

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

Coughlin's Rise

By the Editors

The Bonapartist Philosophy of the State

By Leon Trotsky

Old Garbage in New Pails

By Max Shachtman

The Crisis of Zionism

Two Articles from Palestine

The War In China and Japan

A Letter from Shanghai

At Home

S. O. S.

THE entire edition of 4,500 copies of the popular May number of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is sold out, and yet—

IT IS NOW FOR OUR READERS, AND PARTICULARLY THE S.W.P. AND Y.P.S.L. UNITS TO DECIDE IF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL IS TO CONTINUE. . . . TO ANSWER YES! at least two things need to be carried through at once:

1. All supporters, especially Party and Y.P.S.L. units, must SERIOUSLY UNDERTAKE A SUBSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN within two weeks.

2. Party and Y.P.S.L. units must PROMPTLY PAY FOR THEIR OUTSTANDING BUNDLE ORDERS.

Short of immediate, decisive and positive steps to accomplish these two elementary, but now determining tasks, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL WILL QUICKLY DISAPPEAR FROM THE SCENE. The foreign countries have more than done their share to maintain the magazine. Indeed it is time we rendered more aid to financially weaker places abroad. The responsibility for the immediate future of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL today rests with the American comrades.

* * *

In recent issues of the "At Home" column, we began to point out certain delinquencies and inadequacies of important Party and Y.P.S.L. units, and to suggest remedies. As these notes are written, the following localities WILL NOT RECEIVE BUNDLES OF THE JUNE NUMBER, unless, by the time the June issue goes to press, payments on bundle accounts will have been forthcoming:

LOCAL SAN FRANCISCO: Bundle discontinued already with May issue for non-payment of bills. No good reasons have been given for repeated negligence by the San Francisco organization.

OAKLAND, Cal.: Non-payment of bills for several months; N. I. office not in a position to carry any longer.

DOWNTOWN BRANCH, NEW YORK: Slow in paying bills, although one of largest branches in city. Does poorest job of any important Party branch in the country. In view of presence in Branch of other-

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Volume V June 1939 Number 6 (Whole No. 33)

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles: 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board: **JAMES BUENHAM, MAX SHACHTMAN**
Business Manager: **MARTIN ABERN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Editors' Comment	163
The Bonapartist Philosophy of the State, by <i>Leon Trotsky</i>	166
Class Politics in Palestine, by <i>L. Rock</i>	169
A Program of Action for Palestine, by <i>Haor</i>	173
Popular Education in Crisis, by <i>Dwight Macdonald</i>	176
Old Garbage in New Pails, by <i>Max Shachtman</i>	179
The National Question in Central Europe, by <i>Jan Buchar</i>	182
Australia Cognita, by <i>N. Origlasso</i>	185
The War in China and Japan, by <i>X</i>	187
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Ireland and Ulster, by <i>V. F.</i>	189
Zionism and the Arabs, by <i>Naomi Handleman</i>	191
Inside Front Cover: At Home	

wise active and leading members, what appears to be a general indifference to the fate of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is incomprehensible. Literature agent E. Konikow makes steady efforts for improvement, but quantity handled, subscriptions secured, etc., have decreased. This branch will receive further consideration on another occasion.

SEATTLE, WASH.: Non-payment of bills. Unemployment cited.

Till now bundles have been sent free to field organizers in South Bend, Ind., Wichita, Kans., and other places. But unless larger units pay their bills, this assistance will have to cease. Moreover, the business office has been carrying several cities, such as Flint, Mich., because members were unemployed. This, too, cannot be done any longer until the magazine's income picks up again considerably.

Several other cities, whose names we do not mention here (anticipating improvement) will hereafter not receive their bundles unless payments are made more regularly and back accounts paid up. A considerable amount of money is outstanding with the Party units. If the payments come forth quickly, the magazine will more easily weather the summer period. The management has no wish to act drastically; this is done only when there is

a choice of publication or non-publication of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL itself. In such circumstances, the general good and interest have to prevail over particular local situations. The comrades will understand that: hence now is the time to cooperate and assist the magazine.

* * *

Four hundred (400) SUBSCRIPTIONS which expired in recent months, still remain TO BE RENEWED. Many renewals have been obtained by direct correspondence of the management. But experience demonstrates that to get almost 100% RESPONSE IN RENEWALS, the Party and Youth members must assist by visiting the readers of the magazine for renewals. This is not a hard task, but has to be carried out within two weeks. *Important revenue* can thereby accrue for THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, which has so far maintained itself almost entirely through circulation. Moreover, direct contacts are thus retained by the Party and Y.P.S.L. for utilization in other activities. The response to the RENEWAL SUBSCRIPTION DRIVE may be decisive for the regular appearance of the magazine during the summer months. Party and Y.P.S.L. members, do you want THE NEW INTERNATIONAL to continue? If

you do, SUBSCRIBE YOURSELF AND TAKE PART IN A DRIVE FOR RENEWALS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS!

* * *

The bulk of the subscriptions to be renewed are in Greater New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Newark, San Francisco, Cleveland and Boston.

Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Louis are making systematic efforts to obtain renewal subscriptions and we confidently expect good results there. In New York the efforts of Mary Green, City NEW INTERNATIONAL agent, have brought results; the Teachers Branch in the past has done very well in this respect, but of late there has been a let-down. From the Upper West Side Branch, Chet Manes, agent, several renewal subscriptions have been brought in. But in Greater New York, far, far more needs to be done in the field of subscriptions. . . . The combination offer of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and *Big Business and Fascism* by D. Guerin should make it easier to obtain subscriptions.

Special mention must be made of the work of the Y.P.S.L. agent in New York, Sol Dollinger. Under his direction the Y.P.S.L. is responding better than in any previous period with the magazine. Likewise the Y.P.S.L. Unit in Berkeley, Cal. continues to do a nice job of circulating the magazine and comrade S. T. writes that there will be no let-up despite the summer and vacations. It can be done! The Y.P.S.L. organization in Chicago is cooperating in a joint subscription drive with the Party. Sam Richter of the S.W.P. and Max Weinrib of the Y.P.S.L. are in charge. We have no doubt of the best results, knowing the calibre of the Chicago Y.P.S.L. particularly. . . . Subscriptions! More subscriptions! And still more subscriptions! That is the need today.

* * *

The printer says, that's enough—the type won't stretch. But this should be enough anyway, comrades, for you to get to work so that it can continue to be said: "The finest Marxist magazine published in any language." (*Havana, Cuba* reader.) And: "The best and ONLY Marxist theoretical paper in the world that appears in the English language." (*London, England* readers.)

THE MANAGER

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME 5

JUNE 1939

No. 6

The Editor's Comment

The Bankruptcy of the New Deal and of Capitalist Democracy Is Generating a Native Fascist Movement which Exploits the Growing Sentiment for a Radical Change—The Rise of Father Coughlin and the Evolution of His Program—How Not to Fight Against Fascism—The Burning Need of a Workers' Defense Guard—The End of the Zionist Illusion

FOR TEN YEARS, NOW, seven to seventeen million men in this country have been unemployed. Many millions more have been working part-time. Every year an estimated five to six hundred thousand youth reach "employable age"; a large percentage of these never get jobs of any kind. A few million of the unemployed have had relief jobs on W.P.A. or C.C.C. The average wage on W.P.A. has been \$55 per month; C.C.C. pays \$20 per month. The remaining millions are kept at a minimum, or below-minimum subsistence level through various forms of home relief.

The existence of a permanent large body of unemployed is the surest symptom of the mortal illness of a social system. It was to be found in the dying days of Greece, in the decadent years of the Roman Empire, at the end of the Middle Ages. The social system proves its incurable malady by being unable to utilize and integrate its own members. The unemployed are transformed into an alien growth, a cancer on the social organism. And, like a cancer, the unemployed are a continuous threat of violent disturbance to the entire organism. So it was in Athens, where the impoverished unemployed citizens were whipped into frenzies by the latest demagogue. So, also, in Rome, where the "proletariat" flocked to the circuses and rioted in the streets. So, too, in the late Middle Ages, when the dispossessed serfs roamed in disordered bands through the countrysides and gathered raggedly together for vain and terrible rebellions.

It is not different with us. Is anyone so foolish as to imagine that these ten years leave the unemployed where they began? For one year, two years, the mass unemployment could seem like an accident, a visitation of God or a "natural" catastrophe. For three or four or five years, the New Deal with its smiling leader promising milk and honey for the forgotten man could comfort them with dreams. But an accident that lasts forever is no longer an accident; and all dreams come to an end.

What is happening in the minds of the unemployed, of the five hundred thousand youth thrown yearly into the job-empty labor market? Few questions are more momentous for the future.

Some of the unemployed, especially the oldest unemployed, have sunk into an utter demoralization which re-

sults in a passivity so hopeless that probably nothing will again rouse them. But the growing demoralization of others is of a different kind: it brings about not an ineradicable passivity, but a breakdown in the sense of social responsibility, in the habitual patterned modes of behavior imposed by society, and consequently produces a potential readiness for *any* line of action that promises a sudden break out of the suffocating blind alley.

In short, the unemployed of this country are becoming ready for revolution: if not the genuine revolution of socialism, then the pseudo-revolution of fascism.

Some Popular Illusions

FASCISM—THE BONAFIDE, genuine article—is a strange and seemingly paradoxical synthesis. It is at one and the same time a great, plebeian *mass movement*, and a mechanism whereby the small handful of chiefs of big business preserve their rule in the era of capitalist decay. It is not fascism unless or until it is both of these. It may start as either one, at first quite independent of the other; but it is only when the two fuse that we have fascism in the full sense. Naturally fascism appears entirely different to the plebeians in the ranks from what it does to the big business directors. Many widespread errors about the nature of fascism are caused by analyzing it from the point of view of only one of its two interlocked aspects; if we do not understand both we are condemned to disastrous confusion. With our eyes on the mass movement we can be led to think of fascism as *anti-capitalist*—a rather common illusion at present in this country, employed often in articles written about Germany. With our eyes on big business, we can pretend, as the Stalinists do, that the Hoovers and Garners are fascist leaders—and if we think that, we will not even recognize real fascism as it arises.

In the current discussions of fascism, every painfully won rule of scientific method as applied to political and social phenomena is being discarded by our "anti-fascist" publicists. We are told that fascism is a "foreign product", imported by paid agents from Italy and Germany. We are told that it is artificially foisted upon innocent and unsuspecting masses by a cynically skillful and clever demagogue—the leader. We are told (by Silone, among others, for example) that the fascist *ideology*, by its own power,

and fascist demagoguery deceives and captures the minds of masses.

If it were only this easy! If fascism were merely a foreign product, an arbitrary ideology skillfully manipulated by demagogues, there would then be no need for us to worry. Isolated individuals, tiny groups here and there, can take up a foreign product, can adopt an arbitrary ideology (like theosophy or the theories of Glenn Voliva, the sage of Zion City). But great mass movements, we learned once and should not have altogether forgotten, grow only out of a soil which itself contains the chemicals required to nourish them; and an ideology captures the minds of masses for more than a brief moment only when that ideology is *not* arbitrary but corresponds—even if distortedly and in the long run deceptively—to the intellectual and physical needs of those masses.

Think of the unemployed. Is it not a fact that for ten years they have been learning on their own hides that for them there is nothing to hope for from democratic capitalism? And is this not what fascism tells them—the truth, so far as it goes? Will they believe forever Roosevelt and Browder and Lewis, who tell them what they know in their own lives to be a lie? Have they not been discovering for over six years that the New Deal is a fraud, that it has not given and will not give them jobs? This is what the fascists tell them. Are they not justified in believing the fascists here, rather than the lies about the New Deal that they hear from Dubinsky and the *New Leader* and the *Daily Worker*? Is it not a fact that every branch of the present government and both of the bourgeois democratic parties are shot through and through with corruption? The fascists say so. Is it not true, or at least part of the truth, that the big banks strangle the productive life of the country through their control of money and credit? The fascists stress the vicious rôle of the big banks—even though they give this fact an anti-Semitic twist. Is it not equally a fact that Roosevelt is trying to drag us into a war for the sake of big business? And will not the unemployed, especially the unemployed youth, be the first to die on the battlefields of that war? Lewis and Browder do not explain this to the unemployed, but the fascists do.

Yes, even when we come to fascism's carefully formulated anti-trade union agitation, we do not enter the realm of mere primitive savagery in which Silone thinks fascism dwells. Here too we can find an intelligible, if perverted, correspondence with life as it actually seems to vast numbers of the unemployed (or small farmers or petty business men). Is it not a fact that there is a desperate competition for jobs in the labor market, and that in this competition the unemployed are those who have lost out? And is it not true also that by and large the unions protect the employed, not the unemployed; even, through seniority rules and the like, constituting in some cases more effective barriers to unemployed men than even the employers (who would prefer to dip into the ranks of the unemployed in order to depress the general wage level)? In many trades and industries, the union can appear to an unemployed youth as an insurmountable obstacle to a job.

It is hard to think the question all the way through to the end, to socialism. The unemployed want jobs and a meaning in life. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs in the governmental bureaucracy: why should they not

have them, rather than the incumbent democrats? Jews, some Jews, have jobs; some Jews are rich. With a little assistance, it is easier to blame Jews for trouble than to set out to re-make the world. And the unemployed are ready for action, not postcards to Congress. They won't get it from Lewis or Browder; the fascists will give them plenty.

The Shrine of the Little Flower

WE ARE NOT WRITING about what *might* be, in some dim and distant future. We are writing about today, about what is happening now. The first wave in the growth of fascism as a *mass* movement in this country has begun.

The Nazi Bund is not American fascism. The Bund is, exactly, a "foreign product", and there is not a chance in the world that it will be the authentic fascist movement in this country. The Bund has nevertheless an importance for the future of American fascism. Its prominence and boldness and nation-wide meetings during the past six months show, for one thing, how ripe the seeds are. And the Bund is teaching the native fascists many a crucial lesson: teaching how to organize; how to conduct meetings; how to train storm troops; how to use weapons; how to employ anti-Semitism; how to be scornful of democracy and democrats and democratic laws; and how to be bold.

The recent ballyhooed Dies' witnesses—Gilbert, "retired Wall Street broker", the head of the Knights of the White Camellias, General Van Horn Moseley—sound like crackpots. And these, too, are hardly going to lead the mass movement of the future. But they are not quite so cracked as they seem; and they too are symptoms. They have a nose for what is in the air. Moseley barnstorms through the country, and audiences, often large audiences, listen. He has discarded the sacred platitudes of liberalism. He does not hesitate to speak violence and revolution and concentration camps. The *Herald-Tribune*, read by so many bankers and big business men, prints daily news reports from his tours.

Mayor Hague, in spite of his recent electoral reverses, is a portent that has not been forgotten. He is too old, too much still of an old-fashioned boss, too primitive as a social demagogue to be decisive as an individual leader in the fascism of the future. But he also has been teaching many lessons: to big business, observing quietly; and to young-hopeful demagogues.

The Coughlin movement, however, has made the leap. Father Coughlin, after more than a year of retirement from the radio and the public eye, has come back on the scene in a costume not at all the same as that which he wore during his former appearance. Then, in spite of what many said, he was a fairly typical middle-class "radical" in the Populist tradition, with words and habits often known in this country. Upton Sinclair hailed him as an ally and co-thinker. During the Epic campaign, Sinclair's longest stop on his trip East was at the Shrine of the Little Flower, and he reported on his return to California that Coughlin was 100% back of Epic.

But what is the fascist ideology but typical middle-class radicalism stepped up to high gear against a background of profound social crisis? The gulf from one to the other can be crossed by an easy jump—let the Sinclairs and

Ameringers take full note.

Father Coughlin is now a fascist, and is building a fascist mass movement. A March letter from Royal Oak reads, in part, as follows:

Unquestionably you are one of the Christian Americans who recognizes that we are face to face in a fight with anti-Christ. Christ's divinity is denied. His social order is rejected. His doctrine of brotherhood is flouted. His charity is virtually scorned. Anti-Christ is riding high, wide and handsome.

Meanwhile, the Jews of America have not officially condemned Communism. Meanwhile, the government of America is fostering relations with Communistic states. And meanwhile, the people of America are suffering from the rule of those who are opposed to our Christ.

It is very well to quote the Scripture and say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." But it is just as appropriate to remember that our battling is not against flesh and blood but against powers and principalities and rulers dwelling in high places.

Let's be militant and fight these people to the bitter end, cost what it may. Our Christ Who was crucified was no weakling when He drove the money changers from the temple by physical force. The day has come when we must stand up and fight for all that we hold dear.

The call to action is not going unheeded. In city after city, the movement is growing. Salesmen carry each issue of *Social Justice* into the most populous sections. Trained squads—unemployed youth as a rule—stay close by each salesman, ready to act, and acting, whenever a disturbance begins. The slogans, from the anti-war demagogy to the anti-Semitic filth, are sung out boldly—hawked in New York, for example, even in the heart of the most heavily Jewish districts of the Bronx. The cops are friendly, of course, and lend a hand against any objectors in the crowds. There is a fight nearly every night on the New York streets now.

Social Justice knows what it is doing. It is well and dramatically printed. Below its masthead is a firm and radical platform, wonderfully adopted to the hopes and prejudices of those to whom it is appealing. Its careful anti-Semitism masks itself with pious disavowals of racialism. Appeals to all the sentiments surrounding family and home and flag and religion alternate with slashing attacks on liberalism and communism and atheism. Yes, it is even running a \$15,000 cash prize anti-war essay contest.

It is doubtful, perhaps, that a Catholic priest can in this country be the leader of the definitive fascist movement. But this doesn't make the Coughlin enterprise any the less dangerous. His followers are being shaped into real fascists, and they will be ready to fuse into a broader movement where Coughlin himself may work largely behind the scenes. But you will not find it so simple to make them understand that they are becoming fascists.

How Not to Fight the Fascists

THE SOCIAL CRISIS in this country is deepening far more rapidly than any but a few yet realize. The fascist movement, though still in its first stage, is now advancing at a faster rate than the labor movement. If this continues, fascism will conquer here also.

What are we going to tell those who are now beginning to move toward Coughlin's banner? Are we going to tell them to put faith in the New Deal, to rely on it to protect us against reaction? How absurd, absurd on the face of

it when once we understand what we are dealing with. They are turning to fascism precisely because they are fed up with the New Deal and with democratic capitalism in general. We have got to tell the truth: that democratic capitalism is finished, that it is time to overthrow it, not by the pseudo-revolution of fascism but by the genuine revolution of socialism.

Are we going to let ourselves be fooled into imagining that the fascist danger to the United States lies abroad, in Berlin and Rome? This would be the surest way in which to guarantee the victory of fascism at home. This is the central crime of the "anti-fascists" who ask us to fight fascism by enlisting in Roosevelt's coming war against Germany. Native fascism, the fascism that is the real and main danger, blossoms and flourishes unchecked under protection of the illusory anti-fascist drive which is actually only a drive for support of imperialist war. To fight fascism at home means to fight *against* the war.

And will the growing fascist ranks be hindered by the postcards to Congress, the long editorials, the appeals to reason and decency, the reliance on liberals and the institutions of liberal capitalism? This is what we are told; and Hague and the Bund and the Coughlinites are answering. The whole fascist movement is predicated upon the collapse of "democracy" and scorn and rejection of democratic institutions—except so far as these can be used to their own ends. And their analysis and attitude are correct, and these institutions will not stand against them. That is why they can be fought only upon a different basis and through different means: relying not on democratic capitalism—whose decay and senility is proved by the very rise of fascism itself—but on the independently organized class strength of the workers. Against the demagogy of the fascists, only a bold and comprehensive program of revolutionary economic and political demands—demands breaking resolutely with the capitalist *status quo* and leading to a fundamental reorganization of the social order—will serve. Against the troops of the fascists only the troops of the workers, the anti-fascist workers' guard, trained and disciplined and bold, will stand. The first lesson to be drawn from the transformation of Coughlinism into the first stage of a mass fascist movement is: the workers' defense guard must be built, not tomorrow, but now.

The End of an Illusion

THE ILLUSION THAT the Jewish question could be solved, if not entirely then at least in large part, by the munificent promise of British imperialism to establish a "Jewish homeland" in Palestine, has come to an end with the issuance of the latest White Paper of the Chamberlain Government, which restricts Jewish immigration to Palestine and regulates the maximum ratio of the Jewish population in that country to the Arab population as one to two. With the illusion ends also the basis of the Zionist movement, faithful flunkey of the British Empire and reactionary influence both among the Jews and the Arabs.

Yet, however revolting are the lamentations of the Zionist politicians over the failure of Britain's ruling class—acting, to be sure, in its own sordid imperialist interests—to repress the Arab majority by force of arms so that they might be ruled over by the Zionist agents of London, a

more fundamentally significant fact should not be lost sight of. With all its grandiloquent pretensions, capitalism has been unable to resolve the Jewish problem. Worse yet, in its period of disintegration capitalism actually exacerbates the problem by generating everywhere and on an unprecedented scale the poison of anti-Semitism. Is there a sane and serious person left today who will argue that the Jewish problem can be solved within the framework of the present incurably decadent social order?

Elsewhere in this issue, as on previous occasions, we

publish articles on the Jewish question, with particular reference to Palestine, which we invited from contributors. Although they do not express the views of the editors—they are indeed in sharp conflict with them on many points—we feel justified in presenting them to our readers as contributions to the discussion of the problem that has reached an unheard-of stage of acuteness in recent times.

A contribution to the discussion expressing our own point of view will appear in an early issue of the review.

The Bonapartist Philosophy of the State

ONE OF THE CENTRAL POINTS in Stalin's report at the 18th Party Congress in Moscow was undoubtedly a new theory of the state promulgated by him. Stalin ventured into this dangerous field not from any innate inclination but out of necessity. Only a short time ago, the jurists Krylenko and Pashukanis, both orthodox Stalinists, were removed and crushed for having repeated the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin to the effect that socialism implies a gradual withering away of the state. This theory cannot possibly be accepted by the reigning Kremlin. What, wither away so soon? The bureaucracy is only beginning to live. Krylenko and Pashukanis are obviously—"wreckers".

The Realities of Soviet Life

The realities of Soviet life today can indeed be hardly reconciled even with the shreds of old theory. Workers are bound to the factories; peasants are bound to the collective farms. Passports have been introduced. The freedom of movement has been completely restricted. It is a capital crime to come late to work. Punishable as treason is not only any criticism of Stalin but even the mere failure to fulfill the natural duty to get down on all fours before the "Leader". The frontiers are guarded by an impenetrable wall of border-patrols and police dogs on a scale heretofore unknown anywhere. To all intents and purposes, no one can leave and no one may enter. Foreigners who had previously managed to get into the country are being systematically exterminated. The gist of the Soviet constitution, "the most democratic in the world", amounts to this, that every citizen is required at an appointed time to cast his ballot for the one and only candidate handpicked by Stalin or his agents. The press, the radio, all the organs of propaganda, agitation and national education are completely in the hands of the ruling clique. During the last five years no less than half a million members, according to official figures, have been expelled from the party. How many have been shot, thrown into jails and concentration camps, or exiled to Siberia, we do not definitely know. But undoubtedly hundreds of thousands of party members have shared the fate of millions of non-party people. It would be extremely difficult to instill in the minds of these millions, their families, relatives and friends, the idea that the Stalinist state is withering away. It is strangling others, but gives no sign of withering. It

has instead brought the state to a pitch of wild intensity unprecedented in the history of mankind.

Yet the official edict is that socialism has been realized. According to the official text, the country is on the road to complete communism. Berya will disabuse the doubters. But here the main difficulty presents itself. To believe Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the state is the organ of class rule. Marxism has long ago exposed all other definitions of the state as theoretical falsifications which serve to cover up the interests of the exploiters. In that case, what does the state mean in a country where "classes have been destroyed"? The sages in the Kremlin have more than once wracked their brains over this question. But, of course, they first proceeded to arrest all those who reminded them of the Marxian theory of the state. Since this alone cannot suffice, it was necessary to provide some semblance of theoretical explanation for Stalinist absolutism. Such an explanation was forthcoming in two installments. At the Seventeenth Party Congress, five years ago, Stalin and Molotov explained that the police state was needed for the struggle against the "remnants" of old ruling classes and especially against the "splinters" of Trotskyism. These remnants and splinters, they said, were, to be sure, insignificant. But because they were extremely "rabid" the struggle against them demanded utmost vigilance and ruthlessness. This theory was exceptionally idiotic. Why should a totalitarian state be required for a struggle against "impotent remnants" when Soviet democracy proved wholly adequate for the overthrow of the ruling classes themselves? No answer was ever given to this question.

But even so, this theory of the era of the Seventeenth Congress had to be discarded. The last five years have in a large measure been devoted to destroying the "splinters of Trotskyism". The party, the government, the army, and the diplomatic corps have been bled white and beheaded. Things had gone so far that Stalin at the last Congress was forced, in order to calm his own apparatus, to promise that he would not in the future resort to wholesale purges. This is, of course, a lie. The Bonapartist state will find itself compelled likewise in the future to devour society physically as well as spiritually. This cannot be admitted by Stalin. He swears that purges will not be renewed. If that is so, and if the "splinters" of Trotskyism together with the "remnants" of old ruling classes have been completely destroyed, then the question arises: "Against whom is the state necessary?"

This time, Stalin replies: "The need of the state arises from the capitalist encirclement and the dangers flowing therefrom to the land of socialism." With the monotony of a theology student that is so habitual with him, he repeats and rehashes this idea over and over again: "The function of military suppression within the country has fallen away, has withered away . . . the function of military defense of the country from outside attacks has remained completely preserved." And further on: "As regards our army, our punitive organs and our intelligence service, their barb is aimed no longer inwardly within the country, but outwardly against the external enemy."

Stalin Refutes His Old Theory

Let us for the sake of argument allow that all this is actually the case. Let us allow that the need of preserving and strengthening the centralized bureaucratic apparatus arises solely from the pressure of imperialism. But the state by its very nature is the rule of man over man. Socialism on the other hand aims to liquidate the rule of man over man in all its forms. If the state is not only preserved but strengthened, becoming more and more savage, then it means that socialism has not yet been achieved. If the privileged state apparatus is the product of capitalist encirclement then it means that in a capitalist encirclement, in an isolated country, socialism is not possible. Trying to extricate his tail, Stalin is thus caught by the snout. Justifying his Bonapartist rule, he refutes in passing his principal theory of building socialism in one country.

Stalin's new theory is correct, however, only in that section which refutes his old theory; in everything else it is entirely worthless. For the struggle against imperialist danger, the workers' state naturally requires an army, a commanding staff, an intelligence service, *etc.* But does this mean that the workers' state requires colonels, generals and marshals, with their corresponding emoluments and privileges? On October 31, 1920, at a time when the spartan Red Army was still without a special officer corps, a special decree relating to the army was issued and in it was stated: "Within the military organization . . . there exists inequality which is in some cases quite understandable and even unavoidable but which is in other cases absolutely uncalled-for, excessive and sometimes criminal." The concluding section of this decree reads as follows: "Without posing the unattainable task of immediately eliminating any and all prerogatives in the army, we must systematically strive really to reduce these privileges to the bare minimum; and to eliminate as quickly as possible all those privileges which do not at all flow from the requirements of the military art and which cannot but offend the feeling of equality and comradeship of the Red Army men." This was the fundamental line of the Soviet government during that period. The policy nowadays is taking a diametrically opposite direction. The growth and strengthening of the military and civil caste signifies that society is moving not towards but away from the socialist ideal—regardless of who is guilty, whether foreign imperialists or domestic Bonapartists.

The same thing holds for the intelligence service in which Stalin sees the quintessence of the state. At the Congress at which the G.P.U. agents well-nigh composed the majority, he lectured as follows: "The intelligence ser-

vice is indispensable for apprehending and punishing spies, assassins and wreckers whom foreign intelligence services send into our country." Of course, no one will deny the need of an intelligence service against the intrigues of imperialism. But the crux of the question is in the position occupied by the organs of this intelligence service in relation to the Soviet citizens themselves. A classless society cannot fail to be bound with ties of internal solidarity. Stalin in his report referred many times to this solidarity, celebrated as "monolithic". Yet spies, wreckers and saboteurs need a cover, a sympathetic milieu. The greater the solidarity in a given society and the more loyal it is to an existing régime the less room remains for anti-social elements. How then explain that in the U.S.S.R., if we are to believe Stalin, everywhere such crimes are being committed as are not to be met with in decaying bourgeois society. After all, the malice of imperialist states is not sufficient in itself. The activity of microbes is determined not so much by how virulent they are as by the resistance they encounter in the living organism. How are the imperialists able to find in a "monolithic" socialist society a countless number of agents who occupy, moreover, the most prominent posts? Or, to put it differently, how does it happen that spies and diversionists are able to occupy in a socialist society positions as members and even heads of the government, members of the Political Bureau and the most prominent posts in the army? Finally, if the socialist society is so lacking in internal elasticity that to save it one must resort to an all-powerful, universal and totalitarian intelligence service, then things must be very bad indeed when at the head of the service itself appears a scoundrel like Yagoda who has to be shot, or like Yezhov who has to be driven away in disgrace. Who is there to depend on? Berya? The knell will soon sound for him, too!

As a matter of fact it is well known that the G.P.U. destroys not spies and imperialist agents but the political opponents of the ruling clique. All that Stalin is trying to do is to raise his own frame-ups to a "theoretical" level. But what are the reasons compelling the bureaucracy to cloak its real goals and to label its revolutionary opponents as foreign spies? Imperialist encirclement does not explain these frame-ups. The reasons must be of an *internal* nature, *i.e.*, ones flowing from the very structure of Soviet society.

Let us try to find some supplementary evidence from the lips of Stalin himself. Without any connection with the rest of his report, he states the following: "Instead of the function of coercion there has manifested itself in the state the function of safeguarding socialist property against thieves, and embezzlers of national wealth." Thus it turns out that the state exists not only against foreign spies but also against domestic thieves. And moreover the rule of these thieves is so great that it justifies the existence of a totalitarian dictatorship and even provides the foundation for a new philosophy of the state. It is quite obvious that if people steal from one another then cruel misery and glaring inequality inciting to theft still rule in society. Here we probe closer to the root of things. Social inequality and poverty are very important historical factors which by themselves explain the existence of the state. Inequality always requires a safeguard; privileges always demand

protection and the encroachments of the disinherited require punishment. This is precisely the function of the historical state!

What Stalin Is Silent About

As regards the structure of "socialist" society, what is important in Stalin's report is not what he said but what he passed over in silence. According to him, the number of workers and civil employees increased from 22 million in 1933, to 28 million in 1938. The above category of "employees" embraces not only clerks in a coöperative store, but also members of the Council of People's Commissars. Workers and employees are here lumped together, as always in Soviet statistics, so as not to reveal how large the bureaucracy is numerically and how swiftly it is growing, and above all how rapidly its income is increasing.

In the five years that have elapsed between the last two party congresses, the annual wage fund of workers and employees has increased, according to Stalin, from 35 billions to 96 billions, *i.e.*, almost threefold (if we leave aside the change in the purchasing power of the ruble). But just how are these 96 billions divided among the workers and employees of various categories? On this score, not a word. Stalin only tells us that "the average annual wage of industrial workers which in 1933 amounted to 1,513 rubles rose in 1938 to 3,447 rubles". The reference here is surprisingly only to *workers*; but it is not difficult to show that it is a question as before of both workers and employees. It is only necessary to multiply the annual wage (3,447 rubles) by the total number of workers and employees (28 million) for us to obtain the total annual wage fund of workers and employees mentioned by Stalin, namely 96 billion rubles. To embellish the position of workers, the "Leader" thus permits himself the cheapest kind of trickery of which the least conscientious bourgeois journalist would have been ashamed. Consequently if we leave aside the change in the purchasing power of the currency, the average annual wage of 3,447 rubles signifies only this, that if the wages of the unskilled and skilled workers, Stakhanovists, engineers, directors of trusts and People's Commissars of Industry are lumped together, then we obtain an average of less than 3,500 rubles a year per person. What has been the increase in the pay of workers, engineers, and the highest personnel in the last five years? How much does an unskilled worker receive annually at present? Of this not a word. Average statistics for wages, income, *etc.*, have always been resorted to by the lowest type of bourgeois apologists. In cultured countries this method has well-nigh been discarded since it no longer deceives anybody; but it has become the favorite method in the land where socialism has been achieved and where all social relations ought to be marked by their crystal clarity. Lenin said: "Socialism is bookkeeping." Stalin teaches: "Socialism is bluffing."

Over and above everything else, it would be the crudest kind of blunder to think that the above average sum cited by Stalin includes *all* of the income of the highest "employees", *i.e.*, the ruling caste. In point of fact, in addition to their official and comparatively modest salaries, the so-called responsible "workers" receive secret salaries from the treasuries of the Central or local committees; they

have at their disposal automobiles (there even exist special plants for the production of finest automobiles for the use of "responsible workers"), excellent apartments, summer homes, sanatoria and hospitals. To suit their needs or their vanity all sorts of "Soviet palaces" are erected. They almost monopolize the highest institutions of learning, the theatres, *etc.* All these enormous sources of income (they are expenses for the state) are of course not included in the 96 billions referred to by Stalin. And yet Stalin does not even dare to broach the question of just how the legal wage fund (96 billions) is apportioned between workers and employees, between unskilled workers and Stakhanovists, between the upper and lower tiers of employees. There is no doubt that the lion's share of the increase of the official wage fund went to the Stakhanovists, for premiums to engineers and so on. By operating with averages whose accuracy does not inspire confidence, by lumping workers and employees into a single category, by merging the summits of the bureaucracy with the employees, by passing in silence over secret funds of many billions, by "forgetting" to refer to the employees and mentioning only workers in determining "the average wage", Stalin pursues a simple goal: to deceive the workers, to deceive the entire world and to hide the vast and ever-growing income of the privileged caste.

An Organ for Thieves and Plunderers

"The defense of socialist property against thieves and embezzlers", thus signifies, nine times out of ten, the defense of the income of the bureaucracy against any encroachments by the unprivileged sections of the population. Nor would it be amiss to add that the secret income of the bureaucracy without a basis either in the principles of socialism or in the laws of the country, is nothing else but theft. In addition to this legalized thievery there is illegal super-theft to which Stalin is compelled to shut his eyes because thieves are his strongest support. *The Bonapartist apparatus of the state is thus an organ for defending the bureaucratic thieves and plunderers of national wealth.* This theoretical formula comes much closer to the truth.

Stalin is compelled to lie about the social nature of his state for the same reason that he must lie about the workers' wages. In both instances he comes forward as the spokesman of privileged parasites. In the land that has gone through the proletarian revolution, it is impossible to foster inequality, create an aristocracy, and accumulate privileges save by bringing down upon the masses floods of lies and ever more monstrous repressions.

Embezzlement and theft, the bureaucracy's main sources of income, do not constitute a system of exploitation in the scientific sense of the term. But from the standpoint of the interests and position of the popular masses it is infinitely worse than any "organic" exploitation. The bureaucracy is not a possessing class, in the scientific sense of the term. But it contains within itself to a tenfold degree all the vices of a possessing class. It is precisely the absence of crystallized class relations and their very impossibility on the social foundation of the October revolution that invest the workings of the state machine with such a convulsive character. To perpetuate the systematic theft of the bureaucracy, its apparatus is compelled to resort to systematic acts

of banditry. The sum total of all these things constitutes the system of Bonapartist gangsterism.

To believe that *this* state is capable of peacefully "withering away" is to live in a world of theoretical delirium.

The Bonapartist caste must be smashed, the Soviet state must be regenerated. Only then will the prospects of the withering away of the state open up.

May 1, 1939

Leon TROTSKY

Class Politics in Palestine

THE POLITICAL SITUATION in Palestine is highly complicated. Many factors are jumbled together in a large checkered knot. Hence it is very hard to establish an internationalist class policy for the Palestine proletariat; hence also the great confusion in the circles of the revolutionary left with regard to the problems of this country. The fact that in Palestine itself there does not yet exist a large revolutionary force which might illuminate the international labor movement in this darkness, has also contributed to an increase in the confusion.

The political problem of Palestine must be considered from two main points: first, a definition of the essence of the Arabian national movement, and second, the rôle played by Jewish immigration and settlement. Only an exact Marxian analysis of these two questions can lead us on the correct revolutionary socialist road in the country.

The Zionists and the Arab Movement

All wings of the Zionist movement hold firmly to the theory that no anti-imperialist liberation movement exists in Palestine and that the existing Arab movement is the product of the propaganda of the Arab feudalists and the agents of German and Italian fascism. This is said not only by the fascist Zionists and the liberal bourgeoisie but also by the reformists and even the members of the London Bureau—"Poale Zion and Marxist Circle" and the "Hashomer Hatsair". As grounds for this view they use three arguments: (1) at the head of the Arabian movement stand feudalists for the most part, hence the movement is reactionary; (2) a movement that practises terrorism against the Jewish population and is mainly against Jewish workers, is nothing but a pogrom movement; (3) a movement supported by Hitler and Mussolini is necessarily reactionary and fascistic. These arguments are wrong from the ground up and distort the reality, inasmuch as they are calculated to cover up more or less Zionist aspirations and an alliance with oppressive British imperialism.

Have not many national movements been led by feudalists (*e.g.*, Abd-el Krim in Morocco, the Syrian and Egyptian national movements in their inception, *etc.*)? Were not national liberation movements at the beginning of their development, when they were under feudal leadership, often directed against members of other nationalities in their land (Ireland, formerly also India, the Boxer uprising in China, *etc.*)? And are not national liberation movements exploited largely by other imperialist forces which are hostile to the imperialism against which the movement is directed?—There is no doubt that the Arab national movement in Palestine, like its parallels in other colonial countries, is historically essentially an anti-imperialist movement.

This premise is accepted not only by Marxists but also by Stalinists. The latter, however, draw therefrom absolutely opportunistic conclusions. They attempt to maintain the unity of the national movement and to prevent a class differentiation. The lessons of the national liberation movements and especially the lessons of the Chinese revolution, clearly demonstrate the correctness of the view of Lenin and Trotsky, namely, that the only path to national liberation lies through deepening the social conquests of the masses and extending the class struggle among the nationally-oppressed people.

This view obviously applies to Palestine too; and especially here for another reason: Palestine cannot emancipate itself from the imperialist yoke unless a unification of the Arab and Jewish masses takes place, for the latter represent a third of the population, the Jewish workers are half of the Palestine working class, and Jewish economy is decisive in many branches of industry. The Jewish toiling masses will not, however, support the anti-imperialist movement if no class differentiation takes place in the Arabian national movement. What is so terrible in the situation in Palestine is that, on the one hand, there is a strong national differentiation between Jews and Arabs and, on the other, the national unity in the Arab camp is very firm.

There is, therefore, a grave error in the article reprinted in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL (Feb. 1939) from *The Spark*, in which the author speaks with great satisfaction and enthusiasm of the Arabian national unity which has been displayed in the last two and a half years.

The revolutionary Marxists are duty-bound to support the national liberation movement with all their strength, even if the bourgeoisie or the feudalists stand for the time being at its head. At the same time, however, they must preserve their independence by showing the proletarian road to national emancipation, for only proletarian hegemony and class differentiation in the national movement can assure the complete and stable emancipation of the colonial people.

Zionism utilizes the national and social oppression of the Jewish masses of the world to direct their embitteredness towards national unity, not towards international class struggle. Zionism creates reactionary illusions among the masses with regard to the road to the solution of their problems. Having grown stronger by the decline of the labor movement and the growth of chauvinistic tendencies, Zionism is also necessarily exclusivist and tries to repress the Arabian inhabitants of the country, to gain a Jewish majority, a Jewish state, under any conditions, and to boycott the Arab worker and Arab products. This basic tendency has become increasingly strong in recent years, which were years of the alliance with British imperialism.

The Jewish Population and Zionism

Yet, from the negation of Zionism does not yet follow the negation of the right to existence and extension of the Jewish population in Palestine. This would only be justified if an objectively necessary identity existed between this population and Zionism, and if the Jewish population were necessarily an outpost of British imperialism and nothing more. Those who consider the Jewish population and Zionism to be identical, are: the Arabian feudalists, the Zionist Jewish leaders and the English imperialists. The Arabian feudalists need this conception in order to recruit the Arab masses to a chauvinistic anti-Jewish struggle, by saying: "Smash the Jews, for they are Zionist conquerors!" The Jewish leaders assert that this identity exists in order to anchor the Zionist ideology among the Jewish masses, by saying: "You are Jews, you must therefore necessarily be Zionists as well!" British imperialism employs these arguments for they offer it a magnificent basis for national antagonisms. We wish therefore to examine whether the Jewish camp is really an integral part of the imperialist camp and whether anti-imperialist struggle also demands struggle against this population, or whether, on the contrary, we can and must win its majority, namely, the toiling Jewish masses, for the anti-imperialist struggle.

The Stalinists in Palestine regard the Jewish population as an integral part of the imperialist camp and thus arrive at slogans like these: "Block Jewish immigration! Prohibit the sale of land to Jews! Expropriate the land of the Jews and arm the Arabs!" The C.P.P. preens itself before the Arab population with anti-Jewish terrorist actions. These slogans of the Stalinists are based upon their view of the *objectively* pro-imperialist rôle of the Jewish population and Jewish immigration. In order to motivate these views they often use the simple analogy between the position of the Jewish toilers and the position of the whites in South Africa. It is especially dangerous that such a perverted analogy should take root among the Marxists of South Africa. Unfortunately, there were various mistakes in the article from *The Spark* which are based upon this analogy. On the side of the reformist leaders of the Jewish labor movement in Palestine, too, the attempt has been made to compare the position of the Jews in the country with that of the whites in South Africa. This analogy was drawn in order to show that the Jewish worker must not unite with the Arab, as an argument against the international organization of the workers in Palestine. The analogy was then of course seized upon by the C.P.P. in order to show the "imperialistic character" of the Jews in Palestine. We wish to test this analogy in order to show clearly that the Jewish worker in Palestine is not an integral part of the imperialist camp and that his objective interests will lead him to unification with the Arab worker.

In the first place, it is to be noted that the Jewish workers make up more than half of the total working class, whereas in South Africa (according to the figures of 1922-1925) the white workers were only one-fifth of the working class. The white workers of South Africa are craftsmen for the most part, and the Negroes are employed only at hard labor. In Palestine, there are workers of all categories both among the Jewish and the Arab working

class. A large part of the white workers in South Africa are thrown some crumbs from the table of the English big bourgeoisie which exploits the Negro worker. The result is that the wage of the white worker is from five to six times as large as the wage of the black worker. That is, the white workers in South Africa represent a thin aristocratic layer. In Palestine the Jewish workers are not a layer but a class in which, although there are aristocratic layers, there are still more simple workers. The whites in South Africa have wide political rights (democratic legislation, advanced labor laws, *etc.*), whereas the Negroes are oppressed colonial slaves. In Palestine, both the Jews and the Arabs are oppressed by a foreign power, without having any democratic rights at all.

Britain's Attitude towards the Jews

To show more clearly that the Jewish population in Palestine is not given preference over the Arabian by the British government, we wish to present some outstanding facts. There are two large cities in which Jews are in the majority—Haifa and Jerusalem. In both of them, according to the ordinances and appointments of the government, the mayors are Arabs. Other democratic institutions there are none. (Even these institutions, the municipalities, are "democratic" only in quotation marks. In comparison with the other governmental institutions, however, they are the ideal of democracy.) In the field of municipalities, therefore, the Jews are not given preference. The Jews defray 63% of the government income, while expenditures are allotted to them as follows (1934-1935): 14% to education; 34% to public works, *etc.* Labor legislation too gives no preference to the Jewish worker as against the Arab. The Jewish workers in Palestine, therefore, represent, by their objective interests, an integral part of the general working class and are not given preference by the British government.

On the other hand, that view would also be wrong which saw no chauvinistic-exclusivist, pro-imperialistic tendencies at all in the Jewish population. It is a fact that it maintains a relatively closed economy against the Arab economy and raises slogans like "100% Jewish products", *etc.*; and as a result of the influence of the Zionist leaders, most of the population demands a Jewish majority in Palestine and a Jewish state.

The Jewish population in Palestine therefore has objectively a dual character. Corresponding to its class differentiation, it contains on the one hand a Jewish working class and accelerates the rise of an Arab working class, that is, forces which are objectively anti-imperialist, and on the other hand, to the extent that it is permeated by Zionist exclusivist tendencies, that is, submitted to bourgeois influence, it strengthens the positions of imperialism and of reaction in the country. On this premise the revolutionary socialist policy and its attitude towards Jewish immigration must be built up.

Since the World War, two hostile camps face each other in Palestine, an Arab and a Jewish. The former demands the stopping of Jewish immigration and identifies this demand with the struggle against Zionism. The latter demands the opening of the doors of the country to immigrants and sees therein the essence of Zionism.

Against both these camps there appeared directly after

the World War a section of the Comintern which for a number of years adopted an independent internationalist position. The members of the Comintern in Palestine, up to the great turn in the colonial question at the time of the Chinese revolution, while absolutely opposed to Zionism (against the national boycott, against slogans like the Jewish majority and the Jewish state, alliance with England, etc.), declared at the same time that the Jewish population is not to be identified with Zionism and hence demanded the maximum freedom of movement for Jewish immigration into Palestine. Not only this, but they demanded from the government also material aid for the establishment of the Jewish immigrants in the country. They declared plainly that the struggle of the Arab national movement against Zionism, the Jewish majority, does not require the demand of stopping Jewish immigration, and they justified the unconditional maintenance of the Arab majority. They declared that the struggle against Jewish immigration shifted the anti-imperialist struggle to anti-Jewish rails and that this was profitable only to English imperialism. They declared plainly that any struggle against Jewish immigration would only strengthen Zionist chauvinism among the Jewish masses.

With the turn to the right in the colonial policy of the Comintern, however, which was also manifested in Palestine, the Communist party of Palestine, submissive to Stalinism, began the struggle against Jewish immigration, asserting that it was an immigration of conquest and that the struggle of the Arab national movement was a defensive struggle. But is the correct answer to Jewish aggressive chauvinism, Arabian defensive chauvinism? Unfortunately, there is a similar error in the article from *The Spark*: The struggle of the Arabs against Jewish immigration is a defensive struggle against the conquering Zionist movement and therefore, even though we are, as socialists, generally in favor of free immigration, it is not necessary in Palestine. The "Hashomer Hatzair", of the London Bureau, argues similarly: The struggle we are conducting against the political independence of Palestine is a defensive struggle against the aggressive Arab national movement and therefore, even though we are, as socialists, generally in favor of the independence of the colonies, it is not necessary in Palestine.

Without taking a clear internationalist position in the question of Jewish immigration, without a sharp struggle against any oppression of the Arab population by imperialism and Zionism, without a sharp struggle against attempts to suppress Jewish immigration—the establishment of a broad anti-imperialist front is impossible.

Two Views on Settlement

In the question of Jewish settlement, two main views are prevalent. One, that of the Zionist movement, demands complete free settlement and land purchase, without protecting the tenant from being dispossessed; the other, that of the feudal leadership of the Arab national movement, which hides under the cloak of "tenant protection", demands the prohibition of land sale to Jews.

Before 1926-1927, the Comintern in Palestine was for tenant protection and the recognition of his right to the land, but at the same time demanded that Jewish settlement on uncultivated land be made possible; it repeatedly de-

clared that there are still large areas of land in the hands of the government and the Arabian Effendis which are cultivable but uncultivated. This attitude was genuinely internationalist.

But since Stalinism has completely dominated the Comintern, its supporters in Palestine began the struggle against the right of Jewish settlement. Thus there is not today any internationalist force in Palestine: The Comintern people let themselves be taken in tow by the Arab feudal leaders and the Socintern and London Bureau people make up an integral part of the Zionist movement. Unfortunately there are certain deviations and not internationalist views in this question in the article from *The Spark*.

If we are to set down our attitude towards Jewish immigration, we must keep the following two fundamental views in mind: (1) the Zionist movement sees in immigration the basis for paradise in the country; (2) the feudal leadership of the Arab national movement sees in Jewish immigration the basis for hell in the country. Both views are false. Marxists cannot be for immigration or against it, just as they cannot be for or against immigration from country to city. Marxists must only record that in the capitalist order it is necessary to fight for free migration, without falling into illusions about the "liberating rôle" and the "creation of happiness" attributed to this migration, without adopting a chauvinistic attitude towards this migration ("Jewish majority", "Jewish products", "Jewish labor", etc.). The same view must be adopted by the Marxists with respect to settlement.

It is correct that the Arab national movement must be supported in its struggle against imperialism. But this is not at all the same thing as saying that we must support the actions of the feudal leadership of this movement which are calculated to turn the movement from anti-imperialist to anti-Jewish paths. A little illustration will plainly show how the struggle against Jewish immigration distorts the anti-imperialist struggle: a short time ago rumors spread in Palestine that the government was on the verge of stopping Jewish immigration; whereupon the Arabs organized joyous demonstrations in which they cried: "Long live Chamberlain!" "Long live England!" "The government is with us!"

The reader may say: "Between the struggle for the right of existence and free immigration of the Jews and the struggle for the independence of the country, there is an unbridgeable gulf, and we must therefore choose one of the two." The complete victory of the movement for independence in Palestine is, however, impossible without the support of the Jewish toilers, who hold important positions in Palestine's political and economic life. The liberation movement will not receive this support so long as the anti-Jewish terror exists and so long as the Arabian toiling masses will struggle against Jewish immigration. On the other hand, the existence of the Jewish population will not be assured and there will be no immigration without terrible suffering for the Jewish masses, without the support of the Arabian toiling masses who are the majority of the country's population; and the Arabian masses will not give this support so long as the Jewish masses are against the independence of the country and remain a tool in the hands of England for the suppression of the Arab

masses. Only an internationalist labor movement can be the leading force in the consistent anti-imperialist struggle. So long as such a force does not yet play an important rôle in the country, the Jewish masses and the Arab national movement will remain in a difficult and distressed position.

A Revolutionary Socialist Policy

The revolutionary socialist policy in Palestine must be built up on the following foundations:

1. The Jewish question can only be solved by the socialist world revolution. Zionism is a factor that weakens the class struggle of the Jewish masses, and strengthens the reaction outside of Palestine as well as the reactionary forces in Palestine.

2. Jewish immigration into Palestine, which is mainly an immigration of workers, strengthens, on the one side, the power and weight of the working class in the country, the power which, regarded historically, is the most extreme anti-imperialist factor and, on the other hand, in so far as it is Zionist, it strengthens the exclusivist positions and the forces of imperialism in Palestine.

3. The Arab national movement expresses, on the one hand, the aspirations of the Arab masses for national and social emancipation, but on the other hand, in so far as it is under feudal and semi-bourgeois leadership, it strengthens the exclusivist tendencies in the country, thereby weakening and narrowing down the anti-imperialist range by leaving the Jewish population to the influence of imperialism and of Zionism.

4. Internationalist socialism in Palestine is the only force that can lead the anti-imperialist struggle consistently to the very end, eliminate Jewish and Arabian antagonism and link the national liberation movement of the Arabs with the struggle of the Jewish masses for the right to their existence in the country and their growth through immigration.

These are the foundations on which the program of the Bolshevik-Leninist movement in Palestine must be built. Here is not the place to occupy ourselves with the details of this program and we wish, therefore, only to indicate the essential main paragraphs:

For what must revolutionary socialists fight in Palestine?

The maximum program of the revolutionary socialists is the proletarian dictatorship, as transitional stage to socialism. To attain this maximum program, the revolutionary socialists fight for the following minimum demands:

I. As the immediate political task: abolition of the rule of imperialistic, absolutist bureaucracy and the establishment in its place of a republic on the basis of a democratic constitution, which is guaranteed by the following points:

1. The concentration of the ruling power of the state in the hands of a legislative assembly composed of representatives of the people.

2. General, secret, direct, and equal proportional elections for the legislative assembly and for all local governmental institutions.

3. Inviolability of the person and domicile of citizens.

4. Unrestricted freedom of conscience, of speech, of press, of assembly, right to strike and organization.

5. Separation of religious institutions from the state and the schools.

6. General compulsory education, support of poor

schools by the state.

In order to attain complete equality of rights of the toilers of both peoples and to abolish all national exclusiveness, regardless of what side it may come from:

1. Establishment of a joint organization of the workers and struggle against the "conquest of labor".

2. Struggle against all boycotts of one people against the products of another people and the acceptance of members into all existing coöperatives without distinction of nationality.

3. Distribution of the governmental and municipal budget in accordance with the needs of the masses, without regard to nationality.

4. Struggle against the national terror and against Zionism, against all exclusivist tendencies and aspirations for creating national majorities or for suppressing national minorities.

5. In case of settlement—participation of the peasant already occupying the land in the action of the colonization, *i.e.*, to grant him the same facilities that are used by the settlers.

6. Complete equality of rights for both peoples to increase by means of immigration. Right of immigration for the Jews from Europe and other continents as well as for Arabs from surrounding countries.

In order to democratize the Palestinian state economy:

1. Direct taxes instead of indirect. Progressive income tax.

2. Salary reductions for the high officials.

3. Reduction of the budget for the army, police and prisons.

4. Fundamental increase of the budget for education, health and agriculture.

5. Distribution of the budget according to the needs of the masses without regard for nationality.

In order to abolish feudalism, the following demands:

1. Transfer of the lands of the big landowners, the government and the religious institutions to those who till them without regard for religion or nationality.

2. General annulment of the debts of the fellahin and the distribution of cheap credit to the fellahin.

To protect the working class and to strengthen its struggle and its liberating power:

1. Eight-hour working day and six-hour working day for youth.

2. One rest-day in the week.

3. Prohibition of night work, except for branches in which it is technically necessary.

4. Prohibition of child labor.

5. Prohibition of the labor of women in such work as is injurious to them.

6. Minimum wage for all branches of industry.

7. Social insurance.

8. Old-age pensions for workers.

9. Government inspection, with participation of representatives of the workers, to control the carrying out of labor laws.

To attain the immediate political and economic aims, the revolutionary socialist movement must support all oppositional movements directed against the existing social and political order in Palestine, while always retaining its own independence.

The completely consistent and lasting realization even of this minimum program is possible only through the

overthrow of imperialism and the establishment of the rule of workers' and peasants' councils. L. ROCK

A Program of Action for Palestine

The Main Question

THROUGHOUT MORE THAN twenty years there have been repeated proclamations of a "national home" for the Jews in Palestine. The Arabs were according to these proclamations tenants, as it were, whose rights must be protected. What actually took place? Actually many Jews lost their lives on account of their "favored position", and many Arabs because of their "inferior position", while the remainder, Arabs and Jews, live lives of hardship and suffering, without a "home" and without "rights"

There has now come, it seems, a period of proclamations of a "national home" for the Arabs, and the "protection of the rights" of the Jews. Will this period be similar to the preceding one, the difference being only that now the Arabs will lose their lives for the "preference" given to them and the Jews for their "inferior" status? The important question is not whether the "London plan" conflicts with the Balfour Declaration, or does not quite conform to the Macmahon letters, but how far it gives the inhabitants of the country the possibility to conduct their own affairs in accordance with their needs. Not to what extent the plan is able to free the Arab inhabitants from Zionist rule in the future but to what extent it is able to free the inhabitants of the country, Jews and Arabs, from foreign rule in the present—this is the fundamental question.

Parody

The government plan at the London Conference, according to various informants, contains the promise for the independence of Palestine after a certain period, in the future, and various temporary arrangements for the "transition period". Among these arrangements are: the creation of a body or bodies in which the inhabitants of the country will participate, the main tasks of which will be to make suggestions concerning the affairs of the country, and also the appointment of some of the inhabitants as "Government advisors" or "ministers without portfolio".

But is this the plan required by the populace? The country has had promises enough. What it needs is that its rights be actually given, or more exactly, that the one right that includes all be given, the right to conduct its own affairs, to control and not "advise". This proposal, that the representatives of the people will play the part of "advisors", is one of particular interest. For what reason and what purpose must these representatives serve as advisors? The affairs of the country, the needs of those they represent, they certainly know better than the foreign officials and if they are not "fitted" to conduct the affairs of the land, the training that they lack is essentially technical training, sufficient professional knowledge. They are then in need of advisors, professional officials who will

assist them in their work. But the plan on the contrary gives them the task of advising. The people fundamentally concerned will become the advisors of expert officials.

Nor is the appointment of a number of the inhabitants as "minister without portfolio" likely to be of any benefit. There are enough people in the country occupying high offices and receiving high salaries without having to do anything, or in order that they should not do anything. There is no need to add to them. What the populace of the country needs is, on the contrary, that they should be led by people whose status and income will be only a small payment for their beneficial labours for the common good.

The Government's plan, even if the information about it is correct, is not yet a complete one. Many changes are still likely to be made in it, arising from the proposers themselves or from other factors. But this plan, of which we are informed, does not contain what is needed by the people of the country. It is a parody, a mockery of their needs.

An Urgent Need

The question of independence, or the liberation from foreign domination, is the principal question in Palestine, but it is not the only fundamental question.

In these days of the growth of the Nazi rule with the aid of its "democratic" friends, every national movement in a country subject to a "democratic" power may become infused by a "Nazi" spirit to be converted to a movement which, in its struggle against the foreign oppressor, not only does not awaken and train the masses to understand and defend their concrete interests, awaken and train them in their battle for full liberation from the yoke of both their oppressors and their exploiters, but instead helps to increase their blindness and their submissiveness to their exploiters at home as well as the oppressors—whether the old "democratic" ones or the new Nazi ones—from without.

But this danger cannot be prevented by opposition to the struggle against the "democratic" oppressor, or by abstention from this struggle. This way of a negative or "neutral" attitude to the struggle against the foreign ruler, out of fear lest it increase the growth of the Nazi movement in the subject country, or lest it strengthen—in case of the defeat of the "democratic" ruler—the Nazi influence in the world as a whole, is an utterly wrong way.

It is wrong, firstly, because liberation from the external oppressor is a necessary condition of liberation from the internal exploiter. The oppressors are the main support of the exploiters and are their spiritual prop. The foreign subjection is the main cause of the blindness, the lack of clear understanding of the masses. It is a cause of sickness, a source of rotteness in the body of the subject people. However mild the external symptoms of this sickness may be, it necessarily interferes with the material and spiritual

life of those affected. Complete health is impossible until the cause is removed. Liberation from the exploiters is then impossible without liberation from the oppressors, and whoever renounces the struggle against the foreign ruler out of fear that it may distort the struggle against the exploiter at home, is like one that prevents an infant from learning to stand on his feet out of fear that his legs may become bent and he may become unable to walk properly.

Secondly, opposition to the struggle against the "democratic" oppressor—from fear of increasing Nazi influence—and as a result an attitude of tolerance and compliance towards the oppressor not only will not weaken Nazi influence on the subject masses, who will not understand—and with justice—this tolerance and compliance towards those who are neither tolerant nor compliant towards them, but will on the contrary increase this danger.

The only way to prevent the masses of a subject country from going the Nazi way, is to conduct this struggle against the foreign ruler in the correct way, the non-Nazi way, and to do all that is possible to remove the factors that can mislead the masses from this correct way. The danger of Nazi influence on the "movement of national liberation" is particularly great in a subject country which contains a large national minority. In Palestine there not only exists a national minority, large in number and great in importance, but this minority is Jewish—particularly "convenient" subject for Nazi propaganda—and it has also special aims and special promises given to it concerning the country, and also at its head stands a movement whose objects and activities are thoroughly impregnated with the "national" and "national-socialistic" spirit. In Palestine there are therefore particularly "convenient" conditions for Nazi influence on the national Arab movement. And indeed this movement has been infused in recent years by a Nazi spirit, in large measure, as its words and deeds during these years give witness. This movement does not "incline" to the Rome-Berlin axis only because it is assisted by the axis. The reverse is truer, that it is assisted by the axis because it is near to it in spirit.

On account of "the Jewish question" or "the Jewish-Arab question" the struggle of the masses of the country—the struggle with the external foe as well as with the internal foe—becomes distorted to a very great degree. Because of it they are moving rapidly not towards liberation, but towards the severest oppression. The masses of this country have a great and urgent need of a correct solution of this problem.

The Concrete Danger

The "Jewish question" or the "Arab-Jewish question" is a great obstacle in the way of the liberation of the masses of Palestine, including the Jewish masses. But for the Jewish masses, and for the Jewish community as a whole it is the source also of other danger, even the danger to their very existence.

The leaders of the Arab national movement regard the Jewish community as the worst enemy, the greatest obstacle in the way of converting Palestine into an independent Arab state or part of an enlarged Arab state. They regard it as a conqueror that attempts and succeeds in

widening its influence and power in the country unceasingly, and strives to conquer it entirely. Many of the supporters of this movement also hate the Jewish community on account of the "harmful social ideas" that are widely spread in its midst. In the eyes of these people the Jewish workers' organizations are revolutionary organizations, undermining the foundations of society and morals, and the Jews for the most part are not only Zionists but at the same time socialists and even communists. Many of them are also religious fanatics and the Jews are hated by them as infidels. The hatred of the Jewish community, then, on the part of the leaders of the Arab national movement is nourished from many sources, national, social and religious at the same time, and is extremely strong. But if a few years ago there were among the rank and file of the national movement and to some extent among the leaders liberal ideas and even inclinations towards the workers' movement, with the increase of Nazi influence following the events of the last years, the apostles of "Arabism and Islamism", the enemies of the Jewish community, came to acquire almost absolute sway over the Arab national movement, people who will at the first opportunity reveal their real attitude to the Jews in a very open and concrete manner. They have been revealing it these three years, but these acts, of the period of the disturbances, are doubtlessly only a faint hint of what the leaders of the Arab national movement are desirous and capable of doing. These people learned and are learning much from the Nazi movement and this fusion of Hitlerist corruption with primitive viciousness are likely to yield fruits beside which the abominations of the hooligans of the Swastika will pale. Moreover, if the directors of the present disturbances will obtain the rule over the country, without doubt the guides and advisors, and the persecutions of the Jewish guides and advisors, and the persecutions of the Jewish community will be carried out not only with the greatest barbarity and cruelty, but systematically and continuously.

The talk about guarantees on the part of the leaders of the Arab national movement, as rulers, of the rights of the Jewish minority in Palestine, are but empty words, not regarded as being at all serious even by those who talk of them, who do not expect anyone to take them seriously. If these people will receive the power in their hands, while the relations between the Jewish and Arab communities stay as they are, all talk about the position of the Jewish minority in Palestine in the future is rather superfluous. No Jewish minority will remain here. It is doubtful if isolated Jews will remain in any noticeable number. The fate threatening the Jewish community in this case is complete destruction by means of the worst oppression and persecution.

Deception

The leaders of the Zionist movement, of course, see the dangerous position of the Jewish community of this country. It is impossible that they should not see it. It is to a large extent the fruit of their considered actions. But in their opinion the danger is not particularly threatening. There is a strong ally interested for his own sake in the Zionist movement, and he will protect it. It is true that he does not prevent small injuries, or even large ones, to this

movement. But these "variations" are only passing, temporary tactics, or the acts of short-sighted officials. He will not permit a serious blow and he has it in his power not to permit it. He is a firm protector. Actually the "Arab question" is nothing but the "English question", that is, if the ally will do what is wanted or abstain from doing what is not wanted, Zionist aims will be successfully and speedily realized without any opposition—at any rate without any open or concrete opposition. It is true that the fact that the light and heavy blows continue, and that the "Arab question", in spite of being really the "English question", remains as it was or becomes aggravated, seems to show that the protector is not so reliable. But this is only a superficial conclusion. In fact the ally is interested in the Zionist movement from many and vital standpoints. This movement is almost the main jewel in his crown. In fact he perhaps is more in need of it than it is in need of him.

The bond between the Zionist movement and the British Empire is both strong and deep. There is nothing better or more natural than that Palestine should be a part of the Empire, a British dominion or even a British colony. What is the difference what the connection be called when it is of such a spiritual nature? It is true that the ally himself sometimes shows lack of understanding as to the "naturalness" of this bond. But this is only short-sightedness on his part, insufficient penetration into the character of the movement.

It is necessary to explain these things, and "explanation" is given in abundance. All parts of the Zionist movement from the Revisionists to the "socialists" explain the possibilities that the Zionist enterprise offers to its ally. They all compete in offering the service of the Jewish community in Palestine and of the Jewish people as a whole to the great Empire. All the currents in the movement, with the "socialists" at their head, show how well and how deeply they understand the exalted civilizing functions of this Empire, how they value its splendid colonizing work in its various possessions, in which peace and happiness rule; how important the task and how good the fortune to be a link in this happy union of nations, called the "British Empire". This union is a faithful protector to all that lie in its shelter, and particularly to the Zionist movement; faithful not only in times of peace but also in times of war.

"Even in time of war?" Yes, particularly in time of war there is less room for fears, in such times communal disturbances are not likely to take place; in war, especially, the ally will be most interested in order and quiet in this country, on the shores of the Mediterranean, near the Suez Canal, through which its oil lines pass. Especially at such times he will most value the Zionist enterprise. In this ally's interests—are our interests, in his good—our good, now and in the future, forever.

Thus speaks the one side. The other side, the "protector's" own people, have discussed and discuss publicly if it would not be advisable that in time of emergency Britain should turn away altogether from the Mediterranean that has become dangerous, give up for the period of the war its obligations and connections with the countries bordering on this sea, concentrate all her forces on more important and secure positions, and if the victory will be on her side all that belongs to her and is necessary to her will

return to her as an obvious result, and the connections with her friends—with those of them, of course, who had not ceased to exist in the interval—will be renewed.

But these are "internal discussions" and the Zionist leaders act as if they do not hear (did they receive a hint on this matter during the London talks?). At any rate this is a question of wartime, of which nobody knows when it will arrive and what will occur in it. In normal times, in the opinion of the Zionist leaders, the faithfulness of the ally was beyond all doubt. Is their certainty shaken now? The London conference does not prove that the final decision has been made. As long as the "limitation" of immigration is spoken of the matter has not, apparently, been decided. If it had been—why any immigration whatever? Can it be to add some thousands more to those in the trap? But if there is yet no decision there is a clear warning here. Not only in time of war, but even in time of peace the ally is ready to abandon his "work". It is true that this enterprise has its use, otherwise he would not have concerned himself with it, supported it and raised it. Its destruction will be a loss. But who can ever gain without losses? On the great checker-board there are many pieces. Is it possible to keep them all and win?

The "final decision" perhaps has not yet come, but there is a clear warning: the ally is not an everlasting protector. He will help until he ceases his aid. He will protect until he stops. He is loyal until he breaks his faith. It is doubtful if anything can be clearer. Have the Zionist leaders grasped this? There is no sign that they have. At any rate they do not reveal it. In their opinions it is another misunderstanding, this time—not on the part of minor officials, but of high ones. Others will come in their place, British democracy will come and will understand and will aid. But which "democracy" will come to aid? The "democracy" that "defends" Czechoslovakia and Spain in speeches, which is more Catholic—when it holds power—than the Pope, is this a reliable protector? This confused and hypocritical "democracy", will it not betray when it is necessary for the Empire, "the pillar of civilization"?

But America will not permit, her "subjects" have invested money here (did not her subjects invest money in China?), Poland will not permit (it is particularly interested, apparently, in the revival of the Jewish people in its ancient country!).

British imperialism, world democracy, anti-semitic Poland, the Conscience of Mankind—all of these are fitted and all are ready to come to the rescue of the Zionist movement.

There has come no change, the same words as before—vain deceptions.

Self-Government

The path of the Zionist leaders of these days is but the direct continuation of the path of the movement they lead. The fifty thousand Jews that were in Palestine at the end of the World War could not by their own powers convert this country into a Jewish State. Neither can the 450,000 Jews that are in the country today accomplish this aim by their own strength. To realize this the aid of an external power is essential, and the perpetual dependence on this foreign power is necessarily a source of corruption in

normal times and of deception in critical times. The Zionist movement—both the New and the Old Zionist organizations—have not and cannot have any real way to avert from the Jewish community in Palestine the dangers that it itself created and is continuing to create.

Also, the advice that the Jewish community should announce its willingness to abandon the Zionist aims and to live as an ordinary minority under Arab rule is, in the prevailing conditions, futile. Even if such a declaration were possible, it would be useless. The party to which it would be directed would not believe it, nor attribute any value to it. If the power will be in its hands—whatever the Jewish community may announce—it will act towards this community in only one way, that of oppression and reducing the “minority” by all possible means.

The Jewish community in Palestine, should the actual rule be in the hands of its enemies, will have no choice, but to defend its life and liberty by all the means it can. But this defense must be defense and not attack in the form of defense. The Jewish community has the right and the duty to defend its right to conduct its life according to its will. But the Arab community has the same right to no lesser extent. Any opposition on the part of the Jews to the struggle of the Arab community for complete independence, for full self-government within its own borders, will be utterly vicious and will increase the hatred for them among the Arabs and enlarge the danger threatening them. Its “use” is doubtful and its damage certain.

Under the conditions of Jewish settlement in Palestine, the demand for self-government on the Jewish community is not impossible to realize. There is no doubt that the best way to realize the independence of Jews and Arabs is the partition of the country, in one way or another, into two free parts, not depending on one another. Such a

definite division would greatly decrease the harmful influence of the urges to conquer of the one side or the desire to destroy of the other. The patriots would not be satisfied, of course, with either of the parts, but the masses would turn their attention to their vital needs and, at any rate, the “national aspirations” would not succeed in penetrating the spirit of the masses and distorting their struggle to the extent that they do today. Therefore the least interdependence is especially important, in order that the difficulty of realizing the “national aspirations” should be the greatest, and the encouragement to their growth the least. But without the partition of the country it is possible to secure the self-government of the Jewish and Arab communities in the country, each within the spheres of its habitation, and this possibility must be realized in fact.

Only this way of the defense by the Jewish community of its rights, with the full recognition of the rights of the Arab community, will increase its defensive powers, and is also likely to lessen the opposition to it among the Arabs and to weaken the power of its enemies. This is the only real way that will bring blessing to the Jewish masses at all times and the hope of salvation to the Jewish community as a whole in times of danger.

Self-government of the Jews and the Arabs, each group within the limits of its own settlement, this is the correct and only solution of the “majority” and “minority” question in Palestine. Therefore it is also the correct way toward the full solution of the problem of the country, that is the establishment of a system that will know neither “majority” nor “minority”, but a single community of brothers living by its labors.

“HAOR” (EL NOUR)

TEL-AVIV, PALESTINE, April 11, 1939

READING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT:

Popular Education in Crisis

AS EVERY ONE KNOWS, popular education is one of the great historical cornerstones of bourgeois democracy. Free schools were one of the first and most insistent demands of the rising proletariat in the last century. The bourgeoisie made this concession partly because it could afford to and partly because it fitted in with its own interests. For all its limitations, parliamentary democracy meant a greater participation of the masses in the political life of the nation than either feudalism or the absolute monarchy had granted. And this in turn demanded a minimum of popular education. There was also another aspect, concisely expressed in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article on “Education”: “The nation that is not to fail in the struggle for commercial success . . . must needs see that its industries are fed with a constant supply of workers adequately equipped in respect both of general intelligence and technical training.” Illiterate peasants are as little useful to the modern employer as to the bourgeois-democratic politician.

Thus one finds the rise of popular education synchro-

nizing with the rise of industrial capitalism. In France, the foundations of the modern system of state-supported free schools was laid in legislation introduced in 1833 by Guizot, mouthpiece of the rising bourgeoisie and author of the celebrated slogan—“*Enrichissez-vous!*” Bismarck and the social democracy joined hands to create a model system of state education at the same time as German industry was rationalizing its plants and winning ever greater victories in world markets. In England, the Chartist agitation stimulated the raising of the annual parliamentary grant to education from £30,000 in 1839 to £100,000 in 1846, £396,000 in 1855, and £663,000 in 1858. In the United States, the first compulsory school attendance law was passed in 1854, in the middle of the decade during which the country, according to the historian, V. S. Clark, “made the most remarkable industrial progress in its history”—a decade which saw the nation’s two chief industries, textiles and iron, almost double their production.

Between 1865 and 1930, popular education in the United States steadily gained momentum. Decade after decade,

the statistics on schools, like those on steel production, mounted ever more triumphantly. In 1870, 57% of all children of school age were enrolled in the public grade schools. By 1880 it was 65%, by 1900 72%, by 1932 83%. The boom in high school and college education came later, in the twentieth century. In 1890 only 6% of those between the ages of 14 and 17 were enrolled in public or private high schools. By 1900 the figure was 10%, by 1920 26%, by 1930 48%. College enrollment rose from 238,000 in 1900 to 598,000 in 1920 and 1,100,000 in 1930. These are figures to make any Fourth of July orator expand with justified pride. *O. beautiful for spacious skies. . .*

Distress Signals

The depression hit the public school system like a hurricane. In 1930 annual expenditure per public grade school pupil was \$90. By 1932 this had fallen to \$82, and by 1934 to \$65, according to the *Statistical Abstract of the U.S.* (1938). The short-lived "Roosevelt recovery" won back some of the ground lost, expenditures rising to \$74 per pupil in 1936. But the recovery has gone with the wind and for the last two years the national economy has hung in the doldrums, slowly and steadily drifting backward. By now, in the spring of 1939, there are increasing signs that a serious crisis is impending in popular education. According to *Time* for April 24, "By last week so many distress signals flew over U.S. schoolhouses that educators were thoroughly alarmed." *Time* itemized a few:

In Ohio the state school fund is \$17,000,000 in the red, and several cities are facing a complete shutdown of their schools.

School funds are "low" in Colorado, Michigan, Illinois, the Dakotas.

The Pennsylvania Property Owners Association recently stated that "Pennsylvania's public school system is doomed to early collapse". Conditions are especially bad in the coal counties, where operators owe millions in local taxes—the great Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. alone owing \$3,000,000. In eight coal counties, 6,000 teachers have received no pay for from one to ten months. To support their families, those not lucky enough to get relief have been working after school hours as undertakers, night watchmen, store clerks, salesmen, and coal bootleggers. "Pennsylvania's educators," writes *Time*, "pleaded with economy-minded Governor James to replenish the special State fund for schools in distressed areas, now exhausted. Having pleaded in vain, nearly 200 teachers last week marched out of 27 schools in Northumberland and Schuylkill Counties, declared they would not go back until they were paid."

"Georgia owes its schoolteachers \$5,000,000, sees no way of paying them before June 30—and after that date they cannot collect because of a State law prohibiting debt carry-overs to the next fiscal year. Unofficial calculations were that 200 Georgia schools, with 20,000 pupils, were closed. . . . In Lamar County, white children's school term was shortened to eight months, Negro children's schools were closed."

The Little Red School House—

As these facts indicate, the current school crisis is most acute in the rural and small-town areas, where it is merely

an intensification of a long-chronic condition. "In 1930," *Time's* article begins, "although every U.S. state had laws requiring that all children be schooled, some 800,000 U.S. children of elementary school age had no school to go to. Most of them were in poor farm areas that could not maintain a school." Some weeks ago, Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, in a public address put the number of illiterate adults in the United States at 3,000,000, most of them in the rural South. He also estimated that 12,000,000 other American citizens could not read well enough to understand a newspaper, thus being, for all practical purposes, also illiterate. Finally, he gave the basic reason for these appalling statistics: that in 1930 the farmers of the United States had 9% of the national income and 31% of the children. The newly published survey of the National Education Association, *Teachers in Rural Communities*, covering 11,000 teachers scattered throughout the country, reveals that the composite mean salary for the group is \$833, with Negro teachers getting \$346, and some individual salaries running as low as \$200. Two out of three of these rural teachers "support" a family. Less than half of them have either telephones or heated bedrooms, and one-third of them don't have that rural necessity: a car. Under capitalism, you get what you pay for. When one considers that half the public school pupils of the country are educated in these rural schools, staffed by teachers paid these coolie wages, the wonder is that *only* 12,000,000 Americans can't read the newspaper.

—And the Big City

But the farm areas, as I have just pointed out, are chronic weak spots in the school system. Things are different in the cities, perhaps? Not at all! For the last few years, the schools of Chicago, for example, have been in a state of utmost demoralization, because of the failure of the city to pay the salaries of the teachers. But Chicago's budget troubles are well known to be due to the corruption and inefficiency of the notorious Kelly city machine—which was, by the way, supported by both the New Dealers and the Stalinists in the last mayoralty election. Granted—but how can one explain away the disaster that is about to overtake the school system of the nation's biggest city, which for some years now has rejoiced in a comparatively progressive and enlightened city administration? The Board of Education of New York City is currently faced with the necessity of dismissing 6,819 teachers, closing down all night schools, shutting the city playgrounds and swimming pools throughout the summer, and otherwise cutting down expenses. (The New York Public Library, for lack of funds, has also drastically curtailed its services.) This is necessary because the progressive LaGuardia administration has cut \$3,000,000 out of the city's educational budget, and the reactionary State legislature has cut another \$5,300,000. Between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction, it looks as though the city's school system is about to suffer the worst dismantling in its history. The reactions of the friends of "progress" to this fact are, to say the least, naïve. "I can't believe that the State legislature will persist in depriving our present generation of the educational facilities to which they are entitled," says Mrs. Joanna M. Lindlof, an official of the

Board of Education. "I have too much respect for their intelligence and their desire to perpetuate democratic principles." But, in these days of mounting deficits, democratic principles don't cut very much ice—except when it is a matter of defending them against the fascists on the other side of the Atlantic. The legislature has wound up its session and gone home with the New York City school budget still \$8,300,000 shy, and Mayor LaGuardia has been so excited about the World's Fair and the new express highways and bridges he is building that he hasn't had time to worry about anything so unspectacular and plebeian as the school system. But the Merchants' Association of New York has given thought to the problem and has put forward a solution, which you've perhaps already guessed. Yes, it suggests a cut in teachers' salaries.

Education that Does Not Educate

The immediate cause of the crisis in popular education, of course, is the simple fact that our declining capitalist economy can no longer meet the bills. But there is a more general factor, and one with ominous implications for the future of bourgeois democracy. In the last century, the more liberal and enlightened bourgeoisie looked to education as the chief means of making capitalist democracy work. Once the masses were educated, then they could vote "intelligently" and the social system would function smoothly in an ever-ascending spiral of progress. It was a thrilling vision, but the liberals, here as in other matters, stubbed their toe on the hard rock of the class struggle. Schools don't make money, and so the bourgeoisie were never willing to pay enough in salaries and other ways to get a really good school system. More important, the educational process was stultified and deformed by the pressure of class interests. No amount of intelligence and good will on the part of "progressive" educators like John Dewey and his followers could alter the basic fact about education under capitalism: that it must be conducted primarily in the interests of the ruling class. And as that class increasingly loses its historical or social function, the educational process also degenerates.

Last year the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published the findings of a survey its staff had conducted, over a ten-year period, of higher education in the state of Pennsylvania. This survey, based on written questionnaires given to 45,000 high school and college students, deals a death blow to the nineteenth-century faith in education as the great social panacea. The *N. Y. Times* editorially termed the findings "appalling" and stated that the Carnegie Foundation had been so alarmed that it had withheld them from publication "until they had been thoroughly mulled over". The Carnegie survey made two major discoveries: (1) that students intending to teach scored lower in educational tests than the average of their classmates, and that in many cases they scored lower than high school students four years below them; (2) that of 4,000 high school students who went to college, 1,000 scored lower than the average of those who did not go to college, while 3,000 of the high school students who did not go to college scored higher than the 4,000 who did. Speaking of "the able and often brilliant young minds that are left behind because they cannot pay college bills", the survey drew the conclusion: "Both state subsidies and the

income from endowments are today flowing in large amounts to individuals who might be replaced by more appropriate intellectual investments." The survey also discovered that one out of every seven of the college undergraduates examined got lower scores in their senior year than they had in their sophomore year—*i.e.*, the longer they stayed at college, the less they knew. "In brief," summarized the *Times*, "the findings indicate that our higher education does not educate."

"The Odds Are on the Cheaper Man"

But what if our schools and colleges really *did* educate? In the last decade, American capitalism has deteriorated to such an extent that this has become a secondary question. According to the excellent little pamphlet, *Youth Want Jobs*, recently issued by the Young People's Socialist League, seven of the twenty-one million young people of the nation are unemployed. Every year two million more young men and women are graduated from our high schools and colleges, two million pouring out of the educational system to find no jobs waiting for most of them. The most intellectually ambitious youth might well ask himself why he should spend years at his books in order to fit himself—if he's lucky—for a W.P.A. pick and shovel job. Or in order, when and if war comes, to get his well-cultivated head blown off. As Kipling wrote of the young Englishmen of an earlier age who went out to fight the Afghans:

A great and glorious thing it is
To learn, for seven years or so,
The Lord knows what of that and this,
Ere reckoned fit to fight the foe—
The flying bullet down the Pass,
That whistles clear: "All flesh is grass."

No proposition Euclid wrote
No formulas the textbooks know,
Will turn the bullet from your coat,
Or ward the *tular's* downward blow.
Strike hard who cares—shoot straight who can—
The odds are on the cheaper man.

Not much can be said for Kipling's social angle, but his general idea was sound: "The odds are on the cheaper man." And this seems to be as true of the capitalism of our time in peace as it obviously is in war. Our ruling class of late has been showing more and more signs of impatience with higher education—except for their own sons, of course. Louis M. Hacker could write a few years ago of "the unanimity with which twentieth century America accepted a collegiate education as a prime requisite for future success, whether the chosen career was to be in business, politics, or the professions". But a recent survey of business men showed that 42% of those queried believed that a young man's chances of success were *greater* if he stopped his education with high school, while only 29% came out definitely in favor of a college education.

It is not very hard to see the direction in which all this is tending. A few weeks ago a Mr. Mark Jones, who is president of the Akron Belting Co., gave a speech before a teachers' convention in New York City. "The American standard of living is declining," he said quite bluntly, "the economy is in devolution, and the number of individuals who are reaching the end of their economic resources is

increasing day by day." This Mr. Jones blamed on the "ideologies of the left", and went on to criticize educators because they had not done a better job of dispelling certain popular "illusions" encouraged by these ideologies. These "illusions" he listed as: equality, democracy, security, collective bargaining and economic planning. "No fantasy of dreamers," he concluded, "has exerted such a devastating effect upon the countless millions or upon the course of human events than the illusion of equality. For more than one hundred and fifty years it has served to delude the masses into belief in the equality of individuals and races." Thus Mr. Mark Jones of the Akron Belting Co., and thus the more conscious members of his class. It is clear that popular education, as it has developed in the last

century, has no place in their future scheme of things—even if capitalism could pay the bills. This spring of 1939 may well be a major turning-point in the history of our public education system, for it is by now a question not only as to whether a declining economy like ours can much longer afford to educate the children of the masses, but also as to whether it is desirable, from the standpoint of ruling-class interests, that this should any longer be done at all. Nor should the statement made last month by the president of the National Education Association be forgotten: "The United States is farther from universal education, to which the public looks for preservation of the fundamental traditions of democracy, than it was one hundred years ago." Dwight MACDONALD

Old Garbage in New Pails

THE INVALUABLE ASSISTANCE given the imperialists by the social democracy in the last World War is too well remembered to require elaboration even at a distance of twenty-five years. If the leaders of the Second International had not sown such demoralization and confusion among the workers by their chauvinistic activity, their repetition of the official imperialist lies, it is doubtful if the war would have lasted half as long as it did. There is indeed good reason to believe that if the rulers of France, Germany, Austro-Hungary and England felt that they could not rely upon their agents in the labor movement, the fear of proletarian revolution might even have curbed their otherwise uncontrollable lust for settling inter-imperialist rivalries on Europe's battlefields. For this we have the involuntary confirmation of no less a patriotic authority than the then and present leader of the French trade unions, Léon Jouhaux, who confessed in a speech delivered on August 1, 1937 at Toulouse, on the twenty-third anniversary of Jean Jaurès' murder in Paris: "If on the day of the assassination of Jaurès his friends had not spoken to the people of Paris, the revolution would have preceded the war, for the workers thought that the hand of the assassin was armed less by the love of country than by the desire to shatter an obstacle to the war."

Given an organized labor movement, the social democracy is an indispensable prop of the bourgeois social order. The ruling class tolerates it until it finds it expedient to resort to fascism, whereupon it dismisses the social democracy and exterminates the labor movement. The moving protestations of patriotism and loyalty are thereafter of no avail. "The Moor has done his duty, the Moor must go."

While a measure of bourgeois democracy is maintained in a country, that is, while the social democracy is tolerated, it proves its indispensability to the bourgeoisie in all crises, above all when war comes, for then it does not allow itself to be excelled in patriotic zeal. But what about the social democratic party of that country in which fascism has rudely suppressed or exiled it, in which there is not even a pretense of democracy—how can it come out in favor of the "defense of the fatherland"? It cannot and, as a rule, it does not. What it does do, however, is hire out its services to the ruling class of a *foreign* democracy,

asking in return only that it be brought back to the position it once occupied in its native land on the gun carriages of its temporary foreign employer.

The exiled German social-democratic leadership is now playing precisely that not very dignified rôle in world affairs. A blatant example was the revelation a year and a half ago that the sorry hero of the Saarland social democracy, Max Braun, had applied to the French government for financial support to his newspaper and his movement in return for military propaganda among the youth of the German emigration which would convert them into ardent soldiers for the French army "against German fascism"

The perverted war-mongering of the German social-democratic leaders, who capitulated cravenly to fascism when they had invincible forces at their command and now hope to restore their power by "a policy that expects salvation by foreign bayonets", as one of their dissident number puts it, is not confined to France. In all the imperialist "democracies" the German social democrats have their emissaries and representatives whose main activity is directed towards mobilizing the labor movement for the new Holy War, this time not "against czarism" but "against fascism". The United States has its share of these ladies and gentlemen, mainly former members of the Weimar Reichstag.

There is Miss Toni Sender who was known years ago as a bit of a radical oppositionist to the German party leadership, along with Max Seydewitz and Paul Levi, but now repents weekly in the *New Leader* in the form of moving supplications to all decent Americans to join in a war—defensive, you understand, or at least, preventive—to crush the German monster. Working-class mothers are soothingly assured by her that it is better for their sons to die gloriously under the Stars and Stripes than to live as serfs under the Swastika. Another recruiting sergeant in the War for Democracy is the former Reichstag member, Gerhart Seger, now editor of the New York social-democratic *Neue Volkszeitung* which, unlike the old *Volkszeitung* but quite like its ex-editor, Ludwig Lore, glistens with an American chauvinistic sweat. Still another former Reichstag member now in this country is Wilhelm Sollman, whose nationalism and contempt for the proletariat were

notorious in the Weimar days of the party. A briefer but not less purposeful visit to the United States was paid a while back by the former editor of the *Berlin Vorwärts*, Friedrich Stampfer, faithful retainer of His Royal and Imperial Majesty during the last war, mouthpiece of the party bureaucracy all the time, and missionary for the coming war. He is the perspicacious politician who, six years ago, just after Hitler became Chancellor, told John Elliot of the *Herald-Tribune* that "fascism stands no chance of gaining a foothold in a nation like Germany that has a certain level of political culture, owing to the resistance that will be forthcoming from the workers". Since Stampfer and his colleagues prevented the organization of this resistance, it was not forthcoming. Stampfer has now transferred his anti-fascist hopes from the Reichswehr Generals to the General Staffs of the French, British and American armies. Also with us today is Albert Grzesinski who, while Prussian Minister of the Interior ten years ago, did not show much ability in crushing the Nazis but did distinguish himself in the struggle for Democracy by his brutal decree suppressing the Red Front Fighters League. In a recent biography he described his sorrow at being unable to enlist for the front in 1914 because patriotic duty kept him behind the lines where his proposals for the "Stick-It-Out!" propaganda campaign won him the approval of the Prussian Generals among whom, he writes, he often found more social understanding than among the trade union leaders. In the next war—not for the Barons of East Prussia, this time, but for the financial Barons of the Bourse, the City and Wall Street—duty will again retain him behind the lines where he is already active in the war preparations "against fascism".

All the "democracies" now have their quota of Senders, Segers, Sollmans, Grzesinskis and Stampfers. And since a defense of their pro-war position of 1914-1918 would not be very popular with the bourgeoisie or even the proletariat of the countries in which they have taken refuge—for virtually all their newly-acquired fatherlands were in the Allied, anti-German camp!—they have adjusted their present pro-war agitation to the new geographico-political requirements. Together with the more native patriots, they reluctantly murmur a hint that the last World War might have been imperialistic and the slogans under which it was fought a pack of lies. But this time, things are really and truly different. The coming war will—they give their solemn word of honor—not be fought for spheres of influence, sources of raw materials, colonies and markets. It will be fought for the Great and Honorable Cause of smashing fascism. It is not—God forbid!—that they are for a war, any more than they were for it on August 4, 1914. Rather it is a case where war is either inevitable or else an accomplished fact. Inasmuch as one cannot be utopianly neutral and since, moreover, fascism menaces us all, and since, finally, the poor proletariat is too weak to do anything by itself—the only thing left is to help the Democracies arm and, as soon as it is most expedient to start marching, speed their victory over totalitarian fascism.

The garbage which these social-democratic war missionaries spread before the workers is not new; it is the same foul stuff with which they poisoned the European masses twenty-five years ago. Only the pails out of which it is

dumped are new, or at least scrubbed to look like new. How true to form the social democrats are running today may be seen by comparing their present position with their record during the last year.

* * *

In the middle of 1914, the Austro-German ruling classes must have concluded, according to Count Max Montgelas, that "the risk of a European war that breaks out over Servia can be borne only if Italy and Rumania consider that there are grounds for the alliance and, if possible, if Bulgaria too is fighting from the outset on the side of the Triple Alliance".

Who was more qualified to supplement the efforts of Austro-German diplomacy in these countries than the German social democracy? The diplomats worked in the chancelleries of Italy, Rumania and Bulgaria to draw them into the war on the side of the Central Powers; the social democrats sent their own ambassadors to work in the labor movements of those countries towards the same end. In giving their social-democratic lieutenants such missions, the Prussian warlords were actuated by the same considerations that moved Woodrow Wilson to send the socialist turncoat George D. Herron as his confidential agent to the socialist and labor circles of Europe. "The enemy countries," writes M. P. Briggs, the biographer of Herron, "were employing ex-pacifists and socialists in much the same manner as the United States and Great Britain were employing Herron. The old associations of these men had created a bond between them which made it possible for them to hold conversations with a predisposition to understand each other. They used the same idiom, whatever differences there might be in language. . . . Thus Herron's socialism served as a valuable apprenticeship for his short diplomatic career."

Now, the all-too-prevalent view that the German social democrats acted during the war in exactly the same way as the Kaiser and his entourage, is quite erroneous. Socialist support of the war was motivated on "socialist" and even "revolutionary-internationalist" grounds. Revolutionary-internationalist? Yes; because, they said, we German socialists cannot confine our struggle against capitalism to its German sector alone. We must not be so nationalistically-limited. Our efforts must be directed mainly against the world-imperialist vampire, Britain, on the one side, and against arch-reactionary czarism, on the other. Our troops will cross the Russian frontier, as the younger Plekhanov had said years before, not as conquerors but as liberators; whereas the Cossacks crossing the German frontier will come to enslave the German workers to reactionary feudalism and to smash the most advanced socialist movement in the world.

"Germany does not pursue the aim of extending her markets by means of this war or of strangling her competitors," wrote Wolfgang Heine in his polemic against the anti-war left wing. "The war, on Germany's part, is therefore no imperialist undertaking."

The former extreme radical and associate of Luxemburg who turned chauvinist over night, Paul Lensch, declared it "a symbolical act that the world revolution [!] was begun by the German side with a conscious insurrection, with the tearing up of Belgian neutrality".

"We in Germany," wrote Philip Scheidemann in a letter

to the New York *Volkszeitung* on September 14, 1914, "had the duty to defend ourselves from czarism, had to fulfill the task of protecting the country of the most highly developed social democracy from the menacing enslavement by Russia. . . . A Germany enslaved by the Czar would have meant setting back for decades the socialist movement of the whole world, not only the German."

With this "revolutionary" war-cry, with the slogan of the defense of the socialist movement from reactionary czarism, social-democratic war emissaries were dispatched all over Europe to rally foreign support for German imperialism. They even had the impudence to send Noske to occupied Belgium and Auer to Roubaix and the North of France with the aim of reconciling the labor movement to the noble-minded, socialistically-inspired invasion of Wilhelm's armies. Was it there and then that the touching and all-but-eternal friendship was cemented between the social-democratic leaders and Paul von Hindenburg?

Müller and Scheidemann were sent to Holland to win the support of the Dutch social democracy. Dr. Südekum became notorious for his voyages, made with the knowledge and consent of the government, to Sweden, to Rumania, to Italy, which remained neutral in the first period of the war. It is interesting to recall that the French social-chauvinists heaped abuse and slander upon the Italian Socialist party by saying that its position in favor of Italian neutrality in the war was due to the fact that before 1914 the German Social-Democratic party had helped the Italian party financially and that Südekum's visit to Italy right after war broke out was made for the purpose of threatening a withdrawal of financial support unless the I.S.P. maintained a friendly attitude. The same people were anything but abusive after the counter-visits to Italy of the Belgian social-patriot Jules Destrée and the French chauvinist, Marcel Cachin. The latter brought with him the money with which Mussolini was bribed to support the Allies; the fascist-leader-to-be used it to found his Francophile *Popolo d'Italia*.

Another prototype of the Senders and Stampfers was the notorious Parvus—Dr. Helphand. He was sent to Sofia, where he lectured the social democrats on how Bulgaria's entry into the war on the side of Germany would aid in the victory of Democracy. From there he proceeded to Constantinople, where he made a fortune in grain speculation and in provisioning the German armies and, as his political work, agitated among the Caucasian revolutionists and nationalists that "in the interests of the Russian revolution", now was the time to organize an insurrection in the Caucasus against the Czar.

The policy of supporting "revolutions"—not at home where they were brutally suppressed, but in the camp of the enemy!—was a recognized part of the war strategy of each imperialist group, even if it was so dangerous that it was cautiously applied. German imperialism was not loathe to offer assistance to Indian and Irish nationalists. Wilson, through Herron, sought to establish connections with the German internationalists during the war. Renaudel, the French social-patriot, exclaimed upon hearing the news of Liebknecht's vote against war credits in the Reichstag: "Bravo, Liebknecht! At last, here is the word waited for by the socialist hearts of France." (The same Renaudel, it goes without saying, urged the French au-

thorities to mobilize the *French* Liebknechts for immediate service at the front, where the speediest and most conclusive results might be hoped for.) The business of organizing "revolutions" *elsewhere* was, of course, largely entrusted to the social democrats in each country.

Thus, Parvus' efforts in Turkey were complemented by similar activities in Austria. The social-democracy cordially and hypocritically supported its Galician section—the Polish nationalists led by Daszynski and Pilsudski—in the formation of legions to fight for Polish independence . . . from the Czar. At the same time, according to the account Scheidemann gives in *Der Zusammenbruch* of the joint meeting of the German and Austrian party leaderships towards the end of 1915, Victor Adler said, "We—the Austrians—are ready 'to take' Poland and Servia. That's not annexation. Austerlitz even considers a further partition of Poland to Austria and Germany as the 'happier solution'." These genuinely Hapsburg-socialists were for the "socialist revolution"—but only as a commodity for export behind the enemy lines. Acting on the same "principle" they helped organize in Vienna a "Ukrainian Union of Revolutionary Socialists" to fight for "Ukrainian independence" (again, from the Czar but not from the Kaiser). Its leader was described by the organ of the revolutionary Ukrainian exiles in Geneva as a man who had "assembled around himself and around Austrian money a dozen swindlers, drunkards and people without opinions, Bukovinians and Galicians, who readily consented to play in Austria the pleasant, care-free, profitable and gay rôle of private revolutionists of His Majesty Franz Josef, Kaiser and King of Austro-Hungary".

How many such "private revolutionists" of the modern, "anti-fascist" type, will we see mobilized into similar groups in the coming war? To judge by the number who are *already* functioning, they will be as thick as flies and just as sanitary.

Let us again emphasize that the war which is now justified morally in the name of "the struggle against fascism" was justified a quarter of a century ago, in one camp, in the name of a "revolutionary struggle against czarism". Parvus wrote joyfully, a year after the war began, that "now the German General Staff had to come out for the revolution . . . and the German workers stepped forth against czarism as a well-organized army". If Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Falkenhayn, Kluck and Emmich were leading the Russian revolution, then Lensch was surely right in declaring of the Kaiser's Chancellor that "at the head of the German revolution stands Bethmann-Hollweg". The same Lensch proudly claimed that "as a matter of fact, the Russian revolution [March, 1917] is a child of the German victories". At the first war congress of the party where the leadership had to give an accounting of its pro-war policy, at Würzburg, October, 1917, Dr. David, reporting for the Reichstag fraction, had the cool effrontery to say: "The justification of our attitude has still another strong argument. A policy is best judged by its successes. What success has it had? The one immense fruit of this war, which we all greeted with jubilation, is the collapse of the czarist system, is the Russian revolution, the Russian democracy, and with it the end of the perils which the czarist system meant to Europe. But this event would not have occurred if we had acted as Haase

and his friends wanted us to on August 4, 1914."

But the slogan "Down with czarism!" on the lips of the social-patriots was as hypocritical, as fraudulent and as treacherous as the slogan "Down with fascism" is on the lips of the social democrats and Stalinists of today. The German social democrats remained quiet while the German troops of occupation imprisoned genuine Polish revolutionists. They continued to support the Kaiser when the German invader forced the "liberated" Polish worker and peasant into whiplashed labor battalions. The German proclamation of the "Kingdom of Poland" in November, 1916, for which Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns, Wittelsbachs and even Saxon royalty immediately claimed the throne, was hailed by the *Vorwärts* as the execution of the testament of Marx and Engels! Even after the overturn of the Czar by the March revolution, the social democrats revealed most crassly the hollowness of their "war against czarism" slogan by continuing to vote the military budget in the Reichstag. In July, 1917 the fraction voted an additional war credit of fifteen billion marks!

Almost a year after the Bolshevik victory, on October 3, 1918, that is, just a few weeks before the utter collapse of Germany and the abdication of the Kaiser, the same Stampfer who is now again recruiting imperialist cannon-fodder for a war against czarism—beg pardon! against fascism—was still writing in the *Vorwärts* to urge more sacrifices for Hindenburg and less thought of revolution:

"Woe to the people that stacks its arms five minutes too soon! . . . A people who loses patience at the end of a long war and cripples the maintenance of domestic authority, is like a sick man who, in fevered frenzy, rips off his bandages and leaps out of bed." Less than forty days later, fortunately, the German workers did rip off the bandages with which the Stampfers had kept them paralyzed for four years, and brought the war and the Hohenzollern dynasty to a close.

* * *

In their war-mongering agitation of today, the Senders and Segers and Stampfers are merely paraphrasing slightly the socialistically-varnished imperialist arguments of their predecessors, the Parvuses and Südekums and Stampfers of 1914-1918. We have the duty to reply to these emissaries of "democracy" by paraphrasing the indignant declaration adopted by the leadership of the Italian Socialist party in 1915, when it rejected the advances made by Dr. Südekum and his associates:

"We socialists regard the dispatch of the German mission to Italy as an offense against the dignity and independence of Italian socialism; the more so as the German Social-Democratic party, by supporting the German and Austrian policy of aggression, has forfeited the right to the title of internationalist socialists."

Max SHACHTMAN

The National Question in Central Europe

THE NATIONAL QUESTION has often played a fateful rôle in Central Europe. In the year 1848, as a result of the cowardice of the German bourgeoisie and the reactionary policy of the rising bourgeoisie of the Slavic peoples of Austria, the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution was frustrated. Thanks to eternal national strife the rotten, semi-feudal Austro-Hungarian monarchy was able to maintain itself into the 20th century. Nationalistic illusions after the World War contributed powerfully to the defeat of the proletarian revolution in Central Europe and to the isolation and destruction of its first fortress, the Hungarian Soviet republic. In 1938 it was the nationalistic corruption of the masses that was one of the chief causes of the proletariat's inability to intervene independently as the Czechoslovak crisis brought Europe to the very brink of imperialist war—the crisis which suddenly ended with an imperialist truce that handed over the entire "Danube area" to Hitler without a struggle.

In recent years the working population of Czechoslovakia was nationally completely split. The greater portion of the Sudeten German people and even the working class was under the influence of Henlein's fascist "liberation" demagogy. A large portion of the poor peasantry of Slovakia was in the camp of Hlinka's clerico-fascist, autonomist People's Party. The Czech workers and peasants, however, were ready to defend the capitalist fatherland under the leadership of the Czech bourgeoisie. Each national section of the proletariat concluded a class peace with its own national bourgeoisie. The Czech workers stood ready to shed their blood for the interests of Czech

and Anglo-French finance capital, because they believed that they would thereby be defending the freedom of the Czech people. The Sudeten German workers allowed themselves to be misused by German imperialism because they awaited their "national and social liberation" from Hitler.

How could that have come about? How could that have happened in a country, in which the communist party was born of a mass split from the social democracy, a party which numbered hundreds of thousands of members at its founding and which for 20 solid years maintained such sizeable influence that in the general elections its vote always varied between three-quarters of a million and a million? How could it have happened in a country in which the Czech, German, Slovak, Hungarian, Polish and Carpatho-Ukrainian workers constituted a unified and centralized communist party—a fact over which Lenin used to rejoice so much?

The Czechoslovak labor movement went down because of opportunism; it was defeated by the betrayal of the leaders of the Second and Third Internationals. An especially important factor, however, was its inability to pose correctly, that is, in a revolutionary manner, the national question which is so tremendously important in Central Europe. It is this question with which we wish to deal here in detail.

The "Heritage" of Austro-Marxism

The social democracy of old Austro-Hungary was unable to connect the struggle of the oppressed peoples of the monarchy with the class struggle of the proletariat. Had

it done so, that is, had it been a really revolutionary party, the post-war history of Central Europe and probably of all Europe would have had a different aspect.

The struggle of the oppressed nations in the old Hapsburg empire bore tremendous revolutionary possibilities. The bourgeoisie of these peoples was unable to place itself consistently at the head of the struggle for national liberation—for the same reasons that the Russian bourgeoisie was unable to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. Like the Russian bourgeoisie, the Czech, Croat and Slovene bourgeoisie, *etc.*, came into the world too late, so to speak. It actually became a class only in the age of imperialism, that is, in the age of declining and decaying capitalism. Under normal conditions it could only shake off the foreign yoke by mobilizing the toiling masses. It was in fear of and hated these masses, however, who had already raised the demands of their own class. It feared and hated them more than foreign dominion.

Moreover, especially in the case of the Czech bourgeoisie, there dwelled, economically speaking, two souls in its breast. On the one hand, it was interested in the large market for its industrial products which Austro-Hungary with its 50 million inhabitants and preponderantly agrarian territory offered; on the other hand, it would have liked to throw off foreign exploitation and regency. The second alternative, however, only on condition that the masses would not solve the question in revolutionary fashion, but that other, "more respectable", foreign forces would "help 'he Czech people to freedom" and at the same time guarantee the Czech bourgeoisie its class supremacy and the uninterrupted exploitation of its "own" Czech masses and if possible of others, too.

First, Czarism was considered by the Czech bourgeoisie, especially by its more backward portion, to be such a "more respectable" force. For this reason the Austro-Slavic, pre-war program of Kramar demanded the reorganization of Austria on a federated basis and an alliance with the empire of the Czar. For this reason the Czech bourgeoisie in the years 1914-1915 awaited its "liberation" by the Russian cossacks. Soon, however, the defeats of the Czar's army buried these hopes.

The more "modern" representatives of the bourgeoisie, headed by Masaryk, had long ago directed their eyes more to the West, toward imperialist France and England. There they found during the war the more "respectable" outside power which they needed for "liberation".

If already during the war the Czech bourgeoisie began to count on "liberation" from without, to which, moreover, they were driven by Germany's plans for a unified Central Europe, that in no wise meant that it was ready itself to fight actively. It first decided to intervene at the very end of the war after the decision had already been rendered on the battlefields. While the Czech workers had long been struggling for national independence by mass desertions and uprisings at the front, and strikes and hunger demonstrations at home, which they naïvely identified with "social justice", the bourgeoisie still continued to pursue a loyal Austrian policy, sending greetings to the "victorious leaders of the Austrian armies" and assiduously underwriting war loans.

If at that time the proletariat had placed itself at the head of the struggle for freedom, if it had boldly com-

menced the struggle for the overthrow of the monarchy by realizing the right of self-determination, if it had replaced the instinctive connection of the struggle for national and social liberation by the scientific synthesis of both—that is, by the slogans, "Destroy Austria", "Destroy National Oppression", "Destroy Class Rule and Exploitation Together", "Realize the Right of Self-Determination and Peacefully Unite the Peoples in the United States of Socialist Central Europe"—then the Hungarian Commune would not have remained an isolated episode, the revolution would not have been stopped at Warsaw and all history would have taken a different turn.

Already at that time, however, social democracy had placed itself firmly on the basis of the *status quo* and the *status quo* at that time was Austria. Thus the social-democratic leaders became loyal, faithful to the Hapsburgs and counter-revolutionary. The Austro-Marxian "analyses" served only as a profound rationalization of their prostitution. Modern economy becomes more centralized, it demands large spheres of development: *ergo*, the liberation of the small peoples is a reactionary utopia and God preserve, God protect our Kaiser, our country. That an economic union other than on a basis of exploitation is possible, namely, the voluntary union of liberated peoples in a socialist federation and that the road to it lies through the revolutionary struggle for the right of self-determination—that never even occurred to the learned dialecticians of Austro-Marxism.

During the war it was the Czech social democracy, with its leader Smeral, which went to the worst extremes. Today Smeral, as is well known, is one of the leaders of the C.P.Cz. At the time of the World War he wrote a series of articles on "buffer states", in which he showed that an independent Czech state could not maintain itself in the present epoch of capitalism and that such a state would necessarily have to become a football of the great imperialist powers. That was correct. History has brilliantly confirmed Smeral's prognosis long after he himself renounced it. Instead of drawing the revolutionary conclusion, however—namely, that the freedom of the Czech people can be assured only under socialism and that the Czech toilers must struggle for the proletarian revolution even in the interest of their national emancipation—Smeral, in the Austro-Marxian way, drew a counter-revolutionary one: the Hapsburg monarchy must be defended. As a result of this policy he became during the war the man most hated by the Czech people. When at the end of the war he again wanted to speak at a labor mass meeting in Zizkov, a suburb of Prague, the workers cut him off as soon as he appeared on the platform. The leadership of the social democracy lost all influence over the mass movement. The opposition which crystallized in the party toward the end of the war was petty bourgeois and nationalistic. Thus the mass of the toiling people, which under the influence of the Russian Revolution and the peace negotiations at Brest was coming into ever greater flux, remained without revolutionary leadership. On October 14, 1918 the masses spontaneously conducted a general strike with the slogan, "For an Independent Czech Socialist Republic." The movement had, however, no class conscious leadership. When Austria collapsed 14 days later, the Czech bourgeoisie, which at last dared to show its face,

placed itself without any resistance at the head of the "national revolution" and the "national state". The social-democratic leaders, most of whom, just as their bourgeois masters, had changed overnight from Black-and-Yellow to White-and-Red patriots, formed a coalition government with the bourgeoisie.

Imperialist Czechoslovakia

A twofold process now began. With the help of the reformist leaders the bourgeoisie built up the capitalist state. The mass of the proletariat, which had been expecting a "socially just" republic, began to become disillusioned and to rally behind revolutionary slogans.

In the Fall of 1920 came the inevitable collision. The revolutionary tendency had already won a two-thirds majority within the Czech social democracy. The bourgeoisie, however, under the leadership of the incumbent Minister of the Interior and the leader of the Agrarian party, Svehla, had secretly reconstructed its police force and gendarmerie. Actively led by President Masaryk, the right-wing leaders split the social democracy shortly before the party congress at which the left wing was sure to win out. A specially installed government of bureaucrats headed by the tested Austrian veteran Czerny—who, moreover, is today again the Minister of the Interior in the Sirovy government—beat down the provoked general strike which was poorly conducted by the left-wing's centrist leadership. The fate of Czechoslovakia was decided for the moment. It became a capitalist, imperialistic republic. Out of the social-democratic left, however, there emerged a mass communist party.

Czechoslovakia was a typical creation of the imperialist Peace of Versailles. It was one of the group of small imperialist states which were constructed with the dual purpose of policing Germany's eastern border and of blocking the Russian revolution by means of a "*cordon sanitaire*". The borders of these states were so drawn by the peace dictate that strong national minorities were to be found everywhere. This was to make the unification of these states with one another or with Germany impossible and to keep them dependent on the western powers. Quite openly, considerations of strategy were put before any ethnographic ones. Thus Czechoslovakia received territories of which the Czech bourgeoisie had formerly never even dared to dream, for example, the Carpatho-Ukraine. A state arose in which the ruling nation, the Czech, formed only 50% of the entire population. To make the fiction of the national state even half-way tenable it was necessary officially to stamp the Czechs and the Slovaks, who are undoubtedly two distinct peoples even if closely related, as a "Czechoslovak" nation.

Czechoslovakia was a bourgeois-democratic republic, but its "democracy" was always a little peculiar. By means of various protective laws and exceptional regulations the political rights of workers had already been so limited since 1923 that not much was left of them. Even in its heyday, Czechoslovak "democracy" was much more reactionary than, for example, the late lamented Weimar Republic. It could not be otherwise in a state in which 50% of the population was not only socially but also nationally oppressed, especially in its eastern portions, where the

oppression took on almost colonial forms. Once more it is demonstrated how correct Karl Marx was when he said that no people which oppresses another people can be free.

The national independence of the Czech people could have been assured in two ways after the collapse of old Austria: either by the revolutionary way of the overthrow of its own bourgeoisie, the liberation of the oppressed peoples by the realization of their right of self-determination and the voluntary unification of the free peoples of Central Europe in the United Socialist States; or, on the other hand, by the counter-revolutionary suppression of its own proletariat, by imperialist annexation and oppression of national minorities, by arming and by "guarantees" of imperialist allies and protectors. With the aid of the reformist leaders the bourgeoisie succeeded in accomplishing the second alternative. To what extent, however, this alternative really assured the Czech people their national freedom the events of 20 years later demonstrated. In this sense, too, it was demonstrated that no people can be free that permits itself to be misused for the oppression of others.

The National Policy of the Czechoslovak Proletariat

In place of the old "prison of the peoples", Austria, there now arose a series of smaller peoples' prisons. What was to be the policy of the proletariat?

Once more the working class had the opportunity of combining its class struggle with the struggle of the oppressed nations and of winning powerful allies in their toiling masses. For it alone was in a position to show the real way out of the blind alley of eternal nationalistic conflicts in Central Europe by the slogan of self-determination and voluntary unification, by the slogan of the United Socialist States.

To be sure, the social democracy did not understand this and as a reformist party it could not understand it. Once more it put itself on the basis of the imperialist *status quo*. It defended the capitalist republic and along with it the right of the Czech bourgeoisie to suppress national minorities. It opposed the right of self-determination and in practise, too, all of the partial demands of national minorities.

On the other hand, the communist party, in its more worthy past, took some correct steps on the road to a revolutionary policy in the national question. After its second congress in 1924, at which the opportunistic Smeral leadership was ousted, the right of self-determination was added to its program. The fifth congress in 1929 clearly characterized Czechoslovakia as an imperialist state and imposed upon the party the task of combining the struggle for self-determination with the class struggle and of achieving hegemony for the proletariat in the movement for the national emancipation of the oppressed peoples.

In the period which followed, the C.P.Cz. was able to score definite successes in the minority territories. In Sudeten German regions there arose a broad non-party and international movement of the unemployed under communist leadership. In 1930 and 1931, 1,500 local unemployed committees were functioning there and took the leadership in broad actions. Against the will of the trade-union bureaucracy of all tendencies a tremendous, united

strike of the North Bohemian coal miners was led and won. Germans, Czechs, communists, social democrats, unorganized and Nazi workers participated in solidarity, fought against the Czech state and won great power for their democratically-elected strike committees. In the Carpatho-Ukraine there arose under communist leadership a very broad, revolutionary peasant movement which led to big battles with the gendarmerie and the army and finally forced the government to stop the mass foreclosures and to distribute grain to the poor peasants.

Even at that time, however, the national question was posed too abstractly. The preponderantly economic struggle was carried on for immediate, partial demands and at the same time the final solution of the national question was put forward. The proper connection, however, between the struggle for small economic demands and against every concrete expression of national oppression, and the final solution was lacking. Just as it was taboo in the economic struggle to tread the bridge from partial demands to the final goal, because it rested upon "Trotskyist" transitional demands for workers' control of production, so in the struggle for national emancipation a mechanical repetition of the final solution had to suffice, which without proper concretization could have only agitational value.

In the end all partial gains were lost. The following period of "social fascism" and the "united front of communism", together with the effects of the German defeat, isolated the party completely from the masses. There remained only one thing: the international composition of the party and the international, if abstract, character of its agitation.

These remaining accomplishments were cruelly and thoroughly liquidated by the VII World Congress of the Comintern. After helping Hitler into power by his idiotic ultra-left policies, Stalin concluded his illustrious alliance with Laval, which according to its real content bound the Soviet Union to rush to the help of France if France's imperialist interests were threatened, and bound France, should the U.S.S.R. be attacked, to consult with the League

of Nations. For the sake of this alliance Stalin sacrificed the revolutionary movement in all finality.

The Czech Stalinists, together with the French, now became the most glowing patriots. They not only voted the arms budget, they demanded bigger armaments. They not only preached class peace, they denounced all its opponents as "enemies of the people". No one, in fact, was nationalistic or patriotic enough for them. Their whole struggle against fascism was reduced to the denunciation of Hitler's agents, real and supposed, to the police. Even their struggle against the Henlein movement consisted only in denouncing the Henlein adherents to the authorities, and complaining about the authorities to the government if they did not proceed drastically enough.

The only basis, however, for really successfully fighting the Henlein movement was the class struggle, combined with the defense of the German workers against the national oppression of the Czech bourgeoisie and the Czech state apparatus. Only the class struggle could smash Henlein's false "commonalty of the people". It was imperative to bring the Nazi workers and peasants into conflict with their capitalist and big landowning comrades in the struggle for higher wages, shortening of the working day with no reduction in pay, adequate and universal unemployment relief, in the struggle for workers' control of the Sudeten German factories and mines, the division of "German soil" among the German small peasants, for national equality, home rule and self-determination. Then, as to be expected, Czech gendarmes would have been mobilized to protect the capitalist "comrades" against the Sudeten people and that would have been the end of the fascist "commonalty of the people". Instead, however, the "communist" and reformist leaders called the Czech police and thereby welded Henlein's ranks more tightly. In the end, they remained completely isolated. In the last communal elections of the republic, Henlein garnered almost 90% of the Sudeten German votes. (*To be concluded.*)

Jan BUCHAR

PRAGUE, Nov. 15, 1938

Australia Cognita

THE ARTICLE BY Stan Bollard entitled "The Paradox of Australian Capitalism," which appeared in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for February, is characterized by an irritating slovenliness and lack of precision, by unsubstantiated and contradictory assertions, and by a seeming endorsement of contentions incompatible with Marxism.

The inescapable conclusion arising from his "study of the history and development of the Australian Labor party" is that while reformism is now "coming to the end of its tether", nevertheless the workers must thank reformist politics for the reforms of the last fifty years. Says he: "The continual expansion of capitalist industry over the past fifty years has enabled reformism to win substantial concessions for the workers." What a "fascinating" and "unique" set-up we have! Marxists in other lands

must be pardoned for their naïveté in believing that "the history of all recorded societies is the history of the class struggle", and that in an expanding capitalism the manifestations of this struggle (strikes—and the threat of them, unrest, demonstrations) convince the unwilling capitalist class of the advisability of granting reforms in preference to unbalancing the social equilibrium they find so profitable—whereupon the reformist leaders take to themselves the mantle of saviors of the people.

But Bollard himself destroys the illusion he has created. We read: "the trade union bureaucrats . . . do not always succeed in heading the workers into the dead end of compulsory arbitration: the press is constantly full of reports of strikes in a wide range of industries." It is also true that strikes have been prevalent for the last fifty

years. But every strike is inherently in contradiction to reformist ideology and constitutes a leap away from reformism. Thus we must decide whether reforms are produced by the workers' struggles—or by reformism. Those who deny that the former is correct should denounce as ill-advised and useless the struggles of the last fifty years, and not record them simply as events without meaning.

It will be sufficient to deal with but one instance where Bollard distorts history to make out a case for reformism, *viz.*, the two referenda on conscription of October 20, 1918, and of November 7, 1917. In summing up "the results of fifty years of reformism", he says: "the powerful Labor parties have also enabled many militant struggles to be waged in an atmosphere of legality. One such struggle was the great

conscription battle. . . ." The truth is that on the announcement of the first referendum the small band of I.W.W. members began to address meetings of thousands of workers. As a result of the mass pressure, the Labor party bureaucracy split; one section stood with the Labor renegade Billy Hughes for conscription, while the other (mainly second-rankers) swung to anti-conscription. To be ignorant of the real history of the anti-conscription struggle and of the Australian labor movement in general is not in itself a crime. But what can be said for the "Marxist" who, abiding in such ignorance, has the temerity to offer his own "history" as good coin to familiarize Marxists with the "virtues" of reformism in Australia?

The necessity to deal with this vulgar appreciation of Australian labor history arises not solely from what is stated in Bollard's article, but even more from the unstated conclusions which arise therefrom. These conclusions are that we must not castigate reformist politics as being treacherous to the interests of the workers. Is not reformism good for gaining reforms? And do not the reformists openly and avowedly proclaim their reformism? To attack the reformist leaders for their class-collaboration ideology and politics, to oppose their "passive resistance", "folded arms" tactics in strikes is leftist! This, in practise, is the present political system of the Bollards. We are sufficiently modest to refrain from warning our American comrades of the fruitlessness of such an interpretation of history.

In dealing with the "White Australia" policy, the author finds the chauvinistic race and color prejudices unfortunate and to be fought against. But we are allowed to assume that "the fear [of the Australian workers] that if other than white workers were admitted to Australia the local capitalists would use cheap labor to smash their hard-won conditions" is consistent with their own interests. Apart from the inconsistency of Bollard's talk of "their hard-won conditions" (has he not already claimed that reformism won these conditions for the workers?) and the fact that the Australian workers also fear the immigration of *white* workers, this misdirection of working-class hostility must be combated by Marxists. Our work includes the task of showing the workers that there is definitely no solution for their problems except through the revolutionary struggle against capitalism—that the absolute cessation of all immigration would not alter the plight of the Australian workers, since Australia cannot be divorced from world economy and the world market, where cheaply produced commodities exert their influence on the Australian workers' living standards.

Bollard describes Australia as "one of the most paradoxical semi-independent countries in the world; it acts as a junior partner of British imperialism, for which it could be said to manage a branch office. . . ." Inasmuch as this characterization rejects both the view that Australia must be regarded as a colonial country in the *nor-*

row sense of that term, and the opposite assertion that Australia has in fact achieved independent status, we can accept it. But this does not warrant bracketing Australia with the metropolis imperialisms in preference to classifying it as colonial in the *broad* sense of the term. When the Fourth International poses the term "sub-capitalism" as being applicable to countries such as Mexico, it does so from the recognition that the terms "colonial" and "semi-colonial" need amplifying and distinguishing sub-headings for particular non-metropolis countries, and not because of any belief that the orientation of the Fourth International in Mexico is essentially different from that in the "classical" colonial countries, *i.e.*, support of the national struggle against imperialism. In contradiction to the metropolis imperialisms, there are a wide variety of countries in which the national struggles against their imperialist exploiters are progressive (India, China, Mexico, Ireland, pre-October Russia, *etc.*). In the case of Russia, the October revolution repudiated the imperialist creditors and established tariff autonomy. We do not overlook the importance of the racial factor in national struggles. But it is only relative, not decisive. Who will deny that an Australian race is developing? And, in any case, was not the American revolution made by the progeny of English sires?

But Bollard, having categorized Australia as quoted above, having actually asserted the necessity for a national revolution, utilizing a quotation from Lenin in support—proceeds blithely to ignore the implications of this estimate, and proclaims that the problems of the Australian workers "are those same life-and-death issues which confront the workers of the United States and of the advanced Western European countries". Here we see the utter confusion so characteristic of his effort. It seems that, having reiterated four times (with varying degrees of conviction) that the Australian bourgeoisie will not carry out the national revolution, he concludes that "while an Australian national revolution cannot be ruled out as a perspective for the future, it can be definitely ruled out in the present epoch", and that the Australian workers have the same tasks as those in the United States. Every conclusion incorrect!

In the first place, since the socialist revolution necessarily brings to conclusion the national revolution, the former must also be "ruled out" in the present epoch! Yet further on this, too, is contradicted by the assertion that "the Australian workers must carry out a dual revolution", apparently in this epoch. Can it be possible that Bollard imagines "epoch" to mean a month or a year?

Every Marxist recognizes that in this epoch *no* national bourgeoisie will carry out the national revolution, the important reason (not stated by Bollard) being that it dare not set the masses in motion, since such a revolution would call sharply into question their own "rights" of exploitation. Bollard cannot understand that the national revolution can and does proceed despite

and against the wishes of the national bourgeoisie. But such is his confusion that he actually supplies evidence of this very fact. Says he: "When the Lang Labor Government of New South Wales launched its repudiation movement [it] was probably the nearest approach to a national liberation movement in Australia. . . ." It is pertinent to note that Lang's "anti-British bondholder" propaganda at that time (1932) had tremendous popular support, reflected in the greatest specifically political demonstration ever witnessed in Australia, when workers from miles around marched to Moore Park, Sydney. That Lang capitulated ignominiously to the bondholders' representative, Governor Game, is another question.

With the development of the new economic crisis, this anti-imperialist note will be heard more and more. At present, the metal unions in Sydney which carry out ship-repair work have decided to boycott the repair of all ships owned by Australian companies if and when such companies import ships built overseas instead of building them locally. The struggle to implement such a boycott must needs proceed against the Australian capitalists, and will tend to reveal them in fact as saboteurs of the development of Australia, as agents of British imperialism. Need we remark that the reformist union leadership is now engaged in making such provisos as they hope will render the threatened boycott innocuous. But again, this is another question.

If we are to avoid sectarian sterility, we must listen attentively amongst the masses for the rumblings of the approaching anti-imperialist storm; at every opportunity we must intervene to push this movement forward. As was seen in the case of Lang, we will be fighting the national bourgeoisie at every step. This perspective does not exclude, but complements, the everyday struggle against Australian capitalism. In practise, the emphasis will shift from one to the other at different stages. We must not "pass up" the struggle against Australian capitalism (on the lines suitable in big capitalist countries) while we wait for manifestations of anti-imperialism among the masses; but neither must we discard the national revolution because the self-interest and cowardice of the bourgeoisie makes it a non-starter on this road. It is precisely because the national bourgeoisie will not move one inch on this road that there is no basis for temporary united action with it.

Another important question remains to be dealt with. Bollard says: "Secondary industry . . . can only hope to expand for a few more years at the most, and then a severe internal crisis will develop." Again: "but an end to this constant upsurge in Australian economy can be anticipated within a few years." We will leave aside his identification of "secondary industry" with "Australian economy". Nowhere in his article can be found the slightest argument to justify these *ex cathedra* assertions. On the contrary, the only statement bearing on this question is in conflict with them, *viz.*: "The life-blood of capitalist economy

in this country is the returns from export of primary products such as wool, wheat, butter, metals, *etc.*, which are steadily declining." The present position, in fact, is that the severe fall in export price levels, combined with the expenditure of £A70,000,000 on armaments, is already having its effects. Industrial share prices are declining, internal consumption is shrinking, unemployment is increasing, the latest Government loan is a failure, and higher taxation next June is announced by Treasurer Casey.

The Communist League of Australia, in examining last December the perspectives of Australian capitalism, recognized the importance of the fall in world prices for wool, wheat, *etc.*, the resultant dwindling of the internal market, and the utopianism of the idea of offsetting this by expanding manufactures per medium of capturing foreign markets for same. Here our thesis recognized another factor. We quote:

However, another factor must be considered in determining what the next period holds for Australian capitalism. Both British and American capitalism are alive to the strategic importance of Australasia in the approaching imperialist war in the Pacific—a realization which impels them to make these regions a strong southern outpost able to provide the essentials for a modern war on the grand scale. Thus we witness a most exhaustive survey of New Guinea and New Zealand in search of oil, and a certain inflow of overseas capital to establish industries without which Australian capitalism would be handicapped in wartime.

Having due regard to all the factors operating, we conclude that the present temporary stabilization of Australian capitalism (occur-

ring in the milieu of the epoch of capitalist decay on a world scale) will not immediately be transformed into a precipitate decline of the economy. Rather will we see a period of convulsive fluctuations within the national economy, marked by uncertainty and misgivings among the ruling class and its political representatives, with the aggregate of unemployment steadily increasing.

But this continuance of the temporary stabilization will not be of long duration. The huge, uneconomic spending on the war machine severely strains the national economy. This expenditure, financed in the final analysis by direct and indirect taxation on the working masses, speeds on its course with seven-league boots the nemesis of capitalism—the dwindling market.

Capitalism in the next period offers growing unemployment, increasing insecurity, and lowering of the general standard of living, the drive to a new world war, and more authoritarian methods of government.

Bollard's emphasis on his view of upsurge of Australian economy for a few more years is not accidental. It constitutes wishful thinking to bolster his incorrect idea that the Program of Transitional Demands of the Fourth International is not applicable to an economy which is in cyclical upswing. Starting from this incorrect premise, the opponents of the Transitional Program cling to the story of economic upsurge (albeit toppled by reality at each step) as the basis for their opposition.

Before concluding, let us briefly correct a few more of Bollard's mis-statements:

1) The Federal Government (a coalition of the United Australia Party and the United Country Party, and led by the ex-Labor politician J. A. Lyons) is not dominated by the U.A.P. On the contrary, all the dominating is being done by the U.C.P.

(the party of landed and exporting interests closely allied with British imperialism). The U.A.P. is divided, the majority aligning itself with Treasurer Casey (who, significantly enough, recently was made a Privy Councillor), alongside the U.C.P.

2) "The Federal Labor Party . . . poses an untenable isolation policy" (untenable for whom is not stated). The impression left from the whole paragraph is that "isolation" is preferable to "collective security"—not that they are equally pernicious from a working-class point of view.

3) "The bourgeoisie *will be* [our emphasis] forced to attack the greatest gain of the Australian worker, his standard of living." Comment is superfluous here!

4) "The Australian worker possesses a great historical tradition." This is precisely what the Australian worker lacks!

In the critical situation which approaches, the Australian working class will need a scientific revolutionary vanguard. The Communist League, despite the confusion of centrist vapors, will continue its task of gathering together this vanguard on the basis of the program of the Fourth International. After a reading of Bollard's article it is necessary to reemphasize the essential pre-condition for fruitful participation in the vanguard: Learn to think!

N. ORIGLIASSO
SYDNEY, March 27, 1939.

The War in China and Japan

We reproduce below a private letter written from China at the end of March, which contains invaluable information and viewpoints on the Chino-Japanese war and the general situation in both countries.—ED.

FROM my letter, you will have observed the coincidence in our views on the subject of the agrarian revolution. Every fact in the present situation confirms their correctness. In the agrarian interior where guerrilla forces are in control (*i.e.*, in areas behind the Japanese lines), rural reforms, some of them quite drastic, have had to be introduced as the very condition for survival of the struggle against the Japanese army. Partisan fighters, with greater immediacy than in the case of a regular army, must have the sympathy and active support of the population. Thus we find that in some areas, notably in the Northwest where the 8th Route (former Red) Army operates, and in the Kiangsu-Anhwei-Kiangsi border area where the New Fourth Army (Stalinist-controlled) operates, the land tax has been reduced, land rents cut, and so forth. In some places, administrative power has passed completely into the hands of the guerrilla forces and village councils voice the demands of the peasants.

This is a very interesting phenomenon, for it shows that the Stalinists have been compelled by the very necessities of the anti-Japanese struggle to violate their reactionary program. It is very easy to stop the agrarian struggle on paper, at a "united front" conference table in Yenan or Chung-

king. In the villages, however, they are compelled to change their tune. The reforms are grudging and niggardly in comparison with the objective needs. The Stalinists strive by might and main to prevent the peasants from demanding "too much", for then Chiang Kai-shek will be offended and the "People's Anti-Japanese Front" endangered. Ever since the war began there has been friction between the Stalinists and the Kuomintang. This, in essence, is a reaction at the top of the struggle below. Chiang Kai-shek has good reason to be skeptical of the ability of the Stalinists to scotch the agrarian movement.

The Stalinist-controlled guerrilla forces enjoy great popularity among the peasants because of the reforms they have introduced. The peasant looks at everything in terms of taxation and land rents. We may expect in time that he will insist on going beyond the niggardly "reforms" of the Stalinists, but for that a new leadership is needed if the developing movement is to fructify and not be strangled. Above all, a powerful proletarian movement in the cities is needed to give leadership and courage to the villages. That is now lacking.

Class relationships in the village are extremely interesting in the areas behind the Japanese lines. During the past few months I have talked to many travelers who have spent time in these areas and they all tell the same story. Where the guerrillas are in control of a village, the landlords and

gentry display an extraordinarily conciliatory attitude toward the peasants. In some places they have *voluntarily* reduced land rents—something hitherto unheard-of in China. They are animated by a quite understandable fear of the dark masses who have suddenly acquired a new confidence in themselves. They come forward and offer a 10% reduction. If they didn't do so, the peasant might himself reduce the rent 50%—or, worse still, refuse to pay anything. The Stalinists, of course, always counsel "moderation". They act, not as the representatives of the peasants and their needs, but as social arbitrators between the peasants and the landlords.

The degree of the "conciliatoriness" of the landlords and gentry—here is a most illuminating fact!—is invariably in direct proportion to the nearness (or remoteness) of the Japanese army. When the enemy is near, and it seems likely that the area will be occupied, the landlords grow bolder, more arrogant, and more harsh in their dealings with the peasants. How reminiscent this is of the agrarian revolution in Russia! The landlords are divided from "their own" peasants by the wide gulf of exploitation. Threatened in their age-old property rights, they see in the alien invader their social savior. When a country town or village is occupied by the Japanese army, it is always the landlords and gentry who come out on the streets with Japanese flags to welcome the invaders. It is this

class which composes the "puppet" administrations which the invaders install.

However, in the anti-Japanese struggle, the rôle of the landlords is not by any means one of passive waiting for events. There are many instances in which they have given military information to the invading army concerning the strength, organization, equipment and strategic plans of the guerrilla forces in order to facilitate the task of the enemy. When these traitors are caught they face a firing squad. Nothing less will satisfy the outraged peasants. And then reports filtered in to Chungking that the "communists" are double-dealers; that although they promised to give up their class-struggle policy they are in fact shooting the lords of property in the villages. Chiang Kai-shek demands an accounting. In vain do the Stalinist leaders explain that the people being shot are traitors. The "united front" weakens. In village relationships we see the indissoluble connection between the agrarian revolution and the anti-imperialist struggle. Without the vigorous unfolding of the former, the latter becomes impossible.

Rural impoverishment will force the peasant movement beyond the limits which the Stalinists seek to impose on it. As a first installment, the peasant welcomes land rent and tax reductions and hails the party which gives them a sort of legal sanction. But from this it is but a step in his consciousness to the idea that there should be NO land rents at all, especially when the rent collector, the landlord, turns out to be a traitor to his country. This change in peasant psychology is, in fact, already taking place. In many villages, the peasants have demanded outright confiscation of the land held by traitors. The Stalinist leaders have been compelled to concur or lose their following. But when one landlord, or two, or a dozen in a small village are found to be traitors, the peasant begins to think: "Perhaps all the landlords are *by nature* traitors?" This is the greatest danger for the Stalinists. It is the sure guarantee of a fresh, gigantic upsurge of the agrarian movement. When it unfolds, it is our hope that the ranks of the workers will have been reformed and that a powerful proletarian movement under the leadership of the Fourth International will insure its victory. This is our perspective. It is toward this end that we shall strive.

You will, of course, be interested to learn what the situation is in the areas under the direct rule of the Kuomintang. There nothing has been changed for the peasant except for the worse, since the war began. The destruction of Chiang Kai-shek's armies in the first phase of the fighting in the eastern, seaboard provinces created the necessity for extensive recruitment to fill up the depleted ranks. But in the far west, much more than in the east, the peasant is possessed of little "national consciousness", if any. Wars and armies have been his greatest tribulation through the centuries. Fight against the Japanese? Who are they? The peasant has never seen one. He doesn't read and there are no newspapers anyway. The enemy depicted

to him by the recruiting officer is unreal. He listens to the stories of Japanese atrocities in Nanking, etc. They sound like fairy tales out of history. He picks up his hoe and goes back to his fields. There are no recruits. The peasant knows no enemy but the landlord who takes 50% of his crop, or more.

How to meet this problem? Conscription! Press-gangs whose methods are redolent of the Middle Ages in Europe descend on the villages, round up the able-bodied youths and take them under guard to the nearest training camp. The youths complain. Who will plant the crops; who will harvest them? The older ones left behind echo the same thought. But to no avail. If there is resistance, a few are shot as an example to the others. The others are marched off, roped or chained together like galley slaves. A comrade who travelled to Chungking from Ichang on the Yangtze River told me he saw 80 such "recruits" roped together, lying on the deck of the ship, with armed guards placed over them. In villages where he stayed during his travels, the young men would barricade themselves inside their houses when the recruiting squads came along. In several villages near Chungking there were regular massacres of peasants resisting conscription. These are facts which foreign newspaper correspondents do not cable abroad. Most of these journalists are (as were their confrères in Spain) enthusiasts for the People's Front. If there is something rotten in this state of Denmark, they believe it should be covered up, because to criticize "our side" would be to help Japan. There was one honorable exception: Donald M. Davies, Associated Press correspondent in Chungking, who reported in *The Nation* (New York) scenes of "recruiting" he had witnessed near Chungking, at the same time lifting a corner or two of the curtain enshrouding the inner activities of the Chiang Kai-shek government. He was promptly dismissed: A.P.'s formal pretext was that none of their correspondents is allowed to write for any publication except through A.P. We may be sure, however, that Chungking and the A.P. worked together in this matter.

Chungking's unwritten formula for the war against Japan would read, if written, "Win the support of the masses, but leave the social relationships unchanged." This is why, in reality, an impassible gulf separates the government from the masses. In Spain, the Popular Front "uniting the whole nation" was a political fiction which contradicted the social reality, but it had the appearance of a reality because of the large membership and following which the workers' parties enjoyed. In China, especially when one considers the size of the population, neither the Kuomintang nor the Communist party has any real mass following. The following of the C.P. is confined to the area of Northeastern Shensi, where the 8th Route Army is in control, to the central China area (very small) where the Ne-Fourth Army dominates, a small area in Kwangsi, and apart from this to certain circles of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

The Kuomintang rests exclusively on the army and the bureaucracy and is hated by the masses. Hence the "People's Anti-Japanese United Front" is a political fiction, an unprincipled congregation of C.P. and Kuomintang bureaucrats united for defense of the *status quo*. The Kuomintang sits in the seat of power precisely because there is no mass movement, and because its beginnings have been stifled very largely by this "People's Anti-Japanese Front" whose sole accomplishment has been the gratuitous handing of military victories to Japan. When fresh events force the oppressed masses on the road of struggle, the Fourth Internationalists will have their day. We are obliged by all the circumstances to confine ourselves to modest efforts for the present, mainly propaganda and the establishment of points of support among the masses, first of all the workers. I do not doubt that these efforts will bear fine fruit in the not too distant future.

Japan is facing acute difficulties. The Tokyo imperialists have bitten off much more than they can chew. They calculated that by occupying all of eastern China they could force the early capitulation of Chiang Kai-shek. But this has not happened. With help from Britain and the U.S.A., Chiang continues to "resist", that is, continues to refuse to agree to Japan's demands. The fight in China now is not really one between China and Japan, in which China fights for her independence. It is a fight between Japan, on the one hand, and Britain and America on the other, for the enslavement of China. The Anglo-American entente in the Far East, however, is not an entirely happy affair. The aims and ambitions of the two great powers clash at many points and there are audible undertones of hostility between them. That is why Japan can proceed with impunity against the trade interests of both, as she is doing. But still Japan's position is difficult. So far she has found it impossible to construct a central "puppet" government and the "occupied" areas are therefore still under regional administrations. A central puppet government is absolutely essential, both as a foil to Chiang's régime (since it will not submit) and in order that Japan may reap the economic benefits of conquest. The cost of maintaining a huge army of occupation in China is becoming unbearable. It eats up the fruits of conquest. Then, too, Japan's capital resources have been so depleted by the military campaign that there is insufficient capital available for the exploitation of China. Even when it is a question of finding the cash to buy a building from British interests in the Japanese-occupied section of Shanghai, the negotiations bog down for lack of ready money.

To secure funds for the prosecution of the war and for carrying out ambitious economic schemes in China, Japan is trying desperately to expand her foreign exports. This requires heavier imports of raw materials, especially raw cotton and wool. But there is nothing with which to pay for such imports. The specie reserves are nearing vanishing point. This situation recently compelled the government to introduce a

bill in the Diet authorizing the Bank of Japan (government-owned) to issue more notes against diminished reserves. Now it is proposed to devalue the yen by 30% in a desperate attempt to regain some of the lost export markets.

The effects of the war upon the different classes in Japanese society have, of course, varied. Government control of economic life, the war bonds which the banks (finance capitalists) have been compelled to absorb, and the inability of the bourgeoisie generally to cash in on the army conquests, have engendered dissatisfaction with the ruling military clique. Hiranuma replaced Konoye because war needs required further inroads on the big concentrations of wealth, and Konoye was too close to the owners of these sources. Hiranuma is completely the tool of the military. Government regulation of industry and trade had dispossessed large numbers of the shopkeeping bourgeoisie. They have been flocking to China in the hope of recouping themselves, but this ruined country offers no prospects to the petty capitalist or the capitalist who has lost his capital. Many of these people come to Shanghai or other points, dissipate their little remaining money, and then return home to Japan bitterly disillusioned. I have spoken with a few of these people and know their thoughts well. They are turning against the ruling class, for military victories which bring no economic benefits no longer have any luster. The peasants are also hard hit. Curtailment of Japan's imports in order to cut down the adverse trade balance has made fertilizer scarce, for example, little of it being produced in Japan, while the industries making it (chemicals) have been drafted for war purposes. Then, too, horses are being virtually confiscated for the front—this is always a step the peasant rebels against. Agricultural prices have fallen while the cost of manufactured commodities has risen sky high. This creates an impossible situation for the peasant. Meanwhile the villages are being drained of their manhood to keep the front supplied with cannon fodder. The productivity of the land is declining, but government regulation of farm prices prevents the peasant from lessening the gap between the price of his produce and the prices of manufactured articles. A huge army has to be fed. Ruined China cannot entirely feed it. The Japanese peasant must submit to confiscatory prices.

The military coup of Feb. 26, 1936, when a number of young officers slew the heads of the government, was a direct reflection of agrarian dissatisfaction. It may well be that a new crisis is on the way. The 1936 coup led directly to the invasion of China the following year. What is there now to offer to allay the discontent in the countryside? It is indubitable that the Japanese ruling clique is nearly at the end of its tether. A great revolution in China would have toppled it from the throne of power. The army is shot through with discontent. This is clearly revealed in diaries found on killed or captured Japanese soldiers. At least half a million Japanese soldiers have been killed since the war started, and probably twice that num-

ber wounded. The government admits nothing but the smallest figures, but the people have their own way of calculating such things.

Demands for man-power for the army have led to a shortage of industrial labor, and thus far, in essential respects, the Japanese proletariat has benefited from the war. Wages have risen, often more than the cost of living. The Labor Bureau of the Welfare Ministry reported last week that munition workers are earning as much as Yen 10,000 a year—an unheard-of wage. These, of course, are exceptional cases. But average wages have gone up considerably. From a daily wage averaging not more than 50 sen, there has been an increase to Yen 10 and even more. This "prosperity" will not last very long if the military operations continue. The ruling clique will be obliged to attack the workers' living standards. And then the fat will be in the fire. For the present, however, war prosperity has kept the workers quiescent, though there are innumerable grievances on various scores. For all "ordinary" members of the population in Japan, life has become a nightmare of rules, regulations, restrictions, some of an extremely reactionary character, on personal conduct. The life of the individual is being prescribed by the government down to the last detail. It is the middle class

which feels this loss of liberty first. The workers, "accustomed" to being enslaved and ordered about in feudal fashion, will take time to rebel. There is no doubt that the rulers of Japanese society are sitting on top of a volcano. That it has not exploded ere this, is entirely due to the hopelessly bankrupt policies of the "People's Front" in China, which have given the Japanese imperialists a series of quite important military victories, no matter how much the Stalinists may belittle them. That the volcano will explode is, in my opinion, certain. The great danger is a headless revolution, for there is no revolutionary leadership, and thus far the ruling clique has been able to divert mass discontent, to a large extent, into patriotic channels. If, however, a social upheaval in Japan should coincide with a similar upheaval in China, or if the one can precipitate the other, the prospects will be fine. There is, of course, the possibility that a European war may come to the aid of the Japanese rulers, enable them to further their aims in China, give them a breathing spell in which to consolidate what they have won.

I realize that I have drawn a far from complete picture of the situation in China and Japan, but that in any case is impossible within the compass of a letter.

SHANGHAI, Mar. 1939

X.

Correspondence

Ireland and Ulster

TO THE EDITORS:

The importance of the Irish question is increased manifold by the presence in America, England, and Australia of millions of Irish proletarians, whose attitude toward our movement is largely dependent upon our position on Ireland. It is therefore mandatory that we face the problem soberly and analytically. Comrade Morgan's article is unfortunately compounded of pure emotion, and in addition involves numerous distortions and mis-statements of fact.¹ Sympathy for Ireland's wrongs and hatred of the British empire are not a sufficient basis for deducing the proper position on a subject of such complexity. The vital considerations are: 1) What are the consequences of the old policies pursued, and 2) What policies can achieve the desired results.

* * *

Ireland alone of all British possessions may be said to have become a colony by accident rather than design. British policy always aimed at absorption rather than segregation of the Irish. Had this aim been achieved (as in the case of the Scotch and Welsh), Ireland would today be part of

¹ For example, contrary to Morgan's statements, Ireland never provided the bulk of the wheat consumed in England, and the famine of 1846 was caused not by the repeal of the Corn Laws but by the potato blight of the preceding year.

the British monarchy, and the Irish would be petty stockholders in the great British Empire.

This policy failed primarily because the Protestant Reformation came at a time when Ireland was not ready for it. The Irish remained Catholic. Onerous burdens and disabilities were placed upon them by a monarchy striving to consolidate its absolutism on the basis of religious uniformity and centralization. The aim of these measures was not to set the conquered apart from the conquerors, but simply to stamp out heterodoxy. Irish Protestants suffered no persecution. The Irish were oppressed not as Irish but as Catholics, and English Catholics were subjected to much the same treatment.

The early rebellious movements in Ireland contained no progressive features. During the Seventeenth and early Eighteenth centuries, the Irish fought not for separation from Britain, but simply for the restoration of Stuart despotism: the Stuarts, being Catholic, would not enforce anti-Catholic legislation. This in turn caused an intensification of the repression. But however non-national the oppression may have been in its origins, it was thoroughly national in its incidence, and the problem entered into the consciousness of the Irish as a "national" problem.

By the middle of the Nineteenth century, the Irish had secured the removal of virtually all the Catholic disabilities. The Irish

were the legal equals of the British. But the difference between the living standards of the two peoples was a glaring fact. The Irish attributed their situation to their English landlords. But in actual fact, the methods of exploitation practised in Ireland differed only in minor details from the methods practised in England. The poverty of the Irish was the consequence of their birth rate. During the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth centuries the population of both England and Ireland increased rapidly. But whereas in England the agrarian increment was drained off by the growing towns, Ireland experienced no parallel development. The agricultural population became redundant. Landlords in England, as well as in Ireland, charged whatever rents the traffic would bear. But whereas in England there were a thousand tenants bidding for every thousand farms, in Ireland there were two or three times that number. The Irish tenants, competing for a very limited acreage, bid the rents up and their labor down. When five thousand workers apply for one thousand jobs, a similar development takes place. But whereas industrial unemployment is the product of capitalist decay, Irish "agricultural unemployment" was due simply to the fact that the habitable earth, and Ireland in particular, is limited in size. Had the landlords been Catholic instead of Protestant, and residents instead of absentees, the situation would not have differed materially. Even national liberation was and is no cure for such a situation. Unfortunately one cannot guarantee that, even in a state of complete and utter national independence, even under a proletarian dictatorship, a tiny island with no minerals, an indifferent climate, and a poor soil will be able to provide eight million persons with strawberries and cream. Under capitalism in 1850 it failed to provide them with potatoes.

During the last years of the Nineteenth and the early years of the Twentieth century, the bulk of the land of Ireland was transferred from the absentee landlords to the native tenants, as a result of Britain lending the tenants the purchase money. This brought a slight improvement. More important was the reduction of the population by half as a result of emigration.

Since 1922 Ireland has had its own independent government. Under the Cosgrave protection policy, a native bourgeoisie was hatched, to flap its puny wings impotently. In 1937 De Valera secured the ending of the land annuity payments, the surrender of British forts within the Free State, and the severance of connection with the British crown.

These various steps in the direction of national liberation were progressive. Whatever the historical origins of a sentiment of nationality, it is wholly legitimate for it to seek expression in the formation of an independent state. It is the duty of revolutionists to support such national movements, but it is equally their duty to note the point at which a progressive nationalism becomes reactionary.

Ireland today is an independent capitalist nation, with a native bourgeoisie, a class of native landowners, an independent army, and a republican form of government. The standard of living of the masses can be raised only by the socialist development of industry (to the limited extent possible) and the reduction of the population. The latter can be achieved only by large-scale migration—no longer possible under world capitalism—or by a steep reduction of the birth rate—prevented by bourgeois and church forces. Ireland, in short, has solved the problems of the national revolution, and confronts today the problem of social reorganization.

But the Irish ruling class has an effective means of stifling revolutionary development. It has only to appeal to ancient grievances and anti-British sentiment: perfidious Albion is the source of all woes. The bourgeoisie must keep this agitation within bounds; it cannot alienate its chief customer. But the workers do not understand the business aspect of the situation; they throw bombs.

The nominal basis of the agitation, the fact which causes some to denominate Ireland an oppressed nation and others to call her a British colony, is the British occupation of six counties of Ulster. In the agitation of the nationalists, Ulster is represented as a child torn from its mother's bosom, longing to return, and thwarted only by superior force.

In actuality, two-thirds of the population of Ulster is Protestant and British. Far from desiring union with Ireland, the Ulsterians (or Orangemen) are fanatically anti-Irish, and are ready to resist Irish "reunification" with gun in hand. The demand of the Irish that Britain withdraw her garrison from Ulster is not the demand for the self-determination of an oppressed people; it is a demand for a hunting license to shoot Protestants. The Irish are here fighting a wholly reactionary struggle against the principle of self-determination.

The arguments adduced in favor of reunification are 1) historic right, 2) natural frontiers doctrine, 3) presence in Ulster of many Irish, 4) military insecurity against British attack. A similar set of arguments could be adduced to justify Hungary's ambition in Transylvania or Poland's seizure of the Corridor. Like its Hungarian prototype, Irish expansionism is also based far less upon the economic requirements of the ruling class than upon the "revisionist" sentiment of the broad masses. The longing of every people for a large territory, an economically viable state, and a secure frontier, are not without much justification. But the realities of the present situation make impossible the gratification of these demands. It is impossible to "free" certain peoples without enslaving others. A "just" set of boundary lines for the states of Europe is an unrealizable fantasy. The task of the European proletariat is not to rectify frontiers but to destroy them.

The incorporation of Ulster into Ireland would not obliterate the boundary line; it

would perpetuate it. Thenceforth the struggle between the two national and religious groups would constitute the so-called content of Irish political and cultural life. Class struggle and socialism would recede far into the background. The solidarizing of the exploited of both national groups would be delayed for decades.

The consequences of nationalist agitation in Ireland are already manifest in Ulster. Irish revisionism has driven the British population into the arms of Toryism: only the Tories can be counted on to block reunification. Politics in Ulster is the struggle between Irish candidates and Tory candidates; no liberal or labor current exists among the British there. If Ulster is today a stronghold of the British Empire, the Irish revisionists have themselves to thank for it.

Sixteen years of Irish revisionism have not erased the Ulster frontier, nor have they produced any class solidarity between British and Irish workers. Bombing British bridges and post offices, far from winning converts among the British, will only deepen the existing fissure between the two peoples; to the British workers the Irish will appear as homicidal maniacs, not exploited brothers.

The Irish workers must resolutely reverse their policies of the last sixteen years. They must renounce revisionist aims, and set themselves the task of overthrowing their own native exploiters. The seizure of power by the Irish workers and peasants would destroy at once the present firm solidarity of the British workers with their capitalists. The revolution might be extended in short order to Ulster and even Britain herself. Only in this manner will the liberation of the Irish from exploitation become possible.

It is thus the firm responsibility of the Fourth International to tell the Irish: We cannot support your demand for Ulster, for it is reactionary. You must recognize the principle of self-determination, and turn your energies against your class oppressors. Only thus can you win the support of the British workers, without which no Irish movement can succeed.

In taking this position we will greatly intensify the difficulties of propagandizing the Irish. That cannot be helped. When we tell the Polish workers that Poland is not entitled to the frontiers of John Sobieski, or the Turkish workers that Turkey is not entitled to the frontiers of Suleiman the Magnificent, we also do not increase our popularity. But we cannot endorse policies that in their consequences are reactionary. To free the masses from the enslavement of their emotions and prejudices is our first responsibility.

NEW YORK

V. F.

If the subscription number on the wrapper of the issue you have just received is

33

then your subscription *has expired*. Please *renew* your subscription at once to avoid missing any number.

TO THE EDITOR:

No doubt, to quote from the *Spark* seems authoritative to you. However, for us who are less well informed the statement of exact authorship of an article would be welcome. I am referring specifically to *Zionism and the Arab Struggle* in the February issue.

First in regard to the Arab nationalist movement. The crux of the matter is in your one little comparison of the Indian and Arab nationalist movements. There can be no comparison, except that Britain opposes them both. The Arab movement is nationalistic as Germany is, not as India. What is more, the nationalist movement has grown largely out of a conflict of personalities, the almost traditional feud between the El Hussein family (Mufti) and Nashashibi family (long mayor of Jerusalem).

Secondly in regard to Britain. Far be it from any Zionist to defend England. Perfidious Albion once and always! But one must remember that should Britain give up in Palestine, you would have either Arab despotism or Italian fascism.

Thirdly—the Arab people. The Arab economy is a feudal one, with a prevalence of absentee landlords. The peasants like the aristocrats have feuds. Much of the killing of Arabs lately was the settling of feuds under cover of terrorism. In the one city where Jews and Arabs develop together, Haifa, the one city where there exist Arab labor unions, there is not half so much anti-Jewish feeling. That is because Arabs enlightened as to the class struggle recognize that the hundred thousand or more organized Jewish workers are their brothers. They also realize that the labor unions are the most potent and progressive force in Palestine.

Fourthly—Zionism. I don't suppose that the author of the article has been in Europe. He doesn't know that in Europe, where the majority of Jews live, Zionism is a real mass movement (Germany excepted, where Jews are pigs — and Soviet Russia also where there are no Jews). The origins of the movement were—you too know the old story—in the Bible. In our time, however, it was the result partly of the Dreyfus case, partly of Theodor Herzl's personality and partly of the general nationalist trend. At the political beginning of the movement there were three interested factions. Among the great majority of Jews, anti-Zionists have been eliminated. There remain Zionists and non-Zionists.

Fifth—British-Jewish relations. It is true that the socialists are the major force in Palestine. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I have been led to believe that socialists believe in education for evolution, not terrorism and revolution. The practical application of Zionism came out of the World War. Yes—they played the capitalist game. So what!—Everyone is—even Russia.

Sixth—Palestine labor. The labor movement is 25 to 30% of the population. The agricultural workers form 20% of the population. I agree with you that France, for example, has 90% of her people on the soil, but you cannot deny that we have progressed. The Kvutzah, too, has developed.

Robert Owen has gone but the Kvutzah has been existing for forty years, and every week a new Kvutzah is being built.

I agree with you that the Arab problem is a ticklish one. In considering it, however, remember please that emigration and the death rate have decreased, immigration and the birth rate increased, intensive agriculture, also, has been introduced. In addition to material benefits (the bourgeoisie's task) an Arab labor newspaper has been

started.

I really feel there is no solution. "It is really a conflict of right with right. The person who had a solution would have a soft seat in the British cabinet" (Sir Ronald Storrs, of the Lawrence Group, former civil and military governor of Jerusalem).

However, as things are, Britain is preferable to war or Italy, because both would result in fascism. Naomi HANDLEMAN
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Where to Buy the NEW INTERNATIONAL

NEW YORK CITY

Manhattan

14 St. at University Pl., S.E.
14 St. at Broadway, S.E.
14 St. at 4th Ave., S.W.
14 St. at 4th Ave., N.E.
14 St. at 4th Ave., S.E. (1 and 2)
14 St. at 3rd Ave., S.W.
14 St. at 3rd Ave., N.W. (opp. Jefferson Theatre)
14 St. at 2nd Ave., N.W.
14 St. at 6th Ave., N.E.
Rand Book Store, 7 E. 15 St.
12 St. and University Pl., N.E.
Candy Store, 75 Greenwich Ave.
42 St. at 5th Ave., S.W.
42 St. at 6th Ave., S.E.
42 St. at 6th Ave., S.W.
42 St. at 7th Ave., S.W. (opp. Stern's)
103 W. 44 St.
46 St. at Broadway, S.E.
Times Bldg. Newsstand, 42 St. at Broadway
Columbia University Bookstore
Brentano's Bookstore
N.Y.U. Bookstore, 18 Washington Pl.
Store, 58 W. 8 St.
Essex at Delancey Sts.
Bookstore at Grand and Attorney Sts.
Candy Store, S.E. 9 St. and 2nd Ave.
Biederman's Bookstore, 12 St. and 2nd Ave.
Wigderson, 145 St. and St. Nicholas Ave.
110 St. and Columbus Ave.
Knickerbocker Village, K. & K. Stationery Store
Knickerbocker Village, Catherine and Monroe
Maisel's Bookstore, Grand and Attorney Sts.
Essex and Delancy, N.E. cor. newsstand

Bronx

Jerome Ave. and 170 St. (Subway Stand)
Jerome Ave. and 167 St. (opp. Loew's Theatre)
Jerome Ave. and 176 St. (opp. Loew's Theatre)
Sorkin, 206 St. and Bainbridge Ave.
Jerome and Burnside Aves.
160 St. and Prospect Ave.
Allerton Ave. Subway Station
Freeman St. and Southern Blvd.
174 St. and Boston Rd.

Brooklyn

Grand and Union Aves.
Havemeyer Ave. and S. 4 St.
Marcy and Broadway
Pitkin and Douglas Aves.
Sutter and Pitkin Aves.

OUT OF TOWN

Los Angeles, Cal.

S.W.P., 233 So. Broadway, Rm. 312, Music Arts Bldg.
Modern Bookstore, 509-1/2 W. 5 St.
Smith News Stand, 5 and Main Sts.
Smith News Service, 6 and Hill Sts.
National News Stand, 221 W. 5 St.
General News Service, 328 W. 5 St.
Crescent News Co., 208 W. 8 St.

Hollywood, Cal.

Universal News Stand, Hollywood Blvd. and Cahuenga.

San Francisco, Cal.

McDonald's Bookstore, 65-6 St.
Fillmore Bookstore, Sutter and Fillmore Sts.
Golden Gate News Agency, 21-4 St.
Fitzgerald News Agency, 57-3 St.
Sportland Smoke Shop, 3399 Mission St.
Store 20, 3057-16 St.
Mason Grocery, Mason and Pacific Sts.
Ferry Bldg., Stand at Key System Entrance
Koblik's Stationery, 1004 Fillmore St.
Room 2, 542 Valencia St.
Ray's Smoke Shop, 1203 Sutter St.

Oakland, Cal.

Newsstand, 7 and Washington
Newsstand, 12 St., bet. B'way. and Washington
Newsstand in Andrew Williams Market
Newsstand, B'way. nr. 19 St.
Rich's Cigar Store, 2336-1/2 E. 14 St.
Norton's, 7205 E. 14 St.

New Haven, Conn.

Nodelman's Newsstand, Church St., bet. Chapel and Center
Yale Cooperative Corp., 300 York St.

Chicago, Ill.

S.W.P., 160 N. Wells St., Rm. 308
Post Office News Co., 37 W. Monroe St.
Ceshinsky's Bookstore, 2720 W. Division St.
Cor. 57 and Blackstone Sts.
Cor. 12 and Kedzie Sts.

Baltimore, Md.

Frigate Bookshop, Howard nr. Franklin

San Diego, Cal.

Universal News Co., 242 Broadway

Boston, Mass.

Andelman's, Tremont St. (opp. Hotel Bradford)

Cambridge, Mass.

Felix's, Mass. Ave., at Harvard Square

Roxbury, Mass.

Friendly Variety, Warren St. (Grove Hall)

Lynn, Mass.

S.W.P., c/o Lynn Labor Lyceum, 127 Oxford St.

Sam's Corner, Olympia Sq.

Detroit, Mich.

Socialist Appeal Club, 3513 Woodward, Rm. 5

Corner, 13 and Market Sts., N.W.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Labor Bookshop, 919 Marquette Ave.,

Shinder's, 6 and Hennepin

Kroman's, 4 and Nicollet

St. Paul, Minn.

S.W.P., 147 W. 5 St.

St. Louis, Mo.

Foster's Book Co., 410 Washington Blvd.

Clayton, Mo.

The Book Nook, 24A Meramac

Newark, N. J.

Reitman's, Cor. Broad and William Sts.

Littman's, 317 Straight St.

Paterson, N. J.

A. Guabello's Stationery Store

Rochester, N. Y.

433 N. Clinton St.

257 N. Clinton St.

Cor. Cumberland and Clinton Sts.

Cor. East Ave. and Chestnut St.

S.E. Cor. Main and Clinton Sts.

S.W. Cor. Main and South Ave.

Allentown, Pa.

R. Zettlemayer, 637 Hamilton St.

Philadelphia, Pa.

S.W.P., 1806 N. Franklin St.

Cor. 13 and Market Sts. N.W.

Cor. 11 and Market Sts. N.W.

40 St. and Girard Ave.

8 St. and Arch Ave.

Quakertown, Pa.

Esser's Newsstand, Front and W. Broad Sts.

Youngstown, Ohio

Nick's, Wick St. and Commerce

Akron, Ohio

News Exchange, 51 S. Main St.

Cigar Store, Cor. Bartsge and S. Main Sts.

Cleveland, Ohio

S.W.P., Rm. 214, Mariam Bldg., 5716 Euclid Ave.

Schroeder's Bookshop, Public Square

Rubin's Drug Store, 1072 E. 105 St.

Seattle, Wash.

Eckhart News Agency, 102 Washington St.

Roth Cigar Store, 1407-1st Ave.

Raymer's Old Bookstore, 905-3rd Ave.

Sunday Forum Newsstand, Independence Hall

ABROAD

Cape Town, So. Africa

Modern Books, 12 Church St.

Sydney, Australia

Communist League of Australia, 108 William

St., 1st Fl.

Advance Bookshop, 10 Campbell St.

Melbourne, Australia

Mrs. M. Brodney, Bookstall, Trades Hall

N. Gibson, 236 Drummond St., Carlton

London, England

Pioneer Bookshop, 268 Upper St., N.I., Islington

L. Grey, 12-14 Red Lion Ct., Fleet St., E.C.

Clapham Socialist Bookshop, 79 Bedford. S.W. 4

W.I.N., 14A Chichester Rd., Paddington W.2

Liverpool, England

H. Cund, Bookshop, 1 St. Hilda St.

Glasgow, Scotland

T. Mercer, Bookshop, 52 Auldhouse Rd. C.3

Brisbane, Australia

A. Sinclair, P.O. Box 38, So. Brisbane

Johannesburg, South Africa

P.O. Box 2639

L. Sapire, Box 7428

Palestine

Pales Press Co., 119 Allenby St., Tel-Aviv

Pales, P.O. Box 476, Haifa

Pales, P.O. Box 619, Jerusalem

Scotland

R.S.L., 18 Thistle St., Edinburgh 2.

India

N. M. Jain, 21 Dalal St., Fort, Bombay 1.

An Important Announcement

THE BRILLIANT, 39-YEAR-OLD BUT EXTREMELY TIMELY ESSAY BY

ROSA LUXEMBURG

"The Socialist Crisis in France"

¶ THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is proud to announce the publication, beginning with the July issue, of Rosa Luxemburg's famous essay on "The Socialist Crisis in France" which appeared for the first time in German in the theoretical organ of the Social Democratic Party, *Neue Zeit*, thirty-nine years ago, and will appear for the first time in English in our pages.

¶ An essay which has survived the decades since it was written, it has far more than a mere historical interest, although that alone would justify its publication in English today. The questions with which it deals, in that style which made the martyred revolutionist renowned as an analytical Marxist and feared as a polemist, are questions vitally affecting the labor movement throughout the world of 1939.

¶ Should socialists join a democratic capitalist cabinet—a coalition government? Should socialists "defend the republic against reaction"—and if so, how? Should labor make a "popular front" with the liberal bourgeoisie against the "common enemy"? These questions, as urgent today as they were then, are treated by Rosa Luxemburg in a manner which, with a few changes in names, dates and places, makes the reader feel that her essay was written only yesterday by a penetrating contemporary.

¶ A special translation is being made of the Luxemburg essay by Ernest Erber, and it will be published with explanatory footnotes by Dwight Macdonald. A \$2.00 subscription will assure you of all the issues containing the essay—and more.

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS, CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS TO

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

Hailed on Two Continents as *THE Book on Fascism . . .*

FASCISM

and

BIG BUSINESS

by DANIEL GUERIN

In Europe:

"Stands out among books on fascism as one of the most accurate and most suggestive. . . Luminous clarity."
—L'HUMANITE (*Communist Party*)

"Deserves a high place among works analyzing fascism."
—LE POPULAIRE (*Socialist Party*)

"Lucid exposition of the phenomenon of fascism. I have seen nothing approaching it for precise analysis."
—LA REPUBLIQUE (*Radical Socialist Party*)

"Strips off the veil of demagogy in which fascism drapes itself. . . Goes to the heart of the problem."
—LA LUTTE OUVRIERE (*Fourth International*)

\$2.00

In America:

LOUIS M. HACKER: "The best analysis of the origins of fascism that I have read."

JAMES T. FARRELL: "Intelligent, well-documented, a work of the first importance. . . Especially valuable and timely in America today."

GAETANO SALVEMINI: "A penetrating analysis of the economic structure of Italian fascism and German Nazism."

BENJAMIN STOLBERG: "A book that should be read by everyone who wants to understand fascism."

LEWIS COREY: "For a clearcut understanding of the economic and class forces of fascism, you must read Guérin's splendid book."

367 pages

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

• 116 University Pl., N. Y. C.