as such an *exceptional* phenomenon that it requires the annulment of revolutionary policy and its basic principles. Centrism reconciles itself to revolutionary methods but does not believe in them. That is why it is always inclined, at critical moments, to refer to the *peculiarity* of the situation, to *exceptional* circumstances, and so on, in order to substitute opportunist methods for revolutionary ones. Such a shift in the policy of Centrism or pseudo-radicalism is of course acutely provoked by the war danger. With all the greater intransigence must this touchstone be applied to the main tendencies of the Communist International.

2. It is already clear to everybody that the Anglo-Russian Committee must not be regarded as a trade union organization into which the communists enter to fight for influence over the masses, but as a "peculiar" political bloc with well-defined aims, directing its activities primarily against the war danger. With tenfold attention to the experience and the example of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the methods of struggle against the war danger must be closely reexamined so as to be able to tell the revolutionary proletariat openly and precisely *what must not be done* if the Comintern is not to be destroyed and the bloody work of imperialism against the international proletariat and the U.S.S.R. facilitated.

3. In the praesidium of the E.C.C.I. on May 11, comrade Bukharin advanced a new interpretation of our capitulation to the General Council in Berlin. He declared that the capitulation must not be considered from the standpoint of the international revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, but from the standpoint of a "diplomatic" counter-action to the offensive of imperialism against the U.S.S.R.

The burning problem of the united front finds pertinent comment in the following document by Leon Trotsky. The position of the revolutionary Marxists in favor of the united front is fairly well known, especially by virtue of their struggle in the past several years against the spurious "Leftism" of the Stalinist sectarianisms who so obdurately combatted the united front during the so-called "Third Period". The problems of the united front are not, however, exhausted merely by declarations in its favor or even once it is formed. In some respects, it is only then that the real problems commence for revolutionists. The document on the Anglo-Russian Committee, composed of the Stalinist heads of the Russian unions and the reformist leaders of England's unions, deals with some of the most decisive and fundamental aspects of revolutionary policy in the united front. Its pertinence is particularly marked in view of the thoroughly opportunistic course pursued by Stalinism today in the united front, where the crimes of the Anglo-Russian Committee policy are only renewed and multiplied.—ED.

Various weapons of international action are at our disposal: the party (Comintern), the trade unions, diplomacy, the press, etc. Our activities in the trade union field are dictated to us by the tasks of the class struggle. But only "as a general rule". In certain cases, as exceptions, we must—according to Bukharin—utilize the organs of the trade union movement as instruments of diplomatic action. This is what happened with the Anglo-Russian Committee. We capitulated to the General Council not as the General Council, but as the agent of the English government. We obligated ourselves not to interfere not out of party reasons, but for reasons of state. That is the substance of the new interpretation of the Berlin capitulation which, as we will soon show, only makes it still more dangerous.

4. The Berlin agreement of the Central Council of the Soviet Union with the General Council was discussed a short time ago at the April plenum of the Central Committee of our party. The decisions of the Berlin Conference were defended by comrades Tomsy, Andreyev, and Melnichansky, that is, our outstanding trade unionists, but not our diplomats. All these comrades, in defending the Berlin capitulation, accused the Opposition of not understanding the rôle and methods of the trade union movement, and declared that the masses of trade unionists cannot be influenced by breaking with the apparatus, that the apparatus cannot be influenced by breaking with its upper sections, and that these were just the considerations that dictated the attitude of our trade unionists in Berlin.

Now comrade Bukharin explains that the

decisions of the Berlin Conference constitute, on the contrary, an exceptional case, an exception from the principled Bolshevik method of influencing the trade unions, an exception in the name of temporary, but acute diplomatic tasks. Why did not comrade Bukharin, and comrade Tomsy together with him, explain this to us at the last plenary session of our Central Committee? . . .

5. Where did such an appalling contradiction come from in the course of a few weeks? It grew out of the impossibility of standing, if even for a single month, on the April position. When our delegation left for Berlin it did not have Bukharin's subsequent explanation of the position it was to take. Did comrade Bukharin himself have this explanation at that time? At all events, it was nowhere expressed by anybody. . . . It is quite clear that this explanation was thought up after the event.

6. It becomes still clearer when we go back further, that is, to the origin of the question. After the extremely rascally calling off of the general strike by the General Council, the "Left" vying with the Right for the palm, the Opposition in the C.P.S.U. demanded an immediate break with the General Council so as to make easier and accelerate the liberation of the proletarian vanguard from the influence of the traitors. The majority of the Central Committee opposed to this their viewpoint that the retention of the Anglo-Russian Committee was allegedly required in the interests of our revolutionary influencing of the English proletariat, despite the counter-revolutionary policy of the General Council during the strike. It was precisely at this moment that comrade Stalin advanced his theory of stages that cannot be skipped over. By the word "stage", in this case, must not be understood the political level of the masses, which varies with different strata, but of the conservative leaders who reflect the pressure of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat and conduct an irreconcilable struggle against the advanced sections of the proletariat.

In contradiction to this, the Opposition contended that the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee after its open and obvious betrayal which closed the preceding period of "Left development" would have as its inevitable conclusion an impermissible weakening of our criticism of the leaders of the General Council, at least of its "Left" wing. We were answered, primarily by this same Bukharin, that this is a revolting slander; that the organizational alliance does not hinder our revolutionary criticism in the slightest degree; that we would not permit any kind of principle concessions, that the Anglo-Russian Committee would only be an organizational bridge to the masses for us. It occurred to nobody at that time to justify the mainten-

ance of the Anglo-Russian Committee by referring to grounds of a diplomatic character which necessitate a temporary abandonment of the revolutionary line. . . .

7. The Opposition foretold in its writings that the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee would steadily strengthen the political position of the General Council, and that it would inevitably be converted from defendant to prosecutor. This prediction was explained as the fruit of our "ultra-Leftism". Incidentally, an especially ridiculous theory was created, namely, that the demand for the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee was equivalent to the demand for the workers to leave the trade unions. By that alone, the policy of maintaining the Anglo-Russian Committee was invested with the character of an exceptionally important question of principle.

8. Nevertheless it was very quickly proved that the choice must be made between maintaining organizational connections with the General Council or calling the traitors by their name. The majority of the Political Bureau inclined more and more to maintain the organizational connections at any cost. To achieve this aim, no "skipping over stages" was required, it is true; but it did require sinking politically one degree after another. This can most distinctly be followed in the three conferences of the Anglo-Russian Committee: in Paris (July 1926), in Berlin (August 1926) and most recently in Berlin (April 1927). Each time our criticism of the General Council became more cautious, and completely avoided touching on the "Left", that is, on the most dangerous betrayers of the working class.

9. The General Council felt all along, by its consistent pressure, that it held the representatives of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions in its hand. From the defendant it became the prosecutor. It understood that if the Bolsheviks did not break on the question of the general strike which had such a tremendous international importance, they would not break later on, no matter what demands were placed before them. We see how the General Council, under the pressure of the English bourgeoisie, conducted its offensive against the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions with ever greater energy. The Central Council retreated and yielded. These retreats were explained on the grounds of revolutionary strategy in the trade union movement, but by no means for diplomatic motives. . . .

The line of the Political Bureau ended naturally and inevitably with the Berlin conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee at the beginning of April. The capitulation of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions on the basic questions of the international working class movement was neither an unexpected side-leap nor an abrupt manoeuvre. No, it was the inevitable crowning, predicted by us long before, of the whole line followed in this question.

10. At the beginning of June of last year, comrade Bukharin, as we said, was the creator of a theory according to which the necessity of working in reactionary trade unions allegedly brought with it the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee under all circumstances. In the face

of all the evidence, Bukharin at that time flatly denied that the Anglo-Russian Committee was a political bloc and called it a "trade union organization".

Now Bukharin creates a new theory, according to which our remaining in the Anglo-Russian Committee, bought at the price of an absolutely unprincipled capitulation, was not called forth by the needs of a "trade union organization", but by the necessity of maintaining a *political bloc* with the General Council in the name of diplomatic aims.

Bukharin's theory of today is in direct contradiction to his theory of yesterday. They have only this in common, that they are both one hundred percent deceitful, that they were both dragged in by the hair in order to justify after the fact, at two different stages, the sliding down from a Bolshevik to a compromising line.

11. That the Right will betray us in the event of war, is recognized as indisputable even by Bukharin. So far as the "Left" is concerned, it will "probably" betray us. But if it betrays us, it will do it, according to Bukharin, "in its own way", by not supporting us but by playing the rôle of ballast for the English government. Pitiful as these considerations may be, they must nevertheless be demolished.

Let us assume for a moment that all of this is really so. But if the "Left" betrays us "in its own way", that is, less actively, in a more veiled manner than the Right, it will surely not be because of the lovely eyes of the delegation of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, but because of the English workers. That is the general line of policy of the "Left" in all questions, internal as well as external: to betray, but "in its own way". This policy is profitable for it. Then why are we obliged to pay the "Left" with the abandonment of our policy, for a policy which they are forced in any case to carry out in their own interests?

12. But in what sense will the "Left" be a ballast for the English government? Obviously, in the same sense that they were "ballast" during the imperialist war, or are now, during the war of England against revolutionary China, and during the campaign of the Conservatives against the trade unions. The "Left" criticizes the government within such limits as do not interfere with its rôle as exploiter and robber. The "Left" gives expression to the dissatisfaction of the masses within these limits, so as to restrain them from revolutionary action.

In case the dissatisfaction of the masses breaks through to the outside, the "Left" seeks to dominate the movement in order to strangle it. Were the "Left" not to criticize, not to expose, not to attack the bourgeoisie, it would be unable to serve it "in its own way".

If it is admitted that the "Left" is a ballast, then it is admitted that it is the useful, appropriate, necessary, succoring ballast without which the ship of British imperialism would long ago have gone down.

To be sure, the Diehards are fulminating against the "Left". But this is done to keep the fear of God in it, so that it will not overstep the bounds prescribed for it, so that no unnecessary expense be incurred for their "ballast". The Diehards are just as necessary an ingredient in the imperial-

ist mechanism as the "Left".

13. But under the pressure of the masses cannot even the Left overstep the bounds prescribed for it by the bourgeois régime! This unexpected argument is also launched.

That the revolutionary pressure of the masses can undo the game of Chamberlain-Thomas-Purcell, is incontestable. But the dispute does not hinge on whether the international revolutionary movement of the proletariat is advantageous for a workers' state, but rather whether we are helping or obstructing it by our policy.

The pressure of the masses, all other conditions being equal, will be all the stronger the more the masses are alarmed by the perspective of war, the less they rely upon the General Council, and the less confidence they have in the "Left" traitors (traitors "in their own way"). If we sign "unanimously" a pitiful, lying, hypocritical declaration on the war together with the General Council, we thereby pacify the masses, appease their restlessness, lull them to sleep, and consequently reduce their pressure on the "Left".

14. The Berlin Conference can be justified by the "international interests of the U.S.S.R."! Here the mistake of Bukharin becomes especially atrocious. Precisely the interests of the U.S.S.R. will suffer chiefly and most directly as a result of the false policy of the Political Bureau towards the General Council. Nothing can cause us such harm as mistakes and hypocrisy in the revolutionary camp of the proletariat. We will not deceive our enemies, the experienced and shrewd imperialists. Hypocrisy will help the vacillating pacifists to vacillate in the future. And our real friends, the revolutionary workers, can only be deceived and weakened by the policy of illusions and hypocrisy.

That is just why Lenin wrote in his instructions for our delegation to the pacifist congress at The Hague, where we had to deal with the same trade unionists, coöperators, and so forth:

"It seems to me that if we will have at the Hague Conference a few people who are able to make a speech in one or another language against the war, the most important thing will be to refute the idea that those participating in the conference are opponents of war, that they understand how war may and can burst upon them at the most unexpected moment, that they have the least knowledge of the means to employ against war, or that they are in any way capable of adopting an intelligent and effective path of struggle against the war." (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XX, Supplementary Vol., Part 2, p. 530, Russian ed.)

What interests did Lenin have in mind in writing these words: the international interests of the U.S.S.R. or the revolutionary interests of the international proletariat? In such a basic question Lenin did not and could not set the one against the other. Lenin was of the opinion that the slightest yielding to the pacifist illusions of the trade unionists would render more difficult the real struggle against the war danger and injure the international proletariat as much as the U.S.S.R.

Lenin had conscientious pacifists in mind here, and not branded strike-breakers who are condemned by their whole position after May 1926 to a further chain of betrayals. . .

16. In what manner can the thoroughly rotten, pseudo-pacifist agreement with traitors, whom we have already declared by common accord to be the "only representatives" of the English proletariat, strengthen our international position? How? The Berlin conference took place in the period of the opening of hostilities by the English government against China and the preparation of similar hostilities against us. The interests of our international position demanded above all that these facts be openly called by their proper name. Instead, we passed them over in silence. Chamberlain knows these facts and is obliged to conceal them. The English masses do not correctly know these facts and are obliged to learn them from us. Honest pacifists among the workers can go over to a revolutionary line in the face of these facts. The base merchants of pacifism in the General Council cannot speak aloud about facts which would, at best and without doubt, expose their silent conspiracy with Chamberlain against the English workers, against China, against the U.S.S.R. and against the world proletariat.

Now what did we do in Berlin? With all the authority of a workers' state, we helped the "pacifist" lackeys of imperialism to preserve their thieves' secret. Worse yet, we assumed responsibility for this secret. We proclaimed before the whole world that we are "in unanimous accord" with the agents of Chamberlain in the General Council in the cause of the struggle against war. We thereby weakened the resistance power of the English workers against the war. We thereby increased Chamberlain's freedom of action. We thereby injured the international position of the U.S.S.R.

It must be said more concretely: The Berlin capitulation of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions to the General Council extraordinarily facilitated Chamberlain's attack on the Soviet institutions in London, with all the possible consequences of this act.

17. It must not be forgotten that thanks especially to the insular position of England and the absence of a direct threat to its borders, the English reformists, during the war, allowed themselves a somewhat greater "freedom" of words than their brothers-in-treason on the continent. But in general they played the same rôle. Now, with the experiences of the imperialist war, the reformists, especially of the "Left", will endeavor in the event of a new war to throw even more sand in the eyes of the workers than in the years 1914-1918.

It is entirely probable that, as a result of the attack on the Soviet institutions in London, which was prepared by the whole policy of the "Left", they will protest in a little louder tone than the liberals. But if the Anglo-Russian Committee were in any way capable of helping, not Chamberlain, but us, then would not both sides have come to an agreement in the first twenty-four hours, sounded the alarm, and spoken to the masses in a language corresponding to the seriousness of the circumstances? But nothing of the sort occurred and nothing will. The Anglo-Russian Committee did not exist during the general strike when the General Council refused to accept the "damned gold" of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions; the Anglo-Russian Commit-

tee did not exist during the miners' strike; the Anglo-Russian Committee did not exist during the bombardment of Nanking, and the Anglo-Russian Committee will not exist in the event of the breaking of diplomatic relations between England and the U.S.S.R. These harsh truths must be told the workers. They must be honestly warned. *That* will strengthen the U.S.S.R.!

18. It may be replied: But concessions on our part to the bourgeoisie are permissible, and if the present General Council is considered an agent of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement, why should we not make concessions to the General Council out of the same considerations that we make concessions to imperialism? Certain comrades are beginning to play with this formula which is a classic example of the falsification and overthrow of Leninism for opportunist political aims.

If we are forced to make concessions to our class enemy, we make them to the master himself, but not to his Menshevik clerk. We never mask and never embellish our concessions. When we resigned ourselves to Curzon's ultimatum we explained to the English workers that at the present moment we, together with them, are not yet strong enough to take up the challenge of Curzon immediately. We bought ourselves off from the ultimatum to avert a diplomatic break, but we laid bare the real relations of classes by a clear presentation of the question; by that, we weakened the reformists, and strengthened our international position as well as the position of the international proletariat.

In Berlin, however, we got absolutely nothing from Chamberlain. The concessions we made to the interests of English capitalism (new crowning of the General Council, principle of "non-interference", and so forth), were not exchanged for any concession at all on their part (no breaking off of relations, no war). And at the same time, we camouflaged everything by depicting our concessions to capitalism as a triumph of the unity of the working class. Chamberlain received a great deal gratis. The traitors of the General Council received a great deal. We received a—compromise. The international proletariat received—confusion and disorder. English imperialism came out of the Berlin Conference stronger. We came out weaker.

19. But, it is said, to break with the General Council at such a critical moment would mean that we could not so much as live in peace with the organized workers of England; it would give the imperialists a trump card, and so on and so forth.

This argument is false to its very roots. Of course it would have been incomparably more advantageous had we broken with the General Council immediately after its betrayal of the general strike, as the Opposition demanded. The year would then not have been frittered away with doleful gallantries towards the traitors, but would have been used for their merciless exposure. The past year was not lacking in occasions for this. Such a policy would have forced the "Left" capitulators of the General Council to fight for remnants of their reputation, to separate themselves from the Right, to half-expose Chamberlain, in a word, to show the workers that they, the "Left", are not half as bad as the Moscow

people present them. This would have deepened the split in the General Council. And when the swindlers of reformism come to blows, many secrets come to light, and the workers can only gain by it. Such a struggle against the General Council would have been the sharpest form of struggle against the policy of Chamberlain in the labor movement. In this struggle, the revolutionary working class cadres in England would have learned in a year more skillfully to catch the sharpers of the General Council at their swindles and to expose the policy of Chamberlain. English imperialism would have had to face much greater difficulties today. In other words: *Had the policy proposed by the Opposition been adopted in June of last year, the international position of the U.S.S.R. would now be stronger.*

Even if belatedly, the break should have been made at least during the miners' strike, which would have been quite clear to the million miners, as well as the millions of workers betrayed in the general strike. But our proposals in this respect were rejected as incompatible with the interests of the international trade union movement. The consequences are well known. They were registered in Berlin. Today it is declared that the radically false line which already caused so much harm must be maintained in the future as well because of the difficulties of the international situation, which means in essence that the international position of the U.S.S.R. is being sacrificed in order to conceal the errors of the leadership. All the new theories of Bukharin have no other meaning.

20. A correction of the errors now, even after a year's delay, would only be of benefit and not detriment. Chamberlain will say, of course, that the Bolsheviks are not able to maintain peace with his trade unionists. But every honest and even partly conscious English worker will say: the far too patient Bolsheviks, who did not even break with the General Council during our strikes, could no longer maintain any friendship with it when it refused to struggle against the suppression of the Chinese revolution and the new war that is being hatched by Chamberlain. The putrid decorations of the Berlin Anglo-Russian Committee will be cast aside. The workers will see the real facts, the real relationships. Who will lose thereby? Imperialism, which needs putrid decorations! The U.S.S.R. and the international proletariat will gain.

21. But let us return again to the latest theory of Bukharin. In contradiction to Tomsky, Bukharin says, as we know, that the Berlin decisions are not the policy of the united front, but an exception to it evoked by exceptional circumstances.

What are these circumstances? The war danger, that is, the most important question of imperialist policy and the policy of the world proletariat. This fact alone must forthwith compel the attention of every revolutionist. It would appear from this that revolutionary policy serves for more or less "normal" conditions; but when we stand before a question of life or death, the revolutionary policy must be substituted by a policy of compromise.

When Kautsky justified the iniquity of the Second International in 1914, he thought up the *post facto* theory that the

International was an instrument of peace but not of war. In other words, Kautsky proclaimed that the struggle against the bourgeois state is normal, but that an exception must be made under the "exceptional conditions" of war, and a bloc made with the bourgeois government, while we continue to "criticize" it in the press.

For the international proletariat it is now a question not only of the struggle against the bourgeois state, but of the direct defense of a workers' state. But it is precisely the interests of this defense that demand of the international proletariat not a weakening but a sharpening of the struggle against the bourgeois state. The war danger can only be averted or postponed for the proletariat by the real danger to the bourgeoisie that the imperialist war can be transformed into a civil war. In other words, the war danger does not demand a passing over from the revolutionary policy to a policy of compromise, but on the contrary, a firmer, more energetic, more irconcilable execution of the revolutionary policy. War poses all questions forcefully. It admits of evasions and half measures infinitely less than does a state of peace. If the bloc with the Purcells who betrayed the general strike was a hindrance in peaceful times, in times of war danger it is a millstone around the neck of the working class.

If one admits that the turning back from Bolshevism to opportunism is justified by circumstances on which the life and death of the workers' state depend, then one capitulates in principle to opportunism: for what value has a revolutionary policy that must be abandoned under the most critical circumstances?

22. In general, can the trade unions be utilized at one time in the interests of international class policy, and at another time for any sort of alleged diplomatic aims? Can such a situation be established where

the same representatives of the C.P.S.U., the Comintern, and the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions say at one moment that the General Council is a traitor and strike-breaker, and at another time that it is a friend with whom we are in hearty accord? Is it sufficient to whisper secretly that the former must be understood in the revolutionary class sense and the latter in a diplomatic sense? Can such a policy be spoken of seriously? Can one speak seriously to people who propose and defend such a policy?

After the Berlin Conference, the word "traitor", as used for a Menshevik agent of the bourgeoisie, became terribly cheap. But such expressions as "hearty accord", "mutual understanding" and "unanimity" (the words of comrade Tomsky), became equally cheap. Who benefits by this unusually artful combination of methods? It does not deceive our enemy for a moment. It only confuses our friends and reduces the weight of our own words and deeds.

23. The new theory of Bukharin is not an isolated one. On the one hand, we are told that the unprincipled agreement with the notoriously treasonable General Council allegedly facilitated the defense of the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, we hear ever more loudly that the building of workers' and peasants' Soviets in China would be a threat to the defense of the U.S.S.R. Doesn't this mean turning the foundations of Bolshevik policy upside down? Workers' and peasants' Soviets in China would signify a magnificent extension of the Soviet front and the strengthening of our world position. The agreement with the General Council signifies on the contrary a weakening of the internal contradictions in England and the greatest facility to Chamberlain in his work of brigandage against China and against us.

Once it is admitted that Soviets in China are harmful to our international position,

but that the General Council is useful, then the recognition of the principle of "non-interference" is essentially correct; but then supplementary conclusions must be drawn, at least with regard to Amsterdam. One can be sure that these conclusions will be drawn today or tomorrow, if not by Bukharin himself then by someone else. The new principle of opportunist exceptions "in particularly important cases" can find a broad application. The orientation on the opportunist chiefs of the labor movement will be motivated everywhere by the necessity of avoiding intervention. The possibility of building socialism in one country will serve to justify the principle of "non-interference". That is how the various ends will be knotted together into a noose that will strangle to death the revolutionary principles of Bolshevism. An end must be made to this once and for all!

* * *

We must make up for lost time. A broad and politically clear international campaign against war and imperialism is necessary. Our bloc with the General Council is now the principal obstacle in the road of this campaign, just as our bloc with Chiang Kai-Shek was the chief obstacle in the road of the development of the workers' and peasants' revolution in China and, because of that, was utilized by the bourgeois counter-revolution against us. The more acute the international situation becomes, the more the Anglo-Russian Committee will be transformed into an instrument of British and international imperialism against us. After all that has happened, only he can fail to understand who does not want to understand. We have already wasted far too much time. It would be a crime to lose even another day.

Moscow, May 16, 1927

Leon TROTSKY

The Situation in Cuba

THE PROLETARIAT of Cuba faces a situation at the present time which is more or less analogous to that of other colonial or imperialist countries, only more difficult. The Mendieta government, arrived in power under the pressure of the ambassador of the United States, Jefferson Caffery, has been converted into a very efficient instrument of imperialist oppression. To accomplish this destructive mission against the aspirations of the oppressed masses, the government has organized the largest apparatus of oppression ever known in Cuba, under the direction of Batista, the head of the army. It spreads over every inch of the country, from the large cities to the remotest sugar plantations.

The army of Cuba (a country without national frontiers) reaches the exorbitant figure of 18,000 soldiers, with a budget of \$18,000,000, which means, consequently, per capita expenditures higher than in Europe or in America. To this must be added several thousands of men of the technical and secret police who devote themselves exclusively to the political persecution of every person and organization opposed to the government. In addition, there is the rural police, controlled by the municipal

governments, which is only an appendix of the general staff of the army and which collaborates loyally in the persecution of all opponents. In general, the soldiers as well as the police are recruited from the most degenerated social strata, the slum proletariat of the cities and the famished peons of the country. They are very generously paid and enjoy all sorts of privileges which assure their unconditional submission to the government.

To supplement the oppressive apparatus, directed essentially against the working class, exceptional tribunals have been created which judge all affairs of a political nature. These tribunals have put into practice a series of laws of a Fascist nature, like the prohibition of strikes, of trade unions, the suppression of proletarian propaganda. They have likewise prohibited the right of free speech, free assembly, etc. This series of laws, put into effect by the régime of Mendieta and Batista, wipes out all democratic rights and puts the working class of Cuba in a position known only in the completely Fascist countries.

The exceptional tribunals have pronounced sentences of from six months to ten years against members of the Bolshevik-

Leninist party and have condemned our trade union militants for the sale crime of possessing a membership card. At the present time, thirty of our comrades, eminent political and trade union leaders for the most part, are in prison. With the rank and file members of our trade unions, a total of nine hundred workers have been imprisoned, including a minimum of sixty women. These figures refer exclusively to the city of Havana.

Outside of those mentioned above, hundreds of students and petty bourgeois revolutionists have been imprisoned. The repressive conditions are at present undoubtedly much more violent than in the years of the Machado dictatorship. In addition to imprisonment, the number of workers assassinated rises every day.

Strikes. In the month of March, the forces of the working class, assembled around the Committee of Proletarian Defense which is under the influence of the university heads of Havana, and under the pressure of the petty bourgeois oppositional organizations who have an appreciable influence on certain parts of the working class (drivers, railroad workers, printers), engaged in a political general strike supported

by the quasi-unanimity of the functionaries, paralyzing all the activity of the governmental authorities.

Our party, conscious of the weakness of the proletarian organizations, concentrated all its forces on strengthening the Committee of Proletarian Defense created previously (united front) so that the general strike might have a centralized leadership and a chance of victory. But in this proposition we encountered the flat opposition of a part of the Stalinist party which, in the desire to maintain its own hegemony, called for a strike separately from the Committee, and on the other hand, the opposition of the leaders of the students and the petty bourgeoisie, who wanted to precipitate the movement.

Under these conditions, the workers launched themselves spontaneously and without centralized leadership into one of the most extraordinary strikes in the history of the Cuban proletariat. They joined with the functionaries to obtain for themselves the security of job tenure (in Cuba, every faction that takes power proceeds to a new distribution of posts, discharging the former employees).

Martial Law. The government immediately mobilized its entire apparatus. The state of war was proclaimed, thus placing into the hands of the military the power of judging all acts of sabotage resulting from the strike. For three days complete terror reigned. All the inhabitants were invited to stay home after nine o'clock. Even in the day-time it was considered a criminal misdemeanor to walk the streets by twos or more. The police and the military hordes invaded the streets and fired on the workers wherever they dared to assemble. The headquarters of every proletarian organization were raided, sacked and demolished. Our trade union center, the Havana Federation of Labor, was raided, all the furniture in it smashed, the documents taken, and all found there arrested and beaten. The government admits a total of thirty dead, although the figure is actually much higher. Among the dead was our comrade Crescencio Freire, the head of the bakers' union; the student leader Armando Feito and the leader of the Cuban Revolutionary party, Enrique Fernandez, who was a member of the Grau San Martin cabinet. After the general strike, the military tribunal sentenced to death the young revolutionists Jaime Greenstein, who was executed at Santiago de Cuba, and condemned comrade Eduardo Galvez and others to perpetual incarceration.

The strike, for lack of the central leadership which the Bolshevik-Leninist party sought to give it, was unable to resist the formidable attack of the reaction, and terminated in failure. Thousands of workers and thousands of civil employees lost their jobs. The government decreed the dissolution of all the trade unions and sped the condemnation of the arrested. All the foreign militants were expelled. The new civil employees are obliged to belong to the Military Reserves, thus assuring the government a strict control over them. The persecution is becoming increasingly intense. Our comrades imprisoned in the penitentiary of the Isle of Pines are forced to work in the swamps and quarries that surround the prison.

It is under such conditions that our young and weak party is forced to work, but in spite of its relative numerical weakness it is the only party that can lead the Cuban masses to victory.

The Organization of the Workers. In order to understand our problem, account must be taken of the specific characteristics and the social composition of the Cuban people. In Cuba, proportionately speaking, the proletariat is not very numerous and it is only in the large cities that it presents a picture of cohesion and militancy in its economic struggles. The political struggles of the proletariat are of fairly recent origin (the communist party was organized in 1925, but had no influence on the masses until 1929). The proletariat of the sugar plants, in spite of its participation in strikes since 1914, did not engage in the struggle, properly speaking, until during the years 1924-1925 and after the fall of Machado. It constitutes, in general, an unstable group. The sugar worker is engaged in the industry for only three or four months out of the year; the rest of the year he lounges around or begs in the neighboring towns. Agricultural peonage on the sugar cane and tobacco plantations, where the work goes on throughout the year as a rule, is considerable in scope. The peons work under terrible conditions. Despite their low cultural level and their lack of class consciousness, they are nevertheless susceptible to organization, as was proved in the four months of the Grau San Martin government during which there was a certain minimum of democratic rights.

The other factor determining the social composition of Cuba is the petty bourgeoisie. But the Cuban petty bourgeoisie is distinguished from that of other countries by the fact that it does not have an economic base of its own. It is not rooted in small business, in small industry and in small-scale property, but consists exclusively of state employees. It can be defined exactly as a petty bourgeois bureaucracy.

The Parasitism of the Middle Class. The origin of this anomaly derives from the specific interests of American imperialism in Cuba. The principal industries (sugar, tobacco, transportation) belong to United States capital. Wholesale trade belongs to the Spanish bourgeoisie. After the war of independence, the American mediator, faithful to the policy of imperialist penetration, prevented the rehabilitation of the Cuban petty bourgeoisie by making it dependent upon the budget of the new republic. Since the Charles Magoon government, during the second intervention of the United States, the national budget has mounted every year with the sole object of nurturing the growing petty bourgeois bureaucracy. With the prosperity engendered by the high price for sugar during the world war, all went well, but the collapse of prices since 1921 caused a reduction of the budget in spite of the loans contracted on the North American market.

The effects of the crisis were felt very severely by the parasitic petty bourgeoisie. Removed from their bureaucratic positions, they rapidly descended into the ranks of the degenerated slum proletariat. At the crossroads of life and death, the most courageous nuclei flung themselves into battle and a number of militant organizations of

the petty bourgeoisie came to life. The first was the A B C which made its debut under Machado with a democratic program and ended by reaching as openly Fascist ideology. After the fall of Grau San Martin, the Revolutionary party of Cuba, led by him, seemed to express the aspirations of the petty bourgeoisie, but the relative consolidation of Mendieta, the reactionary, and the lack of faith in electoral methods, caused this social layer, in blank despair, to its only way out in . . . insurrection. It then approached the revolutionary organization, *Joven Cuba* [Young Cuba], led by Antonio Guiteras, the Secretary of the Interior in the Grau San Martin cabinet.

The Position of Guiteras. The Young Cuba organization is in essence an amalgam of all sorts of heterogeneous forces of the petty bourgeoisie: conservatives, Centrists, Leftists. The basis of its program is the "anti-imperialist" struggle and it advocates a broad reformist program in favor of the working masses. Guiteras had a broader view than his successors. He had an international perspective for the Cuban revolution. To achieve this goal he had the intention of convening a continental congress in Mexico of all the parties of the Left and he insisted a good deal on inviting all the sections of the International Communist League on the American continent, as he informed our party.

But early in May, Guiteras was taken by surprise by the army near the town of Matanzas, just at the moment of embarking for Mexico. Together with the Venezuelan Colonel Carlos Aponte, he was assassinated.

The death of Antonio Guiteras created a different situation on the Cuban political scene. Our penetration into the ranks of Young Cuba, the sympathy that its members have for our party, open up good perspectives for our organization. The petty bourgeoisie does not want to call a halt to its insurrectionary intentions. It is a question of life or death for it. Here is offered a brilliant opportunity to the proletarian party to demonstrate its abilities of leadership. On the one side, in the terrible situation in which it finds itself, the Cuban proletariat will draw the petty bourgeoisie in its train in whatever insurrectionary movement may come. If our party knows how to mobilize its forces and to take on the form of a vanguard whose voice is heard by the masses, then we shall be able to say that the revolution will be saved.

* * *

But under the present prevailing conditions, the work is very difficult. Our party is lacking in financial resources, cannot publish its press legally, can conduct no legal campaign for collecting funds and must address itself to the proletariat of other countries with the immediate request to come to its assistance. This appeal is addressed in particular to the North American proletariat with which we are united by common fetters of exploitation.

HAVANA.

R. S. de la TORRE

Unser Wort

J. Meichler, B.P. 14, Rue des Pyrenees
Paris 20e.—Preis des Abonnements für
1 Jahr: \$1.20; ½ Jahr: 60c

The Copenhagen Socialist Youth Conference

THE CLOSING of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern nearly coincided with the opening of the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Youth International in Copenhagen. And the parallel extends beyond this coincidence. At both Congresses, the same banal phrases on bourgeois democracy, the same incapacity and the same lack of will to resolve urgent problems in a revolutionary manner, that is, actually to abandon the resolution of them and to leave the task to Fascism. No doubt but that these two Congresses will enter into history as examples of the lowest ideological level that the labor movement ever knew.

The reports of activity at both the Congress of the C. I. and the Congress of the socialist youth at Copenhagen cover a period filled with the most horrible defeats of the labor movement. The bankruptcy of the policy of reformism and of Stalinism expressed itself in the crushing defeats of the German, Austrian and Spanish workers' movements. But the two Congresses only recorded with satisfaction that all these events merely confirmed the correctness of the decisions of the Sixth Congress in Moscow in 1928 or else the Prague Congress of the S.Y.I. in 1931. And with conscience at rest, new and terrible defeats are being prepared for by new flawless decisions.

The very outward aspect of the Copenhagen Congress was extremely pitiful. It was the Danes, the Swedes and the Hollanders who gave their imprint to the congress. Countries like Spain, Switzerland and the United States were not even represented by their own delegates. And thus, the stupid representatives of the Scandinavian countries, who very seriously consider that the relative economic rise and the corresponding relative stability of Scandinavian bourgeois democracy are due to the gifted policy of Scandinavian reformism, proved to be the actual dominators of the Congress. But alas! in reality their stupidity is only the product of the partial boom that exists in Scandinavia and which has its principal roots in the international war preparations. If therefore the narrow policy of the Scandinavian reformists is applied to the countries convulsed to the crisis, the end can only be a horrible catastrophe.

But that is precisely what the president of the S.Y.I., the Hollander Koos Vorrink, whose narrowmindedness surpasses that of the Scandinavians, recommended to the Congress delegates in his opening speech. He called the Scandinavian countries models of socialism and praised as the highest merit of the Scandinavian social democratic parties their having put the interests of the community above the limited interests of the industrial proletariat! An then intoned all the hollow phrases about the renunciation of violence and the "spiritual power of argument", of the "eternal values of democracy and humanity", etc., as if nothing had changed in the last hundred years. Why worry about contradictions when, later on, the president of the Socialist and Labor International, Friedrich Adler—whose evolution from a lion-killer to a flea-cracker was characterized so strikingly in a poem by Erich Mühsam, tortured to death by

Hitler—invited precisely the workers of Italy to direct their arms against the enemy in their own country. Against Mussolini, it seems, the Second International itself recognizes the ineffectiveness of arguments alone. These miserable cretins who called upon the workers clubbed down by the Fascist penitentiary state to engage in armed struggle, but refuse the workers arms in the democratic countries to prevent the victory of Fascism—when will they cease preoccupying themselves with the labor movement?

Particularly characteristic of the reactionary spirit that dominated this Congress is the fact that the declaration of the representative of the youth organization of the Polish Jewish Bund, in which there were such painful words as "revolutionary class struggle", "struggle against social-patriotism", was simply not translated. The same fate was suffered by the speech of the secretary of the Belgian Socialist Young Guards, Godefroid, at the evening festival. Whatever its vague character and its contradictions may have been, it was inspired by a revolutionary spirit. But in order not to upset the harmony, the translator confined himself to reproducing a few phrases on "peace, liberty and socialism" which had nothing to do with Godefroid's speech.

Sunday was reserved for the "day of Nordic democracy" at Malmö, where the reformist state ministers of the "democratic" Nordic countries, who seem to have forgotten entirely that they really represent monarchies and not republics, served up to the youth their insipid wisdom on the advantages of capitalist democracy.

Only two days were reserved for the conference, properly so-called, the afternoon of one being occupied, moreover, by a reception at the City Hall. The opposition to the arch-reformist bureaucracy of the S.Y.I. was led solely by the delegates of the Belgian Socialist Young Guards and the French Socialist Youth, whose value, moreover, is diminished by the fact that a few weeks ago it rid itself of its revolutionary wing. The narrowminded spirit, truly hair-raising, of the Scandinavians and the Hollanders, shows itself in the fact that the debates always revolved around the admissibility of the united front with the C.I. These people have not yet understood the significance of the turn of the C.I. with its complete abandonment of all revolutionary policy. In vain did the press of the miserable Danish section of the C.I. treat the Congress with the greatest benevolence and express the desire that it would contribute to the realization of the "united front of all the friends of progress", of the same progress in whose name Mussolini is proceeding, with Moscow's benediction, to the "abolition of slavery in Ethiopia". The French delegate did all that was in his power to convince his narrowminded colleagues of the absolute candor of the Communist Youth International. The sole result was the adjournment of the question and the turning over of full power to the bureau of the S.Y.I. to examine the results of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern with a view to an eventual realization of

the united front. The same in all the other questions, as for example the question of war; the Belgians and the French who defended the resolutions of the conference of the socialist youth of the Latin countries in Toulouse, remained entirely alone. The majority contented itself with recording the fact that the S.Y.I. is for the maintenance of peace.

Koos Vorrink was not reelected president. But do not rejoice too soon. His successor is H. C. Hansen, president of the Danish section, who yields in nothing to his Holland colleague with respect to reformist narrowness. The secretariat was once more entrusted to the tested hands of the strategist of defeats, Ollenhauer. A little less in his place in this entourage is the Belgian, Fernand Godefroid, the third member of the small bureau.

But another word must be said about the Belgians. For years they have been consoling themselves with the illusion that they will succeed in winning the majority of the S.Y.I. Meanwhile, however, the International has been falling more and more into the hands of the arch-reactionary Scandinavian reformists. The Left wing sections are crushed by the party bureaucracy, as in Switzerland, themselves expel their active revolutionary wing, as in France, or fall into the danger of Stalinist disaggregation, as in Spain. The Socialist Young Guards of Belgium are threatened with the same fate if they lack a firm international perspective. It is not yet too late today. The SflY.G., by means of an uncompromising struggle for the building of a new Youth International, within the frame of the Fourth International, can still exercise an immense attraction and reinforce their own ranks. The eternal compromising with the completely rotten International can lead only to the bureaucracy of the Belgian Labor party, in joint agreement with the bureaucracy of the Youth International, strangling the S.Y.G. at the first opportunity.

All told, the Copenhagen Congress of the S.Y.I. furnished a vivid lesson on the reasons why the proletarian youth falls victim to depression and indifference, while the petty bourgeois youth feels itself drawn to Fascism. The proletarian youth of the highly industrialized countries turns its back upon this narrowminded pretentiousness, this complete inability to say a single serious word about the decisive problems of our epoch. The working youth of the world needs a new international organization with an intransigent revolutionary policy. The Copenhagen Congress will not express the highest degree of the rotting of the workers' movement unless we succeed in building up the new movement. The question of the young proletarian generation is the question of the Fourth International. To work to create sections of the youth on the basis of the Open Letter to all the revolutionary workers' organizations! Then we shall also be in a position to show the road to the Belgian S.Y.G. and to the other elements inspired with a revolutionary will inside the old organizations.

COPENHAGEN

Walter HELD

BOOKS

Philosophy of Confusion

PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM. By JOHN MACMURRAY. 166 pp. New York. John Wiley. \$1.50.

Professor Macmurray's little book, *Philosophy of Communism*, combines occasional deep insights with more frequent deeper contradictions and errors. His intention in writing the book was to explain communist philosophy to those who are interested but know nothing about it. To facilitate understanding, he suggests that the reader avoid two confusions: (1) thinking the Soviet Union a communist society*, and (2) identifying the theory of communism with the steps by which a communist society is achieved. Why he asks his readers to avoid these confusions or why these matters might confuse, he nowhere explains.

At this point, he turns to a consideration of the relation of Hegelianism to dialectical materialism. Communist philosophy, he says, accepts two assumptions of Hegelianism and rejects a third. It willingly accepts the assumptions that (a) "all organic processes are dialectical", and (b) reality is an organic process, but it flatly rejects the assumption (c) that reality is idea. The reasons why it accepts the first two and rejects the third are (1) that nature, the world, is continually evolving or becoming, and (2) that all thinking is subordinate to doing: the principle of the unity of theory and practise.

His analysis of the reasons why communism subordinates ideas to things, subjects ideas to the test of action, is much superior to Stalinist discussions: but we cannot deal with it here. What is of particular interest, however, is his unexpected assertion that the belief in dialectics involves a denial of both *mechanism* and *causal determinism*.† It is impossible to understand why the denial of the first should involve the denial of the second. A statement of this kind can only be based on two criteria: either that of authority or that of argument. As for authority, where in Marx, Engels or Lenin will he find substantiating quotations? As for argument, Professor Macmurray offers none; and he makes this astounding assertion casually as though it were generally accepted by Marxists. His casualness may grow out of the unfortunate confusion of "mechanism" denied by orthodox Marxists, with causality or deter-

minism in general, which has never been denied and is rigorously accepted.

His analysis of the meaning of the "unity of theory and practise" is implemented through the materialist interpretation of history. In essence, he tries to show how the latter derives from the former. Unfortunately for Professor Macmurray, this is not true, for the unity of theory and practise is actually a broad generalization from the universal practise of science. His failure to realize this makes him declare that the assumption of the "unity of theory and practise" is the one principle which Marxists can not cast overboard and remain Marxists. It may also be worth while to add that his re-statement of the materialist conception is set in terms so very different from those used by Marxists, that one is hard put to determine how completely accurate it is. In essentials, however, the theory seems present.

His exposition concludes with two criticisms of Marxian philosophy and a critique of Fascism. Both the criticisms and the critique are a complete exposé of his understanding of Marxism. We begin with the criticisms.

1. The acceptance of the materialist conceptions, Professor Macmurray says, is entirely independent of the labor theory of value. He deduces this from the fact that the labor theory was not essential for his exposition of the materialist conception. The fact, however, that a certain theory is not required for a particular expository purpose does not prove that it is independent of that theory, particularly when the labor theory flows, in fact, inevitably from an application of the materialist conception to any commodity society. The bravado, however, of Professor Macmurray's statement compels us to challenge him to produce an economics based on other assumptions than the labor theory which will explain capitalism as completely and arrive at the same conclusions as Marx. The test of the cooking is in the eating, a proposition to which Professor Macmurray theoretically adheres.

2. Nature and even society, he continues, or rather certain aspects of society like friendship and certain stages of society like the classless society, are super-organic: i.e., not susceptible of explanation by dialectics. Friendship is not susceptible to change and remains the same for all societies, although he admits in another place (p. 74) that economic relations do make a difference. The classless society, too, is non-dialectic, not because it is eternal, but for another reason—it no longer has to adapt itself to its environment, since it has control of natural laws. No arguments are produced to prove this point.

The argument from friendship is insupportable by his own admission. If economic relations make a difference to friendship, then the character of friendship must change according to the character of the economic order. The second point is equal-

ly inadmissible. There can be no meaning to saying that society does not have to adapt itself to its environment because it understands the laws of nature. Such understanding only makes a radical difference in the mode of adaptation; it cannot possibly mean that society has *stopped adapting itself*. Thus Professor Macmurray's contention that there are some things which can not be explained by dialectics, has no foundation, at least, in his own arguments.

His analysis of Fascism is full of mistakes in principle. Fascism, he says, is the negation of politics, since politics is the instrument for the freeing of mankind; and Fascism enslaves. It is also more *revolutionary* than communism, since it tries to reduce politics to a purely economic function, that of administering, not to the interests of freedom, but "for the sake of economic efficiency". The fault, however, is with the communists who have asserted that politics is simply congealed economics. Lastly, it is something new, of which no social system ever dreamed.

It is difficult to imagine an intelligent man, who is even slightly acquainted with Marxism, making such silly mistakes. Fascism is not the negation of politics; only communism can be, for only communism destroys politics by destroying the state. It is as silly to blame communists for asserting that politics is an instrument of economics in the class society, as to blame biologists for pointing out that there is a struggle for existence. Professor Macmurray defines politics, as it ought to be, or, more accurately, as *he* wishes it to be, instead of attempting to determine scientifically its function in society. In his case it is a confusion of politics as an instrument of a class, with the progressive rôle which it does play under given circumstances. In the hands of the proletariat, politics must be ultimately an instrument of freedom, freedom from politics, despite the omnipresent fact that Stalinism, in the Soviet Union, has suppressed fundamental rights of the masses. In the hands of the bourgeoisie, it must be an instrument of oppression. It is nonsensical to say that Fascism exists to produce greater economic efficiency in the general interests of the masses, although unfortunately accompanied with a corresponding loss of freedom. If this were true, Fascism would indeed be more revolutionary than communism.

Fascism superficially has this character for Professor Macmurray through a false analogy. The two dictatorships, the Soviet and the Fascist, are fundamentally different in their social content, in that one is ruled by the proletariat, the other by the bourgeoisie; but they have a *certain* similarity in that both dictatorships take the form of political "dictatorships", i.e., the ruling classes do not rule directly but indirectly through special groups which tyrannize over them. This political "dictatorship" is necessary, at the present stage, for the bourgeoisie of certain countries like Germany or Italy, but it is not necessary for the proletariat. In the proletarian state, its existence is a mark of degeneration. The bourgeoisie accept the costly burden of Fascist control, even though deprived of political rights, for fear of a greater evil: the proletarian dictatorship. The proletariat of the Soviet Union accepts the para-

*At this point, he makes an egregious mistake. He declares the "existence of the dictatorship is inconsistent with the realization of communism" (p. 10). We might ask: "How, then, is it to be realized? What other means exist for its attainment?"

†The phrase "causal determinism" also had a strange sound. It is either a pleonasm or has some unusual meaning known only to Professor Macmurray, since he does not trouble to explain it. Is there any determinism which is not causal?

sitic burden of the bureaucracy for a similar reason: the false fear, propagated by the Soviet ruling apparatus, that its downfall is identical with the overthrow of the proletarian state. In time, the Soviet proletariat will know better. Because of the similarity in the political superstructure of both dictatorships, it was not difficult for Professor Macmurray, who sees the suppression of freedom in the Soviet Union combined with great economic progress, to assume that Fascism is identical in aim with the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, therefore, to consider Fascism, in this sense, even more revolutionary than communism. The truth is, however, the opposite. Fascism is not concerned with greater economic efficiency, which is what the Soviet bureaucracy *must* concern itself with in order to retain power. Fascism is concerned with safeguarding the interests of a decaying bourgeoisie by destroying the organizations of the proletariat and seeing that they remain destroyed. For the bourgeoisie knows that the proletariat, without these organizations, cannot win its freedom from bourgeois oppression. Finally, it is not true to say that Fascism is something new and undreamed-of on the political horizon. The open terroristic dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the bloody suppression politically of the proletariat, was long ago explained by Marx. Its novelty lies only in the forms it has assumed today.

In conclusion, let us say there is only one true remark of any importance made by Professor Macmurray in his entire discussion of Fascism: to wit, that the defeat of Trotsky by Stalin was basically the reason for the recrudescence of Fascism throughout the world. This is only another proof that disturbing truths can come from the lips of people, who, in nearly everything else, are profoundly mistaken.

Reuben GROTE

An American "Germinal"

HORSE SHOE BOTTEMS. By TOM TIPPETT. 297 pp. New York. Harper and Bros. \$2.50.

Tom Tippet's third fellowship from the Guggenheim Foundation enabled him to write his first novel about the people he knows well—the American coal miners. Zola's *Germinal*, which stirred France and became a propaganda weapon for the early French trade union movement, is no longer in a class by itself; *Horse Shoe Bottems* bids well to equal its distinction.

Both books were written about the coal miners of two different countries in the same era. Tippet hopes, however, to complete a trilogy on the life of the miners of this country, leading the story to more recent developments in the coal industry.

Horse Shoe Bottems is the story of English immigrants, who settled in northern Illinois in the early '70's, and manned the first coal mines in that section. The struggle of the mine workers for existence, how they fought and died for an association, is powerfully and authentically recited.

John and Ellen Stafford are the central characters of the moving drama. John works from the early hours of the morning

until late at night exhausting his steely young muscles in the new slope mine. At night the couple plan and dream. One of the young mother's aspirations is to buy a sewing machine—a dream never realized. The Stafford's children grow up; their daddy seldom sees them happily engaged in normal childish activities.

John's employer, Old Bill, a rough and ready Englishman, knows little about business. The newly-made coal operator confides his hopes and misfortunes to the miners, building the future of his coal mine with the welfare of the miners sincerely at heart. Then comes the steady increase in mine operations. Old Bill sells a share of his mine to absentee capital. Young, vigorous American capitalism is penetrating the Middle West. It is just a question of time when the slope ceases to be a paternal institution. Old Bill is squeezed out; the conditions of the miners grow daily worse; the hopes of the English miners in free America soon wanes. The social forces at work in the old country are at work in the newer country.

From the Ohio coal fields come tramp coal diggers to Horse Shoe Bottoms. Many of them were victimized and blacklisted for their initial efforts at unionism. As they roam the country, these tramp coal diggers perform the early ideological work of unionism. They spread the discontent of the miners and inform the men on their way of the new movement of the American coal miners—the Miners' National Association.

Amidst the growing difficulties at the Horse Shoe Bottoms pits comes Sam Haywood of Ohio, one of the blacklisted union pioneers, who gets a job at the slope. In a short time, he has a nucleus of a union established—one of the first converts being John Stafford.

John is sent as a delegate to the Youngstown convention of the Miners' Association. There he meets Siney and James, early mine leaders. The deliberations of the convention do to John what many miners' gatherings have done to hundreds of coal diggers. Unionism is now deeply rooted in his blood; he returns a convinced unionist—a leader in his community.

The author, undoubtedly, has been in a mine explosion. His description of Stafford caught in a mine blast, where 39 of his fellow workers are killed, could not have been written except by one who had undergone the terrible experience of a mine explosion. Tippet in this scene reaches his greatest literary power.

The reactions of little George Dodds' first days in the pit, after his dad gets killed, is a splendid piece of realism. Tippet is greater when he writes about the inside of a mine than when he describes a landscape. You get the feeling that you are down in a mine, swallowed in cadaverous surroundings. The peculiar smell of a shaft, the flickers of tiny oil lamps, that impenetrable darkness—you feel it all as you read the narrative.

What the bourgeois writers see as valor and honor in Knights of the Round Table and the king's musketeers, Tippet sees in his coal diggers and their women with their uncompromising struggle for their ideal, their union; their self-sacrificing spirit, giv-

ing their lives almost consciously for the cause. Eliza Evans, midwife and all around Samaritan of the coal camp, is realistically described.

Perhaps Tippet's greatest gift as a writer is his ability to put down, black on white, how people feel—that thing we call emotions. His power, in this instance, is to describe the emotions of human beings tossed in the turbulent waters of the class war. Throughout all the blackness of the coal mine struggles the writer sees beauty and he compares the zeal and devotion of his workers with the scenery of a northern Illinois hillside in the Spring.

The coal operators, in their lust for profits, are not spared. Their stupidity and cupidity, their barbarism against the coal miner and his family, are exposed in no uncertain terms. Tippet hates the coal operators and hates the system that breeds their kind.

Even in death Tippet's characters have courage. John Stafford and many of his kind died directly or indirectly, victims of the struggle or the industry. But in the cause for which they gave their single lives there still lives the union and what it basically stands for.

Horse Shoe Bottems is a powerful book. I am happy that one of our coal diggers has developed the talent to record our people's indictment of the savage capitalist system.

Gerry ALLARD

In One And The Same Issue

In *The October Revolution*, by Joseph Stalin, recently issued by International Publishers in New York, we find the following two quotations:

On p. 30: "All practical work in connection with the organization of the uprising was done under the immediate direction of comrade Trotsky, the president of the Petrograd Soviet. It can be stated with certainty that *the party is indebted primarily and principally to comrade Trotsky* for the rapid going over of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and the efficient manner in which the work of the Military-Revolutionary Committee was organized. . . ." (*Pravda*, No. 241, November 6, 1918.)

On pp. 71-72: ". . . Comrade Trotsky, *did not get on the practical center*, which was called upon to lead the uprising. How can this be reconciled with the current notion about comrade Trotsky's special rôle? . . . Yet there is nothing strange about it, for comrade Trotsky, who was a relative newcomer in our party in the period of October, *did not, and could not have played any special rôle* either in the party or in the October uprising. . . . All talk about a special rôle of comrade Trotsky is a legend, spread by obliging 'party' gossip-mongers. . . ." (*Pravda*, No. 263, November 26, 1924.)

The italics are ours throughout.

At Home

COMRADE Trotsky, from his exile in Norway, assures us that he will henceforth participate as an active collaborator, contributing regularly to our magazine. We believe we can interpret this to mean that not one issue will appear without one or more of his penetrating articles dealing with the important questions of the international political situation and with the tasks of the international revolutionary movement.

But comrade Trotsky deplores the irregular appearance of our magazine. We all do. However, we shall try not to dwell on this point or to repeat past excuses. On the contrary, our problem is to make a turn, as it is popularly called, and to insure a regular and stable appearance. We propose to accomplish this in the following two ways: First by changing the frequency of publication for a short period. This issue has therefore become the October issue instead of the September issue. The next issue will be dated December, to appear, however, before November 20; we shall then have caught up with the calendar and each subsequent issue will follow monthly. Secondly, we propose to accomplish this by extending our circulation.

With this issue we make the start of a large-scale campaign for subscriptions of which the readers will find some further details on the other side of this back cover.

Our magazine speaks so well for itself that we can ask anyone who has read one or more issues to become a subscriber. As an example we quote from a letter received a few days ago from Cape Town, South Africa: "I wish in a small way to express the deep gratitude felt by the comrades here to the American comrades. First, the *Militant* and now the *New Militant* and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, have been the educators of the Bolshevik-Leninist cadres in South Africa. It is now our task to put into practise the Marxian theory, which has been inculcated into us chiefly through these organs of the working class, and to pass on to the workers of South Africa this theoretical weapon."

In our subscription campaign we do not intend to proceed in the usual manner of such campaigns, or with much ballyhoo. That would not conform to the standard of our magazine, and it is not necessary. We

do not offer special prizes in the campaign, considering that likewise as not necessary. Our readers are among the most active participants and the most serious minded students of the labor movement, who are interested essentially in its fundamental problems. Our magazine is so highly esteemed that the effective participation in the spreading of the ideas of living Marxism, for which it is the outstanding spokesman, will be sufficient reward.

To all party branches and bundle agents

we will send special communications and give special details for the campaign. To our readers we say: Here is the way to assist us in assuring the regular, stable appearance of our magazine. It will help to bring in much needed funds and above all it will spread the idea that we support in common.

In this subscription campaign we consider it of the utmost importance to secure the cooperation of all of our readers.

THE MANAGER

An Announcement of Capital Importance

To Be Published During 1935-1936

The Selected Works of Leon Trotsky

1. THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN.
2. THE STALIN SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION.
3. THE REVOLUTION OF 1905.
4. THE REVOLUTION OF 1917.
5. SEVEN YEARS OF WORLD POLITICS.
6. PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION—II.

A prospectus with full details will be mailed on request.....

Help make these great Marrian classics available by purchasing a PIONEER CERTIFICATE (\$10.00). In addition to being a contributor to this essential work, you will also be entitled to 30% discount on all PIONEER publications and 15% on books of any other publisher.

If you are unable to pay the full \$10.00 at once, you will receive the full benefits of a certificate holder upon remittance of \$5.00 and the balance within 90 days.

DON'T DELAY—MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TODAY!

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

100 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

Enclosed please find \$..... for.....certificate (s). I understand this entitles me to 30% discount on all PIONEER publications and 15% on books of any other publisher. Send my certificate to:

Name

Address State

[] Send me THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN as soon as it is off the press (\$1.50). Price to certificate holders, \$1.00.

ANY BOOK

reviewed or advertised

in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

or elsewhere

may be secured post-free from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

100 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

Send for book list containing all the important books dealing with Marxism and the labor movement published in the U. S. and England.

The Readers Have The Floor



WITH the appearance of our first issue, in July last year, we laid claim to the title of a theoretical organ of revolutionary Marxism.

Now we ask our readers: Have we lived up to that claim? The readers have the floor. What will be the answer?

We can say for our part that we have endeavored conscientiously to fill the great need for such an organ. From many readers we have received assurance again and again of sympathy and support. Such magnificent response proves that our endeavors have not been in vain.

ACTION NOW NEEDED

BUT now we call upon *all of our readers* to express their evaluation of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL in concrete terms. We call upon *all of our readers* to translate their sentiments of sympathy into action.

In short, we are preparing to enter a large scale campaign to extend our circulation. *All of our readers* can help in this task. In fact, we count upon every one of you.

WILL YOU ASSIST?

IF YOU really value the magazine and feel that its militant and fearless defense of living Marxism merits the attention and careful study of other serious-minded and intelligent workers, then we have no doubt you will assist us in extending its circulation. You may not agree entirely with everything the magazine presents. But that should not stand in the way. If you think it fills a need you will help us obtain new readers.

Here is what you can do: Ask your friend, your shopmate or your fellow unionist to become a subscriber to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Our low subscription rate will facilitate your task. One yearly subscription—to be more exact, 12 issues—is only \$1.50. But should your friend have only \$1.00 to spare at the moment, this will bring him or her the maga-

zine for seven issues. Canadian and foreign subscriptions are \$1.75 per year.

A PERFECT COMBINATION

MANY militant workers and students of the labor movement feel the need of theoretical education. They want to study the fundamentals of Marxism in order to be equipped to face the crucial problems of the movement. But their own activity requires, in addition to this, also a Marxian interpretation of the day-to-date events. The *New Militant*, our weekly organ, is a means to fill this requirement.

To such comrades we present again our combination offer of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *New Militant*, both for one year at the price of \$2.00. This gives the possibility of filling both requirements.

But the combination offer at this price holds good only for a very limited period of time. Soon the *New Militant* will be enlarged to an eight-page weekly and its subscription price will change.

WHAT WILL BE THE ANSWER?

NOW we have presented our proposition. We believe it is feasible. THE NEW INTERNATIONAL brings you a Marxian survey of the international political situation and a Marxian analysis of the American scene, its politics, its struggles and its labor movement. Penetrating articles on fundamental principles of strategy and tactics are contained in every issue, together with much other valuable material from the field of culture, arts and sciences. If you sincerely appreciate it, you will want others to read it.

We now ask you the final question: Will you enlist to participate in our campaign to extend our circulation? Will you pledge to send in your first subscription before the next issue appears?

When *all of our readers* enlist in this campaign and work jointly with us it will take but little time to double our circulation. This is our aim. Are you ready for action?

The readers have the floor. What will be the answer?