

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD
UNITE!**



the new International

CONTENTS

Is a Third Party Coming?

LEON TROTSKY:

A Letter to the French Workers

MAX EASTMAN:

Marxism: Science or Philosophy

At the Crossroads in the S. P.

Trade Unions and the Revolution

The Anglo-German Naval Pact

Art and Marxism

Luxemburg and the 4th Int'l

An Answer to M. J. Olgin

etc., etc.

15¢

**August
1935**

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

(With which is merged *Labor Action*)

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

Published once a month by the New International Publishing Company, 55 East 11th Street, New York, N. Y.
Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 for seven months. Canada and Abroad: \$1.75 per year. Entered as Second Class matter January 26, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME II
NUMBER 5
AUGUST 1935

Editors:
MAX SHACHTMAN
JOHN WEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Is a Third Party Coming? by <i>Arne Swabeck</i>	145	Luxemburg and the Fourth International, by <i>L. Trotsky</i> 168
An Open Letter to the French Workers, by <i>Leon Trotsky</i> 148		The Anti-Calles Drive In Mexico, by <i>Jean Mendez</i> 170
At the Crossroads in the Socialist Party, by <i>J. P. Cannon</i> 151		Humanism in One Country, by <i>J.G.W.</i> 171
Trade Unions and the Revolution, by <i>A. J. Muste</i> 153		BOOKS:
The Anglo-German Naval Pact, by <i>I. Jerukhimovich</i> 156		A Reply to Olgin, by <i>John G. Wright and Joseph Carter</i> 171
Marxism: Science or Philosophy? by <i>Max Eastman</i> 159		England's Intellectuals, by <i>Hans V.</i> 174
A Labor Lieutenant and Top-Sergeant, by <i>Harry Strang</i> 163		Woman's Place, by <i>Florence Becker</i> 175
Art and Marxism, by <i>Feroci</i> 166		On Good Intentions 176

Inside-Front Cover: The Third International Is Dead—Long Live the Fourth International! Inside Back Cover: The Press.

The 3rd International Is Dead — Long Live the 4th

WE GO to press too early to be able to give detailed treatment to the Seventh Congress of the Third International which has opened its sessions in Moscow after an interim of seven years. The initial press reports, however, suffice to confirm the conclusion we arrived at after the dreadful collapse of the Comintern when Fascism took power in Germany: *The Third International is dead as a revolutionary organization.* There is hardly a notable principle upon which it was founded by the great leaders of the Russian revolution, which is not being brutally and cynically trampled under foot by the bureaucratic usurpers who hounded the Marxists out of the International in the course of the last decade, and with them, all the principles of Marxism itself. The International which rose out of the war like a tongue of flame to burn out of the labor movement the awful treachery of the social patriots who served as recruiting sergeants for imperialism, is now being turned into a catchpole for the "good" imperialist powers against the "bad" ones. The International which excoriated the social democratic footmen of the ruling class for their policy of entering into bourgeois coalition governments, now has its new leadership proclaim from the tribune that the essence of present-day Bolshevism consists in entering . . . "democratic", "anti-Fascist" coalition governments with the bourgeoisie. The red which once gleamed from Moscow to inspire and encourage a working class world, has been turned into a guttering yellow.

The convocation of the congress was undertaken not only in an attempt to mobilize the international proletariat behind

the banner of chauvinism which the foreign political requirements of the Soviet bureaucracy has forced into the hands of the International, but as a preventive measure against the rising movement for the Fourth International. More than anything else the Soviet bureaucracy fears the growth of a revolutionary internationalist movement independent of its fatal control. But neither its fears nor its desperate actions can stem the tide which is swelling in scope and in power.

Simultaneous with the opening of the congress of the neo-social patriots, the vanguard internationalist organizations of the world took another step forward which will be recorded in labor history as a landmark in its progress. In a vivid, stirring appeal, five revolutionary organizations have joined hands in the issuance of an *Open Letter to the World Proletariat*, summoning all revolutionary proletarian parties, groups and individuals to rally to the Fourth International. The signatories of the *Open Letter* have united to form a Provisional Contact Committee, which can be addressed by writing to P. J. Schmidt or H. Sneevliet, Parmeribostraat 10 huis, Amsterdam, W. Holland. The full English text of the *Open Letter*, which is to be issued in leaflet form immediately, may be found in the August 3, 1935 issue of the *New Militant*.

The Letter is a concise presentation of the revolutionary views of the Marxian internationalists on the essential and burning questions of our epoch. It bases itself upon the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the fundamental problems of the two social orders in conflict in our time—capitalism and socialism—

and, applying the scalpel of Marxism to the significant events in the working class movement during the last decade, it lays bare the lessons of the decay and disintegration of the two official movements—the Second and Third Internationals. The principles of the Fourth International, to which it summons the proletariat of the world, are given in clear and unambiguous outline as the fundamental principles of Marxism which the social democrats and Stalinists have honored only in the breach.

The original signatories to the *Letter* include: The Revolutionary Socialist Workers Party of Holland; the Workers Party of the United States; the International Secretariat of the International Communist League (Bolshevik-Leninists); the Bolshevik-Leninist group in the Socialist Party of France; the Workers Party of Canada. It is expected that the Provisional Contact Committee, which plans to issue a regular information bulletin, will soon have new affiliation in various parts of the world to announce.

The highly important step we record here has all the historical significance of the early days of the movement to build the Third International on the smoking ruins of the Second. Not for a moment are there grounds for discouragement in the disintegration of the Third International. Its existence was not in vain for the revolution. It raised the world proletariat to new heights. From these heights, the Fourth International will lead the working class to its final triumph, to the liberation of the masses from slavery, to the emancipation of all mankind.

The Third International is dead—Long live the Fourth International!

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME II

AUGUST 1935

NUMBER 5

Is a Third Party Coming?

CHANGES OF A profound nature are taking place in American political life. Superficially these may appear as the ordinary upsets and realignments of forces that usually follow a change in the business cycle; but their real significance in an historic sense are of a much more fundamental character.

For three-quarters of a century the broad political trend has followed the traditional two-party system, in which the Republican party was naively reputed to be the true harbinger of prosperity. Its preponderance was undebatable, except for the interruptions of the Democratic administrations of Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today this question hangs in the balance. The Democratic party has perhaps already passed its pinnacle of the popular, panegyric acclaims accorded to it as recently as the 1934 elections. The Roosevelt administration finds ever greater difficulty in managing its overwhelming Congress majority. Some Senators and Representatives become recalcitrant and turn "progressive" or "conservative" as they interpret their own fears of a swing of the political pendulum. Political free-lancers, spellbinders and quacks, democratic windbags and plain charlatans are out to reap the harvest. Republicans are kindling fond hopes of regeneration and revival from the grass roots. And most important of all, third party developments are actually appearing on the horizon. But in their deeper significance all these manifestations denote a beginning toward divisions along class lines of American politics—still clothed, however, in its unique American form.

Here we have a new phenomenon. Although it must be admitted at the outset that these third party attempts are by and large repetitions of earlier forerunners, now they appear at a time when the United States is entering a new epoch. This is important for our analysis. In view of the beginnings of class divisions in political life the emergence of a third party or parties has become historically inevitable in the sense of the inadequacy of the traditional two-party system. Of course, such a statement can apply only when speaking broadly and without making any commitments to any specific kind of third parties. Whether the attempts now being made will result in a third party acquiring serious proportions and serious influence at this particular stage, to be exact, at the 1936 elections, is of importance only for those who stake their political fortune on such a development. To us the question presents itself in a different form. In the first place, it is reasonable to assume that the system of two capitalist parties, representing essentially the same interests and holding sole sway, will soon be a thing of the past. Another party, or other parties, will be due to contend with them for popular mass support. Which party? Historical experience on a world scale has shown us the various forms that such parties assume. Liberal parties of a middle class ideology, labor or farmer-labor parties and the classical social democratic parties—the revolutionary parties are, of course, in a separate category. Theoretically, the rapid large-scale development of either type is possible in the United States. But here we have become accustomed to consider only the third party type of Populist days or the labor or farmer-labor party and therefore more exact definitions and more exact evaluations are now necessary.

There is today a veritable conglomeration of variegated groups

and elements from the blustering demagogue and old and new-baked "progressives" in Congress through the lopsided idealists, social uplifters and naïve self-deluders, to the Old Guard in the Socialist party and the Centrists of the "Militant" and Stalinist brands declaiming with ardor, some noisily, others softly, in favor of one or another type of third party. In its historic essence, the difference between their claims is not so very great.

The presumptuous demagogue or plain charlatan of the Long and Coughlin calibre have no particular allegiances. While they do not favor the martyr's garb of lost elections, they will easily stake their chances on swaying masses to their own political fortunes. At times they may run short of sensational material but in the critical moments of mass despair they are the more dangerous because they are the least principled and the most unscrupulous. For the cautious "progressives" in Congress matters stand somewhat differently, for they are the much more practical kind of office-holding politicians. The younger LaFollettes captured the state of Wisconsin for a brand new Progressive party, but in national politics the Senator considers it much safer to attempt to tag on "radical" amendments to the various Roosevelt measures. Obviously his aim is to build up a certain record and await the propitious moment when he may make the jump into the older LaFollette's shoes. Senator Gerald P. Nye, another "progressive", complains that "capitalists have bought their way into both of the old parties", but he warns his more impatient friends: "Don't make the mistake of trying to cover too much territory and try to change the structure of the nation overnight." Fearful of the "calamity" that any division, that is, division in the capitalist parties, "would throw the government back into the hands of the reactionaries [!]", these cautious "progressives" become suspicious of their own shadow. Governor Olson of Minnesota is perhaps a little more daring, but he is too occupied now with local matters to give much attention to national affairs. Still he says that he is ready to "follow any movement which is designed to bring about a change from the present system to a production-for-use system". A year ago, during the Minneapolis truck drivers' strike, he called out the troops, declared martial law and had his soldiers raid the union headquarters in the name of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor party. Upton Sinclair, of Epic fame, proposes to capture both the Republican and the Democratic parties for a "production-for-use" program and he believes that Roosevelt can still be induced to accept this program as the leading feature of the New Deal. The pacifist petty bourgeois liberals, always ready to champion the "producing interest" in society against the "speculating interest" and who plumped for Roosevelt in order to aid the "forgotten man", now begin to find the New Deal as disappointing as the war to make the world safe for democracy. Full of lovely vagaries and longings they espouse the cause of righteousness against social and economic injustices whose effects make them so indignant. On such grounds they would daringly support a third party. But the system that engenders these injustices is considered by all of these elements as divinely ordained, not to be abolished, only to be tinkered with—to be "regulated in the public interest". Was not this what they expected from the New Deal? And now it disappoints them, but they still find it so terribly difficult to make the choice between

Roosevelt and a new party. Pious protestations against fate plus the capitalist invasion of the Democratic party, which has put them into this cruel position, will scarcely help.

The socialists, Old Guard, "Militants" and R.P.P.A. alike favor a Labor party. The position of the right wing is understandable. Long ago it lost sight of the theoretical socialist premises. Its social reformist position became almost indistinguishable from the New Deal and Abe Cahan could justly proclaim that Roosevelt lacked only the little red Socialist party membership card. Today it accepts warmly all ideas suggesting a broader party that promises greater positions and promises to be a better barrier to Leftward tendencies which it views with such horror and dismay. The Right wing pleads with the high trade union officials to give leadership to such a party. But these officials, who have personal interests to consider, are too busy fighting the militant and the revolutionary workers in the unions. They are too busy putting the union label on strike betrayals and besides, like the capitalists themselves they have vested interests to protect. So far they have not stirred to these pleas and at the present juncture it is most unlikely that they will. Some of them took chances with LaFollette in 1924, but on the whole, the A. F. of L. officials usually tie up the career of their leadership as well as their personal interests in a system of collaboration with the capitalist party in control of the administration. Their title: labor lieutenants of capitalism, is most appropriate indeed. It would be far from the minds of the Right wing socialists to say anything that is unkind about this despicable and treacherous political relationship. Some irritating demands to this effect were made by the "Militants". But that was only for a time, only until the erstwhile "militant" leaders could divert the rank and file pressure for a revolutionary policy into the safer channels of "harmony", and find sufficient comfort for themselves in the formula: What we lose on the Left we shall gain on the Right. Their spineless opposition succumbed to the onslaughts of the Old Guard, whom they hated for one reason and another, but with whom they had no difference in principle. The newly constituted Thomas-Hoan-Oneal N.E.C. majority, born out of capitulation, may continue the efforts to save the S.P. from the danger of the Left and work for a Labor party that will embrace the class collaboration policy of the A. F. of L. leaders. The difference in principle between this new majority and the latter is too fictitious really to stand in the way. But on the Left, the R.P.P.A., fully aware of the perfidious reformism that pervades the S.P., also takes up the cudgels for a Labor party within which they say that "the Socialist party must act as a Marxist force . . . and seek to direct the workers into channels of socialist thought". The net effect of a mass Labor party, they hold, will be the "emancipation of the workers from the thralldom of capitalist politics". No more and no less. But still more than is accomplished by the social democratic parties whose leaders occupy ministerial posts by the grace of their majesties, the tall kings of the Scandinavian countries and Belgium.

The Stalinists present in their latest political turn the most curious and the most fantastic ideas of a Labor party *mélange*. They do not want a Labor party, they say, that is merely a third party. Nor do they want an ordinary Labor party that accepts the leadership of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy or the S. P. Right wing. Their aims are far more grandiose and, incidentally, much more ridiculous. They champion the idea of a Labor party that will wage "revolutionary mass struggle for the immediate demands of the workers which go beyond the interests of capital". It is to be a "genuine Labor party," they say, that will "really carry on a struggle against the growing menace of war and Fascism". What pompous nonsense! What marvelous rhetoric designed to shield an opportunist orientation and clothe it in revolutionary phrases! It is entirely devoid of Marxian content for, as all history proves,

a Labor party, even when it has a genuine trade union base, is a reformist party and nothing else can be expected from it. But the Stalinists are not to be deterred by such arguments or such proofs from history. They have started a veritable crusade to bring their idea of a Labor party into life. Not because a widespread sentiment for its creation already exists; on the contrary, that is not the case and the crusade is undertaken purely because it is prescribed by their latest turn of policy, the American adaptation of the Stalinist opportunist degeneration.

At the present junction of political developments greater advances are scored by the purely third party proponents. Of course, there is no certainty at all that the accelerated tempo of capitalist contradictions will permit either type to unfold on a large scale and play a serious historic rôle or attain a serious political influence in the United States. But it is very natural that the petty bourgeois demagogues of third partyism should be a few steps ahead. Politically the middle class, which is now so hard pressed by brutally and irresistibly advancing monopoly capital, is more articulate, more uprooted from traditional adherence to old shibboleths, and give vent quicker to its feelings of discontent in a clamor for political expression.

Surely the workers are under no less pressure and they have resisted militantly in strike struggles, but their political consciousness still remains on a low level. Definite Labor party sentiments, in the strict sense of the term, are much less manifest. The trade union movement adheres, at least formally, to the political policy of its bureaucratic top leaders. However, with the rumblings of new class conflicts distinctly audible and with fuel piled up for a general conflagration, an urge for independent labor political action is bound to develop. A response in some measure to the pressure that will be put upon them, cannot be altogether avoided by the trade union officials. Naturally, the collaboration that they have hitherto maintained with the political parties of the master class can in no sense be considered as a permanent condition. The dialectics of the class struggle would not permit any such permanency. Already today some changes are noticable in the fact that they lay less stress on the hoary old political slogan of rewarding friends and punishing enemies. In its place they have adopted an attitude of aggressive support for the specific Rooseveltian program of perverted reformism which was supposed to grant collective bargaining rights, assure expansion of the purchasing power of the masses, unemployment relief and social security. The paradox of this perverted reform program with its measures intended to go no further than to help restore the internal equilibrium in order to lay the groundwork for a stronger, a more aggressive and a more monstrous imperialism—on this fact the labor leaders are diplomatically silent. They will be prepared to break their alliance with the parties of the master class only when they sense that the urge for independent labor political action is beginning to take on revolutionary qualities. Their breach would be dictated by efforts to stem such a tide by means of new illusions in place of the old ones and by transferring the policy of class collaboration to an organized political party in order to thwart the progress of the working class.

History may then repeat the rôle of the agents of opportunism, the bearers of social reformist illusions, in a special American version. Not, to be sure, as was the case in Great Britain where the Labour party, despite all its defects nevertheless became a factor of historically progressive importance during the period of capitalist growth as a result of its contribution to the advancement of the proletariat as a class. In this country, when given such developments as indicated above, which are far more likely than the fantastic concoction presented by the Stalinists, it would start as a retrogressive force. Its main function would be to canalize the discontent of the working class into more or less futile reform-

ist endeavors and to swerve the movement from the revolutionary path. It is far more likely also, and this is already indicated by present trends, that this party would be a hybrid combination of third party and Farmer-Labor party forces under the leadership of the petty bourgeoisie rather than a distinct or a genuine party of labor. This can be deduced not because of any so-called American exceptionalism, but because of the dialectic relationship between capitalist disintegration and reformism in the present epoch. On the one hand, we have in the United States a highly developed technology existing on a background of a retarded political ideology of the masses. On the other hand, we have the tendencies of disintegration of American capitalist society and the titanic dimensions of its contradictions that may create the possibility of a stormy forward march of the American working class, in which it may advance by leaps and skip stages. To be sure, it will have to learn anew many experiences that were acquired by the European proletariat over a long period of time, to be consummated here, however, in far shorter periods of time. Forces for the revolutionary movement will develop alongside of the hybrid combination of Farmer-Labor and third party and in direct antagonism to it. Who will gain the hegemony of the masses, the latter or the revolutionary Marxists? That is the decisive question.

The Stalinists are in this respect in a twofold contradiction. In the first place, the forces which they may succeed in arousing by their deceptive Labor party slogan may just as likely become the captives of a retrogressive third party combination functioning as a brake upon the proletarian revolutionary movement. In the second place, their ardent espousal of the Labor party cause, requiring for its realization the trade union movement, which cannot be considered separate and apart from its bureaucratic top leaders, will in the decisive moment render them politically prostrate, servilely kissing the hem of the class collaboration garment.

Ample evidence to back up this statement will be produced in abundance in the course of the developments on the new party arena. Suffice it at the moment to look a little closer at the first of the present third party experiments made at the Chicago conference July 5-6. Except for the great ardor of the delegates present and the hopes of its naïve well-wishers who remained at home, the party for which a basis was tentatively laid is still an unknown quantity. Importance can be ascribed to the Chicago conference only in the sense that it was indicative of the new trend. Great care had been taken in advance to stress what its initiators described, in the common diplomatic parlance, as its purely exploratory character. Sponsored officially by five Congressmen, Amlie, the real father of the Wisconsin Progressive party, Marcantonio, Schneider, Scott and Lundeen, the gathering drew its representation from a fair cross-section of the variegated groups and elements who today form the vanguard of the third party movement. There were present amateur politicians of the *Common Sense* school, intellectuals without any particular allegiance and with as yet unknown principles and, more important, members and officials of trade unions like the railroad unions, the mine workers, the clothing workers, the stone masons, the electrical workers, the Chicago Federation of Labor and the Wisconsin Federation of Labor, together with representatives of farmers' organizations and of diverse political groupings, including the socialists and Stalinists. Socialist representatives attended mainly as observers, amongst them Nathan Fine, who came straight from the Right wing headquarters in the Rand School. As a spokesman of conciliation, replying to the opponents of participation by the Communist party, appeared Alfred Wagenknecht, who entered the conference by way of Missouri and wore a delegate's badge. Fine succeeded in demonstrating his usefulness as a member of the platform committee and there need be little doubt that Wagenknecht proved a certain usefulness in clarifying Marcantonio and his New

York contingent of Knickerbocker Democrats. Or—God forbid—did this pair perhaps attend in order to bore from within this mass movement? Be that as it may, even boring from within depends on the direction that is laid out by the borers. And Fine, it appears, started out with his gear in reverse, for when he returned enthusiastically and reported his noble intentions to his N.E.C. (to become an organizer for the new party while retaining his membership in the S.P.) that went even a little further than Thomas, Hoan and Oneal were prepared to go at this moment. The point not to be missed, however, is that both socialists and Stalinists found it possible to attend this conference and partake in its decisions, including the preparations to call a "more authentic" conference in the Fall to be held for the purpose of putting the stamp of legitimacy on the embryo third party as it is called by one of its well-wishers. Here we have an indication, in embryo form but a distinct indication nevertheless, that the new party trend is assuming the form of the hybrid Farmer-Labor and third party combination covering all the ground from Democratic and Republican "progressives" to the socialists and Stalinists. This is not at all strange in view of the spectacle in France of the C.P., the S.P. and the petty bourgeois Radical-Socialist party uniting to preserve the imperialist republic with the slogan of national defense.

This brief description indicates the make-up of this first gathering; its true political complexion found more adequate expression in the platform adopted. Dedicated to the principle of "production for use and not for profit", its preamble proclaims that "a new economic order is necessary", and that "until it is established industrial stagnation will persist". No more lucid, precise and unassailable statements could be asked from this motley gathering. Is it conceivable that the petty bourgeois third party proponents, who may in moments of despair seek recourse to the strongest language of condemnation to express their moral indignation, have now accepted the revolutionary way out of their dilemma? No, these native radicals, as they call themselves apparently to be absolved from any revolutionary implications, naïvely pursue the illusory phantom of "a new economic order" to be established without the revolutionists, without the Marxists. Roosevelt and Tugwell remain in their views far greater authorities than Marx and Lenin, and on this basis the struggle will ensue for hegemony of the masses between the third partyites and the proletarian revolutionists.

A demand for production for use and not for profit has, as is well known, distinctly revolutionary implications and presupposes revolutionary action for its realization. Today capitalist ownership of the means of production and its legal right to exploitation of labor stands in the final analysis determines all political relations; which is another way of saying that those who own and control the means of production are those who rule. The mere change to government ownership or public ownership, so long as these capitalist relations remain in effect, would therefore not suffice. It is nonsense to assume that production for use, which presupposes the expropriation of the means of production and the transfer of the ownership thereof to the producers, can find its realization without the overthrow of capitalist rule. In other words it can find its realization only through the proletarian revolution. To Marxists this is elementary.

Of course, these are not at all the aims and objectives of the third party movement and the proclamations of its preamble are obviously intended only as an empty adornment. Paragraph 8 of its platform makes this perfectly clear in declaring "We affirm our faith in our democratic form of government." Let us remember that this is not speaking of some future government but of the present capitalist democratic form of government. And should any doubt still remain as to the intentions of the authors of the platform they will quickly be dispelled by its opening paragraph.

The magnificent slogan of the third party gathering is there presented in its real essence, *viz.*: "As a means of transition to an economy of abundance we favor unlimited production for use by and for the unemployed." Is this anything but a glorified barter program? Objectively, and when considering its appearance at a specific historic stage when the marvelous structure of American national economy can find its full and complete usefulness to humanity only through socialization, the third party can become nothing else but a distinctly anti-progressive force. The mere fact, however, that the slogan "production for use and not for profit", aside from its complete perversion, could find its way into this movement gives eloquent testimony to the deep-seated mass discontent with a system of robbery and spoils that is devastating in its consequence—a discontent not yet given articulate political mass

expression.

The United States is at the turn of a cycle, but it is not the ordinary business cycle experienced before. The U.S. has now become inescapably and irrevocably embroiled in the maelstrom of world capitalist disintegration. It is entering a new epoch. The reorganization of its national economy and the ensuing ideological regroupments cut across old political lines. The politics of pork barrel spoils is nearing its end. American political life is beginning to divide along class lines, and the new epoch will put the political parties to new tests in which the petty bourgeois third party, or Farmer-Labor third party combination, will have no real progressive rôle to play. The future belongs to the revolutionary party.

Arne SWABECK

An Open Letter to the French Workers

Stalinist Betrayal and the World Revolution

DEAR COMRADES: I leave France today, and this circumstance enables me, at last, to put my case openly before you: so long as I remained on French soil, I was condemned to silence.

Two years ago, the "Left" government of Daladier, in its honeymoon weeks, gave me permission to settle in France, presumably with the same rights as other foreigners. As a matter of fact, I was forbidden to live in Paris, and I found myself immediately under the strict surveillance of the police. Shortly after February 6, 1934, the Minister of Internal Affairs, Albert Sarraut, after a wild campaign in the press, signed a decree deporting me from France. No foreign government, however, could be found willing to accept me. This is the sole reason why the deportation order was not put into effect until now. I was instructed through the *Sûreté Nationale* to live in a certain department, in a tiny village under the strict surveillance of the police. Thus, during my last year's sojourn in France I was cut off from the outside world more than when I lived on the island of Prinkipo, in Turkey, under the surveillance of the police of Kemal Pasha. Thus, the visa of a Radical government turned into a trap, after its own fashion.

Furthest from my mind is any intention to complain about the government of the Third Republic. The most "democratic" ministers, just as the most reactionary ones, have as their task to *preserve* capitalist slavery. I am a member of the revolutionary party which sets as its goal the *overthrow* of capitalism. Out of this irreconcilable contradiction there inevitably flows the struggle, with all its consequences. There is no cause here for complaint!

If, however, I took the liberty to call your attention to so minor a question as my living conditions in France it was only because this episode is most intimately bound up with the policies of the Communist International which has today become the principal obstacle on the historic road of the working class.

Two years ago, *l'Humanité* used to harp daily: "The Fascist Daladier has called the social-Fascist Trotsky to France in order to organize, with his assistance, a military intervention against the U.S.S.R." There were to be found quite a number of honest but naïve and ignorant people who believed in this canard, just as in the spring of 1917, millions of Russian peasants, soldiers and even workers believed Kerensky that Lenin and Trotsky were the "agents of Kaiser Wilhelm". One should not accuse uneducated and duped people—one must, instead, enlighten them. But one can and one must accuse the enlightened scoundrels who consciously broadcast lies and slanders in order to fool the toilers. Such enlightened scoundrels are the leaders of the so-called communist (?) party: Cachin, Thorez, Vaillant-Couturier, Duclos and Company.

Today, as everybody knows, these gentlemen have made an anti-Fascist "people's front" with the "Fascist", Daladier. The Stalinists who call themselves communists, have stopped talking altogether about the intervention of French imperialism into the U.S. S.R. On the contrary, at present they perceive the guarantee of peace in the military alliance between French capital and the Soviet bureaucracy. Upon the order of Stalin, Cachin, Thorez and Co. are summoning the French workers today to support their national militarism, i.e., the instrument of class oppression and of colonial enslavement. These calumniators have exposed themselves quickly and mercilessly. Yesterday they branded me as the ally of Daladier, and the agent of the French bourgeoisie, but today they themselves have actually concluded an alliance with Daladier-Herriot and Laval, and have harnessed themselves to the chariot of French imperialism.

Right now, Messrs. Calumnators are beginning to say (see, for instance, the paper of the Belgian Stalinists) that the policy of Trotsky and of the Bolshevik-Leninists performs a service not to Herriot and Daladier but Hitler, i.e., not the French but German imperialism. This new calumny, however, has the ring of much too old and familiar a melody. During the imperialist war, because I maintained the position of revolutionary internationalism, Messrs. social patriots, Renaudel, Vandervelde, Séverac, and Marcel Cachin accused me of "supporting" German militarism against the French democracy. It is precisely for this reason that the government of Briand-Malvy deported me from France in 1916. And the valiant Marcel Cachin, during this very same period, "in the interests of French democracy" and on the instructions of the imperialist government, fetched the money for Mussolini for propaganda in favor of Italy's participation in the war. All these facts have been frequently attested in the press and may be easily verified and proved. Cachin, incidentally, has never even attempted to deny them.

At the present moment Marcel Cachin is resuming the very same social-patriotic labors which so dishonored him during the imperialist war. Cachin is followed by all the other leaders of the French Communist (?) party. These are not revolutionists, but functionaries. They carry out whatever their superiors order them to do. André Marty alone gave proof in his time of the qualities of a genuine revolutionist: his past deserves respect. But the environment of the Communist International has managed to demoralize him as well.

To justify their social patriotic turn these gentlemen invoke the necessity to "defend the U.S.S.R.". This argument is utterly false.

As is very well known, even the idea of "national defense" is only a mask by means of which the exploiters cover up their predatory appetites and bloody brawls for booty, turning, besides, their own nation into mere cannon fodder. But if we, Marxists, have always maintained that the imperialist bourgeoisie never can and never will defend the actual interests of its own people, how, then, can we suddenly believe that it is capable of defending the genuine interests of the U.S.S.R.? Can anyone for a moment doubt that at the first favorable opportunity, French imperialism will set in motion all its forces in order to overthrow socialized property in the U.S.S.R. and restore private property there? And if that is the case, then only traitors to the working class are capable of painting up their own militarism, giving direct or indirect, open or masked support to the French bourgeoisie and its diplomacy. Stalin and his French flunkies are precisely such traitors.

To mask their betrayal they invoke, naturally, Lenin—with the self-same right as Lebas, Paul Faure, Longuet and other opportunists invoke Marx. Almost daily *l'Humanité* quotes Lenin's letter to the American workers, in which the story is told of how Lenin at the beginning of 1918 received a French royalist officer in order to use his services against the Germans who had launched a new offensive against us. The aim of this unexpected argument is not to elucidate the question but, on the contrary, to throw dust in the eyes of the workers. We shall establish this immediately beyond the shadow of a doubt.

It would be absurd, of course, to deny the Soviet government the right to utilize the antagonisms in the camp of the imperialists, or if need be, to make this or another concession to the imperialists. The workers on strike also make use of the competition between capitalist enterprises, and make concessions to the capitalists, even capitulate to them when they are unable to gain victory. But does there follow from this the right of the trade union leaders to cooperate amicably with the capitalists, to paint them up, and to turn into their hirelings? No one will label as traitors the strikers who are forced to surrender. But Jouhaux, who paralyzes the class struggle of the proletariat, in the name of peace and amity with the capitalists, we not only have the right but the duty to proclaim as a traitor to the working class. Between the Brest-Litovsk policy of Lenin and the Franco-Soviet policy of Stalin there is the self-same difference as between the policy of a revolutionary trade unionist, who after a partial defeat is compelled to make concessions to the class enemy and the policy of the opportunist who voluntarily becomes the ally and flunkey of the class enemy.

Lenin received the reactionary French officer. During those same days I also received him with the very same object in mind: Lubersac undertook to blow up bridges in the path of our retreat so that our military supplies would not fall into the hands of the Germans. Only some utterly hairbrained anarchist will view such a "transaction" as a betrayal. During those same days, the official agents of France paid me visits and offered assistance on a wider scale—artillery and foodstuffs. We very well understood that their aim was to embroil us again in a war with Germany. But the German armies were actually waging an offensive against us, and we were weak. Did we have the right to accept the "assistance" of the French General Staff under these conditions? Unconditionally, yes! I introduced precisely such a motion in the Central Executive Committee of the party on February 22, 1918. The text of this motion has been published in the official protocol of the Central Executive Committee, issued in Moscow in 1929. Here is the motion:

"As the party of the socialist proletariat in power and waging war against Germany, we, through the state organs, take all measures in order best to arm and equip our revolutionary army with all the necessary means, and with this in view to obtain them wherever possible, and, consequently, from capitalist governments

as well. While so doing [our] party preserves the complete independence of its foreign policy, does not commit itself politically with any capitalist government, and in every given instance takes their proposals under consideration from the standpoint of expediency."

Lenin was not present at this session of the C.E.C. He sent a note. Here is its authentic text: "Please add my vote for accepting potatoes and arms from the brigands of Anglo-French imperialism." (*Protocol*, p. 246.) That is how the then Bolshevik C.E.C. reacted toward the utilization of capitalist antagonisms: *practical agreements* with imperialists ("accept the potatoes") are entirely permissible; but absolutely impermissible is *political solidarity* with the "brigands of imperialism".

Stalin's crime lies not in his entering into this or another practical agreement with the class enemy: these agreements may be correct or wrong, but they cannot be rejected on principle. His crime lies in the fact that Stalin has approved the policy of the imperialist government that keeps guard over the rapacious and predatory Versailles peace. Stalin has not yet taken any sort of "potatoes" from the brigands of imperialism, but he has already *solidarized politically* with them.

The French bourgeoisie is, of course, able to strengthen its army which oppresses 60 million of colonial slaves without Stalin's approval. If it required this approval, it was only in order to weaken and demoralize the class struggle of the French proletariat. By signing the *cum laude* to French imperialism, Stalin behaved not like a striker who is compelled to make temporary concessions to the capitalist but like a strikebreaker who paralyzes the struggle of the workers.

* * *

The betrayal of Stalin and of the leadership of the Communist International is explained by the character of the present ruling stratum in the U.S.S.R.: it is a privileged and an uncontrolled bureaucracy, which has raised itself above the people and which oppresses the people. Marxism teaches us that *existence determines consciousness*. The Soviet bureaucracy above all fears criticism, movement, and risk: it is conservative, it greedily defends its own privileges. Having strangled the working class in the U.S.S.R., it has long since lost faith in the world revolution. It promises to build "socialism in one country", if the toilers shut up, endure, and obey.

To defend the U.S.S.R. the bureaucracy pins its hopes upon its political agility, upon Litvinov's diplomacy, the military alliance with France and Czechoslovakia, but not upon the revolutionary proletariat. On the contrary, it is afraid lest the French or Czech workers frighten the new allies by their careless actions. It sets as its task: to put a brake upon the class struggle of the proletariat in the "allied" countries. Thus, the source of Stalin's betrayal is the national conservatism of the Soviet bureaucracy, its outright hostility to the world proletarian revolution.

* * *

The consequences of Stalin's betrayal manifested themselves immediately in the cynical change in the policy of the French Communist party which is led not by the leaders elected by the workers, but by agents of Stalin. Yesterday these gentlemen babbled about "revolutionary defeatism" in event of war. Today they have assumed the standpoint of "national defense" . . . in the interests of securing peace. They repeat word for word the formulæ of capitalist diplomacy. For, every single imperialist vulture stands for "peace", they all conclude alliances, increase armies, manufacture poison gases, cultivate bacteria—only and solely "in the interests of peace". He assumes the responsibility not only for the Soviet government but also for the French stock-market, its General staff, and the gases and bacteria of this staff, who says that "the Franco-Soviet pact is the guarantee of peace".

L'Humanité writes that the French government will find itself "under the control of the French workers". But that is only a hollow phrase of miserable demagogues. Where and when has an oppressed proletariat "controlled" the foreign policy of the bourgeoisie and the activities of its army? How can it achieve this when the entire power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie? In order to lead the army, it is necessary to overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize power. There is no other road. But the new policy of the Communist International implies the renunciation of this only road.

When a working class party proclaims that in the event of war it is prepared to "control" (i.e., to support) its national militarism and not to overthrow it, it transforms itself by his very thing into the domestic beast of capital. There is not the slightest ground for fearing such a party: it is not a revolutionary tiger but a trained donkey. It may be kept in starvation, flogged, spat upon it—it will nevertheless carry the cargo of patriotism. Perhaps only from time to time it will piteously bray: "For God's sake, disarm the Fascist leagues." In reply to its braying it will receive an additional blow of the whip. And deservingly so!

* * *

The Communist International has depicted the entry of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations and the signing of the Franco-Russian pact as the greatest victory of the proletariat and of peace. But what is the actual content of this victory?

The program of the Comintern, accepted in 1928, states that the "chief aim [of the League of Nations] is to put a halt to the impetus growth of the revolutionary crisis and to strangle the U.S.S.R. by means of blockade or war". Naturally enough, under such conditions the representatives of the U.S.S.R. could not enter into the League of Nations, i.e., the general staff of the world imperialist counter-revolution.

But what has changed since that time? Why has the U.S.S.R. found it necessary to enter into the League of Nations? Whose victory have we heard? The leaders of the Comintern dupe the workers on this question as well. The French bourgeoisie would never have made an agreement with the U.S.S.R. if it continued to see in the latter a revolutionary factor. Only the extreme feebleness of the world revolution has made possible the inclusion of the U.S.S.R. into the system of the warring camps of imperialism.

Assuredly, had not Soviet industry achieved serious successes, if there were no Soviet tanks and Soviet aviation, no one would have reckoned with the U.S.S.R. But there are ways and ways of reckoning. Had the U.S.S.R. remained the citadel of international revolution, had the Comintern waged a victorious offensive, then the ruling classes of France, England, and Italy without any vacillation would have empowered Hitler to wage a war against the U.S.S.R. But, at the present moment, after the annihilation of the revolution in China, Germany, Austria, and Spain, after the successes of European Fascism, after the collapse of the Comintern and the national degeneration of the Soviet bureaucracy, the bourgeoisie of France, England and Italy replies to Hitler: "Why run the risk of a crusade against the U.S.S.R.? Even without it, Stalin is successfully strangling the revolution. It is necessary to attempt to arrive at an understanding with him."

* * *

The Franco-Soviet pact is not a guarantee of peace—what brazen nonsense!—but a *deal in event of war*. The benefits of this deal for the U.S.S.R. are problematic, to say the least. France is "bound" to come to the aid of the U.S.S.R. only in the event that its co-signers in Locarno agree to it, i.e., England and Italy. This means that in case French imperialism finds it more advantageous to reach an agreement with Hitler at the last moment at the expense of the U.S.S.R., then England and Italy will always assist in legalizing this "betrayal". *L'Humanité* maintains strict silence

on this restrictive clause in the pact. Yet, everything hinges on it. The pact binds the U.S.S.R., but it does not bind France!

* * *

Let us allow, however, that the Soviet bureaucracy, after all its mistakes and crimes really had nothing left except to conclude this equivocal and unreliable military alliance with France. In that case, the Soviets could have no recourse other than to ratify the Stalin-Laval pact. But matters are entirely different in so far as France is concerned. The French proletariat must not permit its bourgeoisie to hide behind the backs of the Soviet bureaucracy. The aims of the French imperialists after signing the pact with the Soviets remain unchanged: to set a seal upon the old pillages; to prepare for new ones; to facilitate a new mobilization of the French people; to utilize the blood of the Soviet proletariat. Should the communist and socialist deputies vote in parliament in favor of the Franco-Russian alliance, they would only give another proof thereby of their betrayal of the proletariat!

The struggle against war is unthinkable without a struggle against one's own imperialism. The struggle against imperialism is unthinkable without the struggle against its agents and allies, the reformists and the Stalinists. It is necessary ruthlessly to purge the working class organizations, both political and trade union of the social patriotic traitors to the working class, whatever be their names: Léon Blum or Thorez, Jouhaux or Monmousseau.

* * *

In France there is only a single group that defends honestly, consistently and courageously the principles of the proletarian revolution: the group of Bolshevik-Leninists. Its organ is the weekly newspaper *La Vérité*. Every thinking worker is duty bound to become acquainted with this newspaper.

The Bolshevik-Leninists have defined clearly and precisely the tasks of the proletariat in the struggle against war in a special pamphlet: *War and the Fourth International*. First-hand knowledge of this pamphlet and a scrupulous discussion of the questions advanced in it are likewise the duty of every advanced proletarian, both as regards himself and his class.

The betrayal of the Stalinists, adjoined to the old betrayal of the reformists, demands a complete renovation of all proletarian organizations. A new revolutionary party is necessary! A new, Fourth International is necessary! Service to this historic task is the content of the activity pursued by the international organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

The betrayal of Stalin did not catch us by surprise. We forecasted it since 1924 when the Soviet bureaucracy forsook the theory of Marx and Lenin in favor of the theory of "socialism in one country". Shysters and philistines said that our struggle against Stalin was a "personal" struggle. Now even the blind can ascertain that this struggle is being waged for the basic principles of internationalism and revolution.

During the last few years we have said hundreds of times: "Scratch a Stalinist and you will find an opportunist." Today, there is no need even to scratch. The Stalinists actually stand at the extreme Right wing of the working class movement, and to the extent that they continue to drape themselves with the authority of the October revolution, they are immeasurably more harmful than the old, traditional opportunists.

The hatred of the Stalinists toward the Bolshevik-Leninists (the "Trotskyists") is the hatred of conservative bureaucrats towards genuine revolutionists. In its struggle against the Bolshevik-Leninists nothing is too low and vile for the bureaucracy, trembling for its power and income.

Prior to executing his latest open betrayal, Stalin carried out a new pogrom—for the hundredth time—against the Left wing in the U.S.S.R. He initiated a number of fraudulent trials of oppositionists, hiding their real views and ascribing to them acts which

they never committed. Thus, the former chairman of the Communist International, Zinoviev, was condemned to 10 years' imprisonment solely because, after a number of vacillations and recantations, he was compelled to admit the fatal character of Stalin's policies.

The Soviet bureaucracy made an attempt to implicate me, through a provocateur, in the trial of the terrorists who assassinated Kirov. In the beginning of this year Stalin arrested my son, a young scientist, a loyal Soviet worker, in no way involved in the political struggle. The aim of this arrest is to wage a relentless terror not only against the Bolshevik-Leninists but also the members of their family. The bureaucracy knows no pity in sight of the impending threat to its domination and its privileges. In this sphere the Stalinists find constant support on the part of the capitalist police of the entire world.

Only recently, in the month of April, Stalin sent the leaders of the Russian Young Communist League to Paris to urge the French revolutionary youth to go over to the patriotic position. These young bureaucrats organized within the socialist party a special Stalinist fraction whose main slogan is: "Expel the Trotskyists!" Needless to add, that for this disruptive work the Stalinist clique did not and does not spare monetary resources: poor as it may be in ideas, it has no lack of currency.

But revolutionists do not capitulate in the face of terror. Just the contrary. They reply by redoubling the offensive. *Stalinism is today the chief plague of the world working class movement.*

This plague must be extirpated, excised, burned out with a hot iron. Once again the proletariat must be united under the banner of Marx and Lenin!

* * *

Dear comrades!

I have far from said everything I wanted to say to you, nor at all as I wanted to say it. But I am forced to hurry: at any moment the police official is scheduled to arrive who is to escort me and my wife, the faithful companion in my struggle and my wanderings, beyond the frontiers of France. I depart with a burning love for the French people and with an unwavering faith in the great future of the French proletariat but with an equal hatred toward the hypocrisy, greed and cruelty of French imperialism.

I firmly believe that the toiling people will sooner or later offer me that hospitality which the bourgeoisie today refuses. I would consider it the greatest boon if in the near future the French proletariat were to offer me the opportunity to participate in its decisive struggles. Working men and working women of France! So long as I am physically able, I am ready at any moment by word and action to answer your revolutionary call.

Allow me, then, to shake your hands warmly as a comrade, and to close this letter with that cry which in the course of some forty years has guided my thoughts and actions:

Long live the world proletarian revolution!

Leon TROTSKY

June 10, 1935

At the Crossroads in the Socialist Party

THE DECISIONS of the July meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party in New York throw a revealing light on the road this party is traveling and also provide an instructive political lesson for the revolutionary elements in the party.

The trend of the N.E.C. toward the Right had been indicated at the Boston meeting eight months ago, and again at Buffalo, as we pointed out in our comments at that time. This appraisal was hotly disputed, especially by those who had so recently hailed the S. P. as "the party of revolutionary unity". But now, after the New York meeting of the N.E.C. the predominance of the Right wing in the internal struggle can hardly be contested. The *Socialist Call* admits that "the action of the N.E.C. is a turn to the Right". The *Call* only neglected to add: It was also a crushing blow to the strategy of substituting organization combinations for principled struggle.

The N.E.C. meeting revolved entirely around the struggle against Socialist party members who so far forget themselves as to advocate "abandonment of [bourgeois] democracy". As a touch of irony, the same people who had gained support of the radical socialists by denouncing this same democracy as bogus in the Detroit Declaration, appended a proscription against the use of "deceitful tactics even as a means to a worthy end". Reformism in its crassest form had a field day.

The bizarre combination of Leftists, Centrists, pacifists and reformists which had carried the Detroit convention against the Old Guard fell apart as we had long ago foretold, and those radicals in the party who had relied on this combination were left high and dry.

It is to be expected that a heresy hunt against revolutionary elements in the party will follow the N.E.C. decisions. This is foreshadowed by the refusal to reinstate the five members expelled at Buffalo. Indeed, such a reactionary crusade in the party is the

only logical outcome of the position taken. In effect, the N.E.C. has revised the Detroit Declaration and, having thereby usurped the functions of the next convention, will seek to make its position good by suppressing or getting rid of their revolutionary opponents before the convention. The worshippers of bourgeois "democracy" have never had a very high regard for democracy in a workers' organization anyway.

The political reconciliation of Thomas and Hoan with the New York Old Guard does not solve the crisis nor clear the way for "harmony" in the Socialist party as the *New Leader* jubilantly proclaims. An underlying political harmony between these reformists always existed; their organization struggle only confused and distorted the real conflict of tendencies in the party which arises from profound causes. The relation of forces between these tendencies—petty-bourgeois reformist and proletarian revolutionary—is not changed basically by the decisions of the N.E.C. On the contrary, the unification of the reformists, some of whom were mistakenly regarded as representatives or friends of the proletarian tendency, is bound to aid the process of differentiation in the party on political lines and to improve the conditions for a genuine Left wing to take shape on a programmatic basis.

There is undoubtedly a strong impulse in sections of the party rank and file toward revolutionary socialism. It arose not at all from the radical gestures of Thomas, Hoan and the so-called "Militants", but from the influence exerted by great events and developments upon the minds of many socialists. In the past two years they have seen the strongest party of social democracy surrender to Fascism in Germany without a sign of resistance. In Austria and Spain they have seen that even an armed struggle, organized at the last moment without previous political and technical preparation, also led to crushing defeat despite the heroism of the socialist workers. In this country the devastation wrought by the crisis has not passed over the socialist workers without

effect. In addition, fresh forces, repelled by Stalinism, have come into the party to the number of several thousand in search of expression from their profound and bitter antagonism to the existing state of affairs. And then the youth, always a barometer, have reacted with great sensitivity to these national and international occurrences and have moved far to the Left in the recent period.

Such are the real elements of the Socialist party crisis. The net result is an unclear but nevertheless genuine revolutionary impulse in the party ranks. The S. P. is caught in the general crisis of the international labor movement. The "peace pact" of the N.E.C. and the New York reactionaries cannot dispose of it any more than the sham battle between them has truly reflected the party struggles.

As a result of the New York decisions of the N.E.C., the party crisis will very likely enter a new stage. The harmonizing of the groups at the top will be accompanied by an increased fermentation in the ranks. Whether this results in the demoralization of the Left forces or the strengthening of their morale depends directly on the degree of clarification that is brought into their ranks. The questions of program and leadership, in other words, consciousness, will now play the determining rôle in the further evolution of the Left wing.

The deal of the N.E.C. with the New York Old Guard came as a great shock to the Centrist wisecracks, misnamed "Militants", who publish the *Socialist Call*. Up to the end they staked everything on the flimsy organization combination rigged up at the Detroit convention and suppressed the struggle over the principle issues which would have enabled a Left wing movement to take shape and to harden itself in struggle. Unfortunately, too many party members, who really desire a revolutionary policy, acquiesced in this unprincipled comedy. The result was to be foreseen.

Fundamentally the political line of Thomas and Hoan is the same as that of the Old Guard. The differences between them are secondary, whereas the differences between all the reformists and the revolutionary tendency are fundamental. The "Militants" tried to bridge over this contradiction by personal combinations and horse-trades. This aided, and finally ensured, the victory of the Old Guard which never concealed its reactionary program and fought for it militantly.

The "Militants" styled themselves "revolutionary socialists" but their paper, the *Socialist Call*, since its inception has not yet revealed the reasons for their claim to this title. The paper stood for "socialism in general" and made no criticism of the reactionary, social-patriotic line of the *New Leader*. They hoped to gain an organization victory over the stiff-necked Old Guard without bringing forward any fundamental political grounds for such a victory and without giving any clear indication of what it would mean in political terms. They did not represent the indubitable sentiment for revolutionary socialism in the ranks of their supporters; they only exploited it. By their whole course they did not aid but thwarted the development of a revolutionary grouping on a principled basis.

Not the least culpable of this shabby school of politicians who impede the revolutionary development of the Left socialists are the reformed communists, who, having discovered the dubious merits of the Socialist party late in life, are all the more zealous in their devotion to it and make of it an organization fetish. Proclaiming the S.P. as "the party of revolutionary unity"—a rather hollow-sounding slogan especially since the New York meeting of the N.E.C.—they forbid the revolutionary forces to operate in any other organization channel and inspire the Left socialists with an unholy dread of a split which would leave them with no organization except the one they build in struggle and nothing to rely on but their own strength. Thus they introduce additional elements of caution and diplomacy into a movement which can come to revolutionary fruition only by a bold and independent policy and

a readiness, without shifting or dodging, to face the organizational conclusions of their political positions every time.

Not content with cultivating the decidedly utopian idea that the program of revolutionary socialism can prevail in the S.P., and must not under any circumstances find another organization medium, Zam even advanced the consoling theory in an article in the *Modern Monthly* that the victory of the Left wing is assured—by some sort of automatic process, as it were. Where is this law written? It has not been operative in the European parties of the Second International, and it certainly has not been verified by the recent developments in the S.P.

In truth this theory of the automatic process has no standing whatever either in revolutionary theory or experience. Men make history, even if not out of the whole cloth, and there is no automatic process to take care of it for them. This holds good also in that crucially important aspect of current history, the revolutionary development of the socialist workers. It will not happen by itself, and it is by no means assured. Without discussing the fantastic idea that a Left wing can gain the majority in the S.P. and transform the party into a revolutionary organization—for that appears to us to be completely excluded by every consideration of political reality—it can be asserted that the Left forces in the Socialist party will not progress and develop their revolutionary potentialities, they will not even avoid a regression into reformism, or Stalinism, or into political indifference, without a conscious and deliberate struggle under the banner of a clearly-defined program. The policy of muffling programmatic issues and letting things take their course is guaranteed to bring defeat and disintegration.

Look at the fruits of this policy thirteen months after the Detroit convention which was hailed so widely as a revolutionary turn to the Left. The anti-Old Guard majority of the N.E.C. is broken up and turned into a new majority under the political hegemony of the Old Guard; the expulsion of the five Left wing members at Buffalo is confirmed by reference back to the body which expelled them; and the advocacy of all methods except those sanctioned by bourgeois democracy is made incompatible with party membership—an anti-revolutionary declaration in every sense of the word. This is what the policy of the "Militants" has led to in the brief space of one year which was rich in objective possibilities for revolutionary advancement.

The collapse of the "Militants'" strategy at the N.E.C. meeting is not a defeat for the revolutionary forces; properly understood, it is a certain advantage to them in that it discredits the asinine policy of speculation on the support of individual reformists, concentration on organization questions, hushing up principle issues and—crowning absurdity—refraining from "factionalism" against ruthless opponents who are blazing away with all the weapons of factional warfare.

The futility of the hollow organization struggle conducted by the "Militants" ought to be obvious now to all. With the solidification of the Right wing, buttressed now on the party organizations having more or less mass influence—New York, Bridgeport, Reading and Milwaukee—and supported by Norman Thomas, the most popular figure in the party, it ought to be clear that the subordination of the struggle for principle aims to organization manœuvres is a fool's game for the Left wing. The bad results of this sort of politics can serve a useful purpose, however, if the Left elements learn from the experience to stand on their own feet, that is, on their own program, and find leaders who are able to fight for it.

The potential forces of a revolutionary Left wing in the Socialist party are considerable—in the Y.P.S.L., the Revolutionary Policy Publication Association and in the ranks of the "Militants"—but they are still far from having a clearly defined program, and they are not united among themselves. A serious grouping com-

mitted to the principles of revolutionary Marxism applied to the present epoch has yet to make its appearance. But the conditions for the emergence of such a group which alone can wage a real struggle against the reformists and their Centrist assistants, are more favorable than before. The fever of combinationist politics which took possession of the R.P.P.A. as well as the "Militants" at the Detroit convention, arrested the lively movement for programmatic clarification which marked the party life before that time. The recent events will provide a strong impulse for a renewal of this ideological work. In fact, a new beginning along this line was to be noticed even before the N.E.C. meeting. The programmatic statement issued by an influential group of New York Yipsels and the theoretical discussions in the magazine of the R.P.P.A. are important symptoms of this trend.

The statement of the New York youth represents a sharp break with the positions of social reformism on the key questions of the state and the struggle for power but refrains from taking a position on the questions of internationalism and war—the determining questions of the day on which political positions are concretely tested. The abstract Marxian formulations on the state and the struggle for power have not prevented Stalinism from betraying the international proletariat and reverting to the social-patriotic position of the reformists. By failing to express themselves on these concrete questions the Yipsels who signed the latest statement, by implication at least, adopt the standpoint of Stalinism. Carried to its conclusion that is not a real break with social reformism but, in ultimate practice, will lead to a reconciliation with it.

The errors of the R.P.P.A. group belong to the same category, except that in this case the approach to Stalinism (in the Lovestoneistic version) has been more direct and systematic. Nevertheless, the R.P.P.A., despite its weakness and its programmatic errors can be a serious factor in the development of a socialist Left wing precisely because it concerns itself with the discussion of program questions and has stood by its positions under the reactionary assault launched against it at Buffalo. For the building of a revolutionary movement one declaration of principle, firmly maintained, is worth more than a hundred of the diplomatic manoeuvres and organization horse-trades which constitute the political method of the leaders of the "Militants".

What the R.P.P.A. requires above all now is a reconsideration of its program in the light of the Stalin-Laval statement and the manifest degeneration of the Communist International to the standpoint of social-patriotic betrayal, signalized by the support of this perfidious document. Only on that condition can the R.P.P.A. become a force for revolutionary progress in the socialist ranks.

What is needed as a starting point for a real development of the Left wing is a reëxamination now of all questions by the revolutionary elements, the burgeoning of *political* discussion in their ranks and the subordination of organization questions in all respects to political aims. The Left movement can consolidate itself and go forward only on the basis of great principles and the unremitting struggle for them under all conditions and despite all consequences. This is the rule of revolutionary politics laid down

by all the great teachers. The latest experiences in the Socialist party confirms its wisdom once again.

We are convinced that a serious preoccupation with the great principle questions and a frank discussion of them will bring the Left socialists and Yipsels closer to the program of the Workers party and, eventually, to cooperation with us in a single party. In common with the world movement for the Fourth International we have given precise answers to the most important political questions of our time. We believe the answers are correct. Let the Left socialists consider our program and present their criticisms. We are ready and willing to discuss these matters at any time.

Up till now this programmatic discussion has been evaded by the leaders of the "Militants" on the ground that the W. P. is a small organizaion of "sectarians", whereas they, much wiser and more practical, are concerned with the masses. They have sought to balance off their political weakness by numerical strength, which, as the results of the N. E. C. meeting show, has been largely fictitious in their case. When it is considered that the Detroit Declaration of Principles was adopted only by a bare majority in the party referendum, and that the most influential leaders who supported it have reconciled themselves with the Old Guard, it is clear that the "Militants", together with all the Left groupings, cannot boast of a very large membership.

More than that, the S. P. as a whole has been declining in membership, not growing, is only a propaganda organization and, outside of a few centers like Milwaukee, Reading and Bridgeport where mass influence is exerted on the basis of municipal reformism, not a very large propaganda organization at that. Neither the "Militants" nor any other section of the S.P. have a valid right to wave aside questions of program and talk about "masses".

The American masses are yet to be awakened to political life. The political organization of even the most militant elements is still, for the most part, unaccomplished. If one has in mind to organize them for revolutionary aims and, through them, to lead the wider masses toward revolutionary struggle, one thing is certain: these aims must be clearly stated and consistently advocated under all circumstances.

Let the Left socialists who have experimented with other schemes for quick success, with such unfortunate results, now try this simple prescription. Let them work out a consistent revolutionary program and then seriously try to make it prevail in the Socialist party. We have taken a different road, but nevertheless we will help such a movement of the Left socialists in every way we can. We have every reason to do so, for if our goal is the same we must eventually come together in a common organization.

In our opinion this organization will not be the Socialist party but a completely independent movement of which the Workers Party represents the fundamental nucleus. Our reasons for taking the independent path have only been strengthened by the recent developments in the S.P. We have no doubt that further experience of the revolutionary socialists will bring them to the same conclusion.

James P. CANNON

Trade Unions and the Revolution

HIS ESSAY makes no claim to finality. It is an attempt to raise questions and provoke discussion rather than to provide definitive answers to the question of the rôle which unions and other mass economic organizations may play in the working class revolution in such a country as the United States.

Two other preliminary observations are required. In the first place, though confining ourselves here in the main to discussion of

mass organizations, we are not implying some theory of "spontaneity" of the masses. It is our position that the leadership of the revolutionary Marxian party is indispensable for the success of the proletarian revolution.

In the second place, important as it is in certain respects, we are not dealing here with the question of the A. F. of L. vs. "independent unionism". The question we are posing is: Regardless of how

this issue may be resolved, what rôle will unions and other mass organizations play in the revolutionary crisis?

One of the more able of the younger American historians of the labor movement has frequently made the assertion in private conversation that there would never be a proletarian revolution in a country where a strong trade union movement had been built up. He based his contention on the fact that these unions themselves become great vested interests clearly tied up with the capitalist operation of industry; that the officialdom constitutes a privileged group which develops close relations with the employing class and a psychology similar to that of the latter; that the tactic of compromise, "give and take", progress by slow degrees, becomes ingrained and sets up a resistance against risking all on a throw of the revolutionary dice, and so on; and that these unions gain such a hold upon the workers, come to seem so indispensable, that the workers will not act independently of them even in a major crisis.

The evidence in support of a part of this contention is very strong. The way in which the unions in western Europe and the U. S. survived the war and post-war crisis, in fact, came out of it with enhanced numbers and prestige, as well as the doggedness with which the German workers clung to the unions when these were forced to retreat and quite obviously were no longer able to offer any substantial measure of protection, much less to solve the crisis, sufficiently illustrate the hold of the unions upon the workers. Some form of inclusive organization through which to carry on the immediate struggle, offensive or defensive, on the job, the workers are bound to seek or cling to, so long as they have any opportunity to struggle at all.

It is not necessary, either, to dwell upon the conservatism which has characterized trade unionism in Germany, England and the U. S., for example, the enormous difficulty experienced in shaking even a little the entrenched trade union bureaucracies, etc.

Are we then forced to accept the conclusion that, on the one hand, the unions cannot be uprooted and, on the other hand, cannot be expected to play a progressive rôle as the crisis deepens for the working class—that in order to protect themselves against the assaults of the employers the workers have as it were encased themselves in a suit of armor which in the last analysis weighs down the workers themselves, prevents them from breaking their way to liberty, keeps them rooted to the ground while the reaction showers its blows upon them?

There is indeed no escape from this conclusion—unless it is conceivable that revolutionary Marxists can take the leadership of the unions away from the trade union bureaucrats with their limited vision (even where other vices do not exist) and from the social democrats with their reformist, parliamentarian, pacifist, social-patriotic outlook. But if this possibility has come to seem remote, just barely conceivable, almost in the realm of miracle, this gives us a measure of the extent to which the Communist International (i.e., the Third) and its sections have failed to function as revolutionary Marxian organizations and of the consequent calamity they have brought upon the proletarian movement.

The "normal", the to-be-expected course, is precisely that the influence of the revolutionists over the mass organizations should grow and presently become preponderant. As the crisis of the capitalist economy becomes deeper and more intense, the masses are set in motion. Instinctively, we might say, they fight back against the attempts to lower their standards. The struggles become more bitter. The illusion that employers and workers have mutual interests tends to break down. The state comes out more and more openly against the workers, no matter how elementary their demands. The struggle is waged on a constantly broader front. More and more workers are drawn into strike actions. "General" strikes break out in localities or industries and the strike organizations have to intervene in governmental functions, such

as maintenance of supply services, of order in the strike area, etc. All this is elementary and has been observed often enough.

Such situations open the door wide for the politically developed workers and for the revolutionary party, provided that the latter has not pursued a course in the unions which has discredited it and left it isolated. The developing actions which we have referred to require energy, initiative, the will to struggle, courage, capacity to organize large-scale actions, ability to sway masses in motion, to arouse mass enthusiasm, interpret the subtle changes in mass psychology, and a political outlook on the part of the leadership. But the conventional trade union leadership is, to put it mildly, not distinguished for these qualities. They will try, but they cannot hold back the masses from struggle. As the struggle extends and sharpens, they must call for or, with as much grace as they can muster, accept aid from the radical elements or be pushed out of the picture entirely.

At this point it should prove both interesting and useful to introduce a somewhat detailed description of how this process worked out in certain dramatic episodes during the Auto-Lite strike in Toledo in 1934. It is common knowledge that this strike was on its last legs owing to the indifference of the A. F. of L. leadership in automobiles, the inexperience and passivity of the local union leadership, etc., and that it was brought back to life by militants in the union and in the Lucas County Unemployed League under the leadership of Workers Party elements. Mass picketing and demonstrations in defiance of injunctions culminated in "the battle of Toledo" during which ten thousand Toledo workers, enraged at the brutality of special deputies, stormed the Auto-Lite plant, etc.

The revolutionists had begun to talk up the idea of a general strike of all Toledo workers to compel the Auto-Lite management to settle with the union. The idea got an instant response among the workers. The Central Labor Union, an A. F. of L. body, less reactionary and bureaucratized than similar bodies in some of the larger cities, but not in the remotest sense "Red", was compelled to take cognizance of the agitation. It appointed a Committee of Twenty-three to take a strike vote of the locals affiliated with the C.L.U., with the understanding that the organization of a general strike, if the vote were favorable, rested in the hands of the Committee. As a matter of fact, out of the one hundred or so local unions over 95 voted in favor of such a strike in support of the Auto-Lite workers, and only one against.

The vote having been taken, the disposition among the C.L.U. officials was to do nothing definite about it. As the Auto-Lite Company dragged out the negotiations, however, the workers began to press for action. The officials then resorted to a characteristic device. They called for a big parade and mass meeting to be held on a Friday night. This would serve to let off steam. They did not dare, however, to offer the demonstration openly as a substitute for general strike action. They had to give out the impression that it was in preparation for the strike, that at the mass meeting probably a final call to strike on Monday would be announced.

The spirit of enthusiasm and militancy was running high among the workers. The local union leaders had to bend to it. A few days before the mass meeting, for example, they asked the present writer, known to be a Workers Party member, to be one of the speakers. As the demonstration day came nearer, however, the employers and the higher-ups in the A. F. of L. put on the screws. Things must not "get out of hand" at the meeting since there must not be a general strike. There must be simply a parade with a very brief meeting at the conclusion at which three or four safe C.L.U. officials would speak briefly and prosaically. Then the crowd would be sent home—without any mention of general strike. A few hours before the parade started, the writer was accordingly

informed that he would not be called upon to speak: after the parade the crowd would be "too tired to stand and listen to speeches".

The parade exceeded all expectations in numbers and enthusiasm. The mass meeting opened peacefully with a few remarks by the chairman of the Committee of Twenty-three. The next speaker talked in an uninspired manner. To test out the sentiment of the crowd, someone called out to the speaker who was carefully staying a thousand miles away from that subject: "What about the general strike Monday?" The speaker played dumb. But the crowd quickly demonstrated that the general strike was the one thing in which it was interested. The question was shouted from all directions at the speaker. In a few minutes he gave up the attempt to speak. The same question greeted the chairman of the meeting as he tried to introduce the next safe and sane functionary. The crowd insisted on an answer to its question. The bureaucrats had none to give. The uproar increased. The meeting was thrown into turmoil. The bureaucrats threw up their hands in despair and walked out on their own meeting. The more astute ones perhaps conjectured that the crowd would leave too, and thus the strike issue would be downed.

That is, of course, what would have happened if there had been no experienced revolutionary mass leaders present who had the confidence of the workers, or could at least get their attention, and who knew what to do in such a situation. They were present and acted promptly. Sam Pollock, picket leader, Unemployed League official and party member, took the chair and quickly got the attention of the workers. One speaker after another got up, as per agreement, and hammered home the messages the workers needed and wanted to hear: "General Strike on Monday unless the Auto-Lite Strike is settled by then. Spread this word around over the week-end. Do not go to work on Monday, but wait for orders from the Strike Committee. Disperse quietly when this meeting is over: let no one provoke you." While this was going on, some one came to the platform and said to me: "You fellows have all had your say. Why can't a man who has been in the trade union movement here for 25 years have a chance?" It developed that he was the editor of the official organ of the Toledo C.L.U. He was given his chance to speak, as I would not have been if his fellow-officials had remained in charge of the meeting!

The general strike did not take place, because on Saturday the final negotiations were started which on Monday ended in a settlement between the union and the Auto-Lite firm. Had the strike occurred, representatives of the Unemployed Leagues who would have been party members would undoubtedly have been added to the Committee of 23. Militants would have been put in charge of picketing. Known party leaders would have been drawn in for consultation and would have wielded increasing influence. An enlarged strike committee on which militant rank and filers would have predominated would have been elected in the shop meetings. As the struggle became more intense, the same thing would have happened with the strike that happened in the mass meeting—leadership would have slipped out of the hands of the bureaucrats utterly incompetent and unwilling to handle such a situation and the militants and revolutionists would have taken it up.

Furthermore, if the strike had occurred including the transportation system, the light and power plants, etc., the strike organization would have had to give orders to, interfere with, in greater or less degree replace the mayor, the police, the health authorities, the public utilities commission, etc. To the extent that it did so, it would have foreshadowed and approximated a Soviet, a workers' council—an organ of workers' government as against the organs of capitalist government. And we can think, of course, of developments such as these we have sketched occurring not in a single locality, but in an entire basic industry and over a wide

territory eventually on a national scale.

It is suggested, then, not only that the unions, unemployed leagues, farmers' organizations, may under the leadership of revolutionary Marxists be prevented from becoming bulwarks of reaction, but may as the struggle for power sharpens be transformed into or be directly instrumental in helping to form the organs of workers' power.

It must be understood of course that this will involve the bitterest struggles for control over the mass organizations, for leadership within them. The fact that we have presented our illustration from Toledo in a simplified and abbreviated manner does not imply an underestimation of the violence of this internal struggle.

It is likely that there will be many variations in the process. In a mining region, for example, the union membership and the working population will be nearly identical. The union is the agency through which the miners habitually handle their economic, political, cultural problems. The elections for the Council of Action (Soviet) in that region may very likely take place in the miners' union meeting. The same sort of thing may take place in a farming community which has a militant farmers' union.

In cases where the union organization is not fully responsive to the developing situation and the moods of the workers, the shop organizations may take the initiative with the mild approval or toleration of or even in opposition to the union bureaucracy. In general, as the struggle develops and nears a climax, the masses will get into motion, take things into their own hands in the establishments. It is to be expected, however, that this rank and file participation will in general reflect itself in the union organization. The reflection is likely to be uneven. The union machinery may in many instances prove too cumbersome, the control of the officialdom too rigid, so that the workers will have to proceed independently of them, as the pace of events quickens. This would be especially likely to happen in the case of long-established organizations of the highly skilled workers. Generally speaking, however, we cannot conceive of an advance of the working class to a point where it can enter upon a struggle for power, without an advance in the economic organizations in the direction of industrial unionism, a class struggle philosophy, rank and file control, close contact with the shop and the happenings there, etc.

In connection with all this, it is important to remember that the unions become repositories of an immense amount of information about the operations of industry—technical, engineering, administrative, etc. This also makes them exceedingly important agencies in the process by which the control of the workers over industrial operations is made actual and productive of efficient operation amid the difficulties of the period when workers' power is being consolidated.

The alternative to the general conception we have sketched is to suppose that the unions are peculiar to an earlier period in capitalist development, that they are no longer able to function in the interest of the workers in the period of capitalist decline and collapse, that, therefore, the workers must abandon them or that they will in fact be wrecked by the capitalist reaction.

We cannot accept this perspective. In the first place, as we have already suggested, the workers have demonstrated a remarkable tenacity in clinging to their unions. Whatever may happen to this or that union or any number of unions, the workers do not wish to abandon the union movement but to broaden it, increase its militancy, etc. So long as capitalism endures, organization of some kind on the job to deal with the boss is indispensable. Instinctively the masses fight to defend the unions, the right to strike, etc. If the mass economic organizations are smashed, what in practice can that mean except the establishment of Fascism?

From the other direction the question arises: If the general trend is as we have indicated, toward the broadening of the mass organ-

izations, increase in their militancy, acceptance of Marxian leadership, struggle on a broader scale and a higher and higher political plane, etc., then is it not likely that the unions as a whole will, so far as the industrial sections of the country are concerned, become the workers' councils, the instruments of workers' power? Thus the Central Labor Union, now of course with workers of all categories in its affiliated unions, becomes the Soviet of a given city and the national union federation convention, with its delegates from all industries and sections of the country, becomes the industrial part of the national congress of Soviets?

Theoretically, it seems to me, this possibility cannot be excluded. The "seizure of the factories" by the Italian workers under the direction of the General Confederation of Labor comes to mind in this connection. When a body such as the British Trade Union Congress calls or sponsors a general strike in support, for example, of the miners, the conflict almost from the first moment takes on the character of a direct clash with the state which either places the leading union body in a hopeless dilemma or leads to revolutionary steps, depending on the character and the aims of this same leading body. Other things being equal, a movement of the workers with the full sanction, under the leadership of the organization through which they have been accustomed to carry on their struggles would seem to have more promise of success—starts out with a ready-made machinery for communication, action, etc.—than a movement where this condition does not exist.

Much more attention must be given both to the analysis of this possibility and the details of seizure of power where this condition prevails, than has yet been given to the subject to this author's knowledge.

It would be far from safe, however, to assume confidently that such a condition will exist. The trade union organization as such,

while being drawn into the current of revolutionary action and the main supporting, may not be ready or entirely fitted to conduct the movement, even assuming that the revolutionary party has the dominant influence in it. The union organization is after all primarily economic rather than political and not in the first instance equipped to deal with the larger national and international political issues. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that the pace of development in various unions may vary as I have suggested at an earlier point in this article. The revolutionary party must give a great deal of study to these questions and be prepared as the actual crisis develops to deal in accordance with the facts of the situation and the actual forces at its disposal.

For the present, we conclude with brief practical suggestions. First, the slogan "Deeper into the unions" (whether they happen to be A. F. of L. or independent) must be applied by the party and all its committees and members much more thoroughly and enthusiastically even than heretofore. Second, in every strike situation the policy of drawing in the broadest forces—all the unions, unemployed organizations, political parties and groups—must be carried out, in order to break down trade union provincialism, politicalize the struggle, develop class consciousness, face the workers with the problems of conflict with capitalist governmental agencies, etc. Third, the greatest emphasis must be placed on drawing the employed and unemployed organizations together, forming Councils of Action on which these and also the more militant farmers' organizations are represented, to prevent the division of the working class into employed and unemployed, to insure the broadening of all struggles and again in order to accustom the working masses as workers, and not as craftsmen, skilled or unskilled, etc., etc., to confront the employers and the state.

A. J. MUSTE

The Anglo-German Naval Pact

I. WHEN 35 IS EQUAL TO 100

THE ANGLO-GERMAN naval negotiations begun in London early in June have attracted general attention. According to the London press, the next few days may be counted to see the final elaboration of the draft of the agreement. This would be the first Anglo-German two-power pact on German armaments. The negotiations are being conducted upon the basis of the "final" proposal made at the end of March of this year by Hitler on the occasion of his meeting in Berlin with Simon. The proposal boils down to the following: England concurs in the elimination of those points of the Versailles Treaty which limit the naval combat forces of Germany. Fascist Germany's "equality" in the field of naval armaments is to be restored.

The German government, on its side, concurs that the ratio between the German and the English fleets is to be fixed at 35 : 100 (excluding naval airplanes).

Let us see what is the meaning of this proposal.

The total tonnage of the most important classes of ships (ships of the line, aircraft carriers, cruisers, minelayers, undersea craft) of the English fleet amounts to 1,200,000 tons, according to the provisions of the London naval treaty of 1930. The principal forces of the fleet are concentrated in the waters of England (the so-called "Home Fleet") and in the Mediterranean ("Mediterranean Fleet"). In addition, a large number of cruisers, minelayers, submarines and auxiliary ships are maintained between the fleet bases in the Indian Ocean, in South Africa, in Chinese waters, in Australia, New Zealand, the West Indies and Canada.

If the English fleet thus surpasses the German numerically and

in strength, it is however distributed over "all the seas". The tonnage of the "Home Fleet" comes to approximately 400,000 tons, which amounts to 35% of the total tonnage of the English fleet. In the present international situation, the English government cannot weaken the squadrons lying outside "home waters", as was done on the eve of the World War in order to strengthen the defense of the motherland. Can England give up Malta, Hongkong, Singapore, Australia, the West Indies? On the contrary, the English Admiralty deems it necessary to reënforce the "overseas forces" of the fleet. In this way, only a part of the naval forces can be located in the North Sea.

The German fleet, on the other hand, is located in two waters—in the North Sea and in the Baltic Sea. And if one takes into consideration the rôle played by the Kiel Canal, and the strengthened influence of German Fascism in the Scandinavian countries, which guarantees the free use of the straits of the Sound, then the German fleet has *one* seat of naval war and not two. Hence, wherever the main forces of the German fleet may be located—be they in the North Sea or in the Baltic—they are constantly concentrated in the vicinity of the English coast.

It is clear from what has been said that the naval forces of England and Germany are equally strong on their most important European stage of war.

Yet this is but one side of the coin. The other side is no less important. We have in mind the "qualitative factors", so to say, of the two fleets. The majority of the ships of the English fleet already show a respectable age. Of the 15 ships and cruisers of the line, for example, only two (the *Nelson* and the *Rodney*) had

their keels laid in 1925 and were sent down the ways in 1925. Of the other 13 ships, two were commissioned in 1913, three in 1914, three in 1915, four in 1915 and one in 1918. The other classes of ships of the English fleet are in a similar condition. (The Admiralty considers it necessary to replace, in the next four or five years, no less than eight ships of the line, four aircraft carriers, 22 cruisers, and half of the minelayers and submarines.)

It is true that the ships of the English fleet have been repeatedly modernized at a cost amounting to 60% of the original expenditures. Likewise, most of the ships are materially (depreciation) and especially with regard to striking power, obsolete, for the art of fleet operation and technique have made tremendous advances during this time. Not only have time, and the "peace" which set in for it in the North Sea after the German fleet had ceased to exist, left their mark upon the English fleet, but the "inertia of materials" and the financial difficulties—consequences of the economic crisis—equally hampered in no small measure the normal, material and efficient renovation of the ships.

The German fleet is in a different position. The majority of its battle units (at least 80%) were built up or have been in building in the last few years. In other words, the expansion of the fleet took place exclusively by means of the building of the most modern ships.

Among other things, German Fascism has the advantage of starting the naval race on the basis of the latest technique; the Versailles Treaty freed it from the pressure of the "inertia of materials". Every new ship of the German war fleet will therefore not be equal to the corresponding unit of the English fleet, but will surpass it. On the whole, this would mean that in the North Sea the German fleet would be stronger than the "Home Fleet", even if it is assumed that the ratio of 35 : 100 will be maintained, which is, however, extremely doubtful.*

It is, however, quite inadequate to confine oneself to an analysis of the possible relation of forces of the fleets of England and Germany on the basis of the mere "law of numbers". Even when we take into consideration the difference in the quality and quantity of the ships, we do not obtain a correct picture of the new relation of forces in the North Sea. What is involved is that the development of war fleets have produced factors which violate the traditional "law of numbers". Such factors are *aviation and the submarine*.

The experience of the imperialist World War of 1914-1918 on the sea already showed what great importance, rôle and influence for the course of naval operations are played by aviation and the submarine. It is entirely clear that in the coming war operations, especially upon such a comparatively limited naval war stage as the North Sea, aircraft and submarines will often play a decisive rôle, by the fact that they will deliver a combined blow at the combat forces and especially at the lines of communication in the broad sense of the term.

As is known, England was placed in an extremely dangerous position by the German submarines in the years of the World War. The then commander of the English fleet, Jellicoe, deemed it necessary to warn the government in 1917 that unless extraordinary measures were taken, "the war would be lost". And yet Jellicoe was then the commander of the largest war navy of the world and in the history of England. The fleet had some forty ships of the line alone! Yet they were helpless in battle against the submarines.

That is how it was 15 to 17 years ago! Since then the war navy has not only been perfected, but it has found a mighty ally—aviation. Naturally, England also has this fighting means at her dis-

*A ship of the *Deutschland* type could, without special risk, engage in battle with at least two English "heavy" (or "Washington") cruisers. If new, large

ships of the line should appear in the German fleet they will, without doubt, outstrip the ships of the line of the English fleet.

posal, but nonetheless it should not be forgotten that England is an island which depends to a high degree upon imports, that is, on the smooth functioning of marine traffic lanes, in contrast to the continental countries which depend less upon them or not at all.

With the evolution of the submarine fleet, the superiority of the insular position of England has been converted into its opposite: its insular position and its dependence upon imports have become its Achilles' heel. The North Sea, the canal zone and the coastal zones of the Atlantic are exceptionally favorable to the operations of submarines which pursue the aim of "cutting off" the British Isles from the outer world. The evolution of aviation makes the prospects of the struggle even worse. If the submarines represent a menace on the traffic lanes, on the open sea or in the coastal zones, then airplanes constitute the gravest danger to the Isles themselves. And against this combined threat, no fleet of ships of the line offers salvation under the concrete conditions.

And moreover, what could prevent German Fascism from building powerful submarines, even if only within the limits of the "legal" 400,000 tons and with the most exact regard for the principle of 35 : 100 (which will not be the case in reality)? As for aviation, it is not even mentioned in the London negotiations. When it is considered, therefore, that the German shipbuilding yards and aircraft plants, whose productive possibilities are enormous, are in a position to build hundreds of submarines and thousands of airplanes in the course of a single year, it becomes clear how radically the air and naval armaments of German Fascism alter the whole situation in the North Sea and especially the position of the naval forces of England not only in Europe but in general.

In reality, 35% corresponds under certain conditions to no less than 100%.

2. TOWARDS A NAVAL ARMAMENTS RACE

In principal matters, the London negotiations have been concluded. The pact was garbed in the form of an exchange of notes between the British Foreign Minister, Sir Samuel Hoare, and the head of the German delegation, von Ribbentrop. Underlying the pact is the principle already known to us. The ratio of strength of the German and English fleets has been fixed at 35 to 100.

The British delegation was obviously clear in advance that in the concrete conditions of the North Sea, the proportion of 35 to 100 may be equivalent to parity. And yet the English government gave its approval in principle to the abolition of the fleet limitation provisions of the Versailles Peace Treaty with regard to Germany and to the recognition of Germany's "equality" in the field of naval armaments. Apparently, London let itself be guided in this connection by the following fundamental considerations: Germany is building up strong naval fighting forces anyway. The English government finds itself apparently unable to prevent it. On the other hand the legalization of the naval armaments of Germany puts an additional argument into the hands of the English government to justify its own naval armaments in the eyes of the country.

It is not excluded that other considerations also played a certain rôle. Among other things, the hopes have hardly been given up in England that in the last analysis the German Fascists will give preference to the East rather than to the West as the direction of their aggressions. Perhaps the London negotiations themselves were regarded in certain circles of British imperialism as a means of pushing Fascist Germany towards the East.

But withal, the British delegation nevertheless did not accept the German project in the formulation as proposed by Hitler: 35 : 100 for the *total tonnage* of the English fleet. It introduced an essential rectification into the German project. Germany obtains the right to bring its navy up to the level of 35%, not of the total tonnage of the English fleet, but of the *tonnage of the separate*

classes of ships. This alteration was adopted and a corresponding point figures in the Anglo-German pact.

Wherein lies the meaning of this rectification? To be able to answer this question, it is necessary first of all to establish the possible ratio of 35 : 100 with regard to the tonnage of the separate classes of ships of the English fleet on the basis of the provisions of the London naval pact of 1930. This can best be visualized in the following table:

CLASSES	GREAT BRITAIN Total tonnage (in 1,000 T)	GERMANY Tonnage based on 35:100 ratio (in 1,000 T)
Ships of the line	525	183.7
Aircraft carriers	135	47.2
Cruisers	339	118.6
Deep-sea torpedo boats	150	52.5
U-Boats	52	18.2
TOTAL:	1,201	420.2

As this table shows, the English government grants Germany the total tonnage demanded by her, with even a surplus of 420,200 tons. This means, measured by the present tonnage of the German navy (some 200,000 tons) *an increase of Germany's naval combat forces by 100%*! From this alone one can see clearly the value of the declamations of official London circles about the pact with Germany serving the "interests of the reënforcement of peace". What we are faced with in reality is the *prologue to a mad naval armaments race in Europe*. The child should be called by its right name: The English government is urging on this armaments race with all its strength. Least of all in it is there observable an aspiration towards reënforcing general peace. In reality, the ruling circles of England were concerned in concluding this bi-partite pact with Germany, with squeezing out the greatest possible benefits for themselves.

This is confirmed by the following. In granting Germany the right to increase her naval combat forces by 100% and to bring her total tonnage up to 420,000 tons, the English delegation stipulated at the same time that this tonnage, as we have seen, shall be distributed pretty exactly over the separate classes of ships. The meaning of this clause is very simple. It is not to England's advantage to have Germany dispose freely of the tonnage granted her. For within the limits of 400,000 tons Germany could build a vast number of small cruisers, torpedo boats and *still more U-boats*, and utilize less of her tonnage for the construction of big fighting ships—dreadnoughts and cruisers of the line. The pact now establishes, however, what percentage of the tonnage Germany may utilize for the building of ships of each separate class.

What remains unknown is only what basis the ruling circles of England actually have for relying upon German Fascism keeping exactly to the spirit of the pact, especially in that section of it which deals with the distribution of the tonnage according to classes of ships. Obviously the English government has no such assurance, and indeed it cannot have. German Fascism accepted the English amendments only because, in the first place, it is not so much concerned with the meaning of the pact, but with *the single fact of its conclusion*. Isn't it the *first* two-power pact on German re-armament, concluded, moreover, with England! For its sake German Fascism was prepared to vote in favor of all the amendments, all the more so because, basically, it limits in no wise and by nothing the utilization of the 400,000 tons granted it, in accordance with the judgment of the heads of German Fascism.

The English government, which signed the pact with inexplicable haste, yielded on every point. Especially did England yield in such a cardinal question as the tonnage of the German U-boats. On the basis of the elaborated pact Germany has received the right

of parity with England with regard to submarines (52,000 tons). Notwithstanding, it has declared itself ready to content itself only with 45% of this tonnage (so long as it does not require the remaining 55%!), which comes to 23,400 tons in absolute figures. Within these limits, Germany could build from 25 to 30 medium and 40 medium and small U-boats.

The reasons which moved the ruling circles of England to make all these concessions, derive principally from the fact that they wanted to create conditions under which the rebuilding of Germany's fleet would not outstrip the expansion of the British fleet with new fighting ships. The English Admiralty is obviously extremely concerned, in the worst case, not to remain behind Germany in its fleet-building tempo.

It also appears possible that England's agreement to the raising of the U-boat level of the German fleet was bought by the German delegation with the promise that the center of gravity of the German fleet construction will not lie in the North Sea but in the Baltic.

The Anglo-German naval pact is of great importance for the whole international situation and for England herself. The strengthening of German naval armaments will be utilized on a grand scale in England for the expansion of her own naval forces. That is just what the Anglo-German pact is based upon: *an open armaments race*.

It is, however, perfectly clear now that France will not preserve an attitude of indifference towards the fact of the strengthened menace to her oversea connections, and will draw very definite conclusions from it. It is enough, however, for France merely to begin to increase her naval armaments for Italy to follow on her heels. On the other hand, the reënforcement of England's armaments automatically involves the extension of the fleet-building program of the United States, whereupon counter-measures on the part of Japan will not wait long to make their appearance! Finally, this will impel England towards a new expansion of her fleet construction, inasmuch as the British Admiralty must take account of every change in the naval combat forces of other countries, not only in the North Sea, but also in the Pacific Ocean, the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean. This alone shows that the Anglo-German pact is the last nail in the coffin-rod beneath which lies the idea of disarmament on land and sea and in the air.

From what has been said, the real content and the real significance of the Anglo-German naval pact becomes clear. If the ruling circles of England think that they can, in this manner, solidify their own security at the expense of other lands, they are there with not weakening the danger of war, but only accentuating it. But if England entertains the hope that the hurricane which such a policy would let loose will leave the British Isles untouched, a tremendous mistake is being made.

Moscow, June 1935

I. JERUKHIMOVICH

MARXISM AND PHILOSOPHY

Following the series of articles by our collaborator, Rubin Gotesky, dealing with several aspects of the philosophy of Marxism, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL prints in this issue an article by Max Eastman in which he presents his views on this highly important question, which he first made public in systematic form in his *Marx, Lenin and the Science of Revolution*. We are glad of the opportunity to present Eastman's position to our readers despite the fact that we disagree fundamentally with it. In addition to a reply by the editors which will be printed in a coming issue, we invite readers to send in their opinions on the subject dealt with, so that we may publish all comments of significance or interest.

Marxism: Science or Philosophy?

THE FIRST STEP towards understanding Marxism is to realize that Marx himself did not wish to be a philosopher. There were hints of this in the writings of Engels, but also evidences to the contrary. The full extent and passion of Marx's revulsion against philosophy became known only a few years ago when an old manuscript, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, in which he and Engels first formulated their views, was deciphered and published by the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow. This manuscript reveals an arrant rejection of the very conception of philosophic knowledge—a veritable holding of the word *philosopher* in contempt—lying at the basis of the whole edifice of Marx's intellectual life.

In *The Holy Family*, written three years before, Marx had rejected Hegel's metaphysics arrantly enough, describing it as "drunken speculation", and Hegel himself as the "master wizard". He had eulogized the materialist, Ludwig Feuerbach, for having "unveiled the mystery" of Hegel's system and "annihilated the dialectic of ideas", and he had endorsed the viewpoint of British materialism and of the French enlightenment, calling it "the philosophy of good sense". "It opposes philosophy to metaphysics," he cried, "just as Feuerbach opposed reasonable philosophy to exaggerated speculation on the day when he first took a clear stand against Hegel."

So Marx wrote in 1843. But in 1845—as this old and new manuscript informs us—he did not want even a reasonable philosophy or a philosophy of good sense. He did not want any philosophy at all. He was ready to pitch Feuerbach out of the window after Hegel. Feuerbach himself had coined the aphorism, "My philosophy is no philosophy," but nevertheless Marx now rejected him as a man who never learned to see "without the eyes—which is to say the eye-glasses—of the philosopher."

But let us read some solid excerpts from this new and yet basic document of Marxism. (The italics are mine.)

"German criticism right up to its very latest achievements has not abandoned the field of philosophy; not only has it not examined its own general philosophical presuppositions, but on the contrary all the questions with which it is occupied have grown up out of the soil of one definite philosophical system, the Hegelian. There is mystification not only in its answers, but in the very questions it asks. . . .

"We therefore shall precede our special criticism of certain individual representatives of this movement with some general remarks (about German philosophy and *about all philosophy in general*). These remarks will be sufficient to make clear the standpoint of our criticism. . . .

"We recognize only one single science, the science of history. You can view it from two sides, and divide it into the history of nature and the history of people. . . . In direct opposition to German philosophy which came down from heaven to earth, we here intend to rise from earth to heaven—that is we will not start from what people say, imagine, represent to themselves, nor from thought-of, represented or imagined people, in order to arrive afterward at bodily people; we will start from really acting people, and try to deduce from their actual life-process the development of these ideological images and reflections of that life-process. For these misty formations in the brains of people are necessary sublimations of their material, empirically ascertained life-process, which is bound up with material conditions. In this way morals, religion, *metaphysics*, and other forms of ideology, lose their apparent independence. They have no history, they have no development; only people, developing their material production and

their material relations, change also in the course of this activity their thinking and the products of their thinking. . . .

"Thus where speculation stops, that is, at the threshold of real life, a real positive science begins, a representation of the activity, the practical process of the development of people. Phrases about consciousness disappear, their place to be occupied by real knowledge. When you begin to describe reality, then *an independent philosophy* loses its reason for being. In its place may be found, at the most, a *summary of the general results abstracted from an investigation of the historical development of man*. . . .

"We fully realise that Feuerbach . . . went as far as a theorizer could go without simply ceasing to be a theorizer and a *philosopher*. . . .

"Feuerbach's mistake lies in the fact that he could not approach the world of sensation without the eyes—which is to say, the *eye-glasses—of a philosopher*. . . .

"And by the way, with this view of things, which takes them as they are in reality, all deep-thinking philosophical problems reduce themselves to some simple question of empirical *fact*. . . .

"For a *practical* materialist, that is for a communist, the thing is to revolutionize the existing world—that is, practically turn against things as he finds them, and change them."

A more radical empiricism—a more "vulgar and profane" empiricism, to quote Marx's own earlier description of his stand—is not to be found in the whole of philosophic literature, nor a more wholesale rejection of the idea that philosophy can be a guide or dictator of forms to science*.

Is it not surprising, then, and puzzling, that Marx should have become the founder of a new philosophy in the full sense of the term—a new theory of being—and that this philosophy should have become the equivalent of a state religion in the first proletarian republic, its teaching in the schools enforced by law, and its principles propagated throughout the world with rigid dogmatism by the supporters of that republic? It is still more surprising when you learn that he founded this philosophy, or drew the outlines of it, in the same year in which he completed this arrant attack upon the very idea of philosophy. Engels allots the old manuscript to the year 1845-6. And it was in 1845 that Marx "hastily scribbled down"—as a notation for further work along the same line—those famous *Theses on Feuerbach* in which, as Engels also tells us, he "planted the genial seed of the new philosophy".

Obviously the next step towards understanding Marxism is to find out why Marx planted the seed of a new philosophy in the very labor of rooting up all philosophy forever. To this end we

*Riazanov himself, the Russian editor of this manuscript, a sufficiently orthodox Marxian and one sufficiently involved in the meshes of the state philosophy, feels compelled to acknowledge that this is the main revelation contained in it. "The manuscript permits us," he says, "to establish one fact important to any scientific investigation of the development of Marxism. The conclusion familiar to us in the *Anti-Dühring* was already formulated in the manuscript on Feuerbach. Philosophy as a special science of the general connection of things and of knowledges, a *summary summary*

um of all human knowledge, becomes superfluous. Of all previous philosophy there remains only the science of the laws of thought: formal logic and the dialectic." This statement is inaccurate in two respects. Philosophy as a "summary" of knowledge is just what Marx in this manuscript still sanctions; anyone who seriously attacks philosophy must make allowance for a generalization and interrelating of the sciences. And moreover Marx makes no other exception; there is not a word about "logic and the dialectic" in these passages.

must recall the outlines of that Hegelian metaphysics in which he believed until Feuerbach liberated him, and then the exact nature of this liberation. After that we shall see in the *Theses on Feuerbach* themselves the reason why Marx did not succeed in getting rid of philosophy.

Hegel believed that the whole world is contained in, or made out of, Mind. And this Mind, when properly understood and arrived at in its totality by evolution, or by the thought of the philosopher, is the same thing as God. Hegel's God differs from the old gods, however, in being active and changeful. He has his very being in a process of development. You can see this process in nature and world history, or you can see it in the way the logical categories work out their relations, the one merging into the other in a peculiar manner to which Hegel, following his predecessors, gave the name of "dialectics". It consists of an affirmative assertion, and then a passing of that over into its opposite, a negation of it by its own self-active propulsion, and then a "negation of the negation", or reconciliation of these two opposites in a higher unity which includes them both. It is astonishing how much of the change and motion in the world, as well as the relations among abstract ideas—if you examine them with a sufficiently casuistical determination to believe so, and particularly if you refrain from defining the word *opposite*—can be made to fit into this mould. For that reason when all the emotions attending the idea of divinity and of absolute or universal being are mixed up in a description of life and the world in these terms, you have—if you can stand the hard work involved—a great philosophical poem, a great experience for the feelings and the mind. And since we really know little or nothing about the nature of life and the world as a whole, it is easy for credulous people, or people brought up in such ideas, to lend to it the added glamor of belief.

The important thing about it for us, however, is that it enabled Hegel, without ceasing to be religious, to be very matter-of-fact and hard-headed, indeed brutally realistic, about the "phases" that a divine spirit has to pass through on its dialectic pilgrimage. It enabled him to accept in the name of God the hard and bloody world of universal change and evolution that scientists were then already coming to behold, to accept and even slightly to extend the downright understanding of it. In particular it enabled him to bridge in a new way the gap between what we know and what we want, between the "pure" and the "practical" reason as they had been separated by Kant. Kant had given a different and a firmer root in "reality" to the active side of our nature, our wilful self, than to what our minds know. And Hegel, with his doctrine that reality is a process, and moreover a mental process, had united the two. The very essence of being, he said, and therefore the highest condition of the human mind, is one in which knowledge of the real and action toward the ideal are the same thing.

"Being is Thought," Hegel said, but thought is a "process of becoming." "The truth is the whole. The whole, however, is merely the essential nature [thought] reaching its completion through the process of its own development. . . . What has been said may be also expressed by saying that reason is purposive activity."

Such was the flavor, and such for our purpose the essential drift, of Hegel's philosophy. The development of what he called a "scientific" consciousness was a development away from the simple condition of sense-certainty, the sensing of an object by a subject, towards a condition of pure meditation in which subject and object are both known to be thought or spirit, a condition of "Absolute Knowledge, or spirit knowing itself as spirit." This Absolute Knowledge is "the consummation and the final cause of the whole process of experience"; but then also this Absolute is not a mere goal or consummation, it is not static, but is "the process of its own becoming". Josiah Royce, who greatly loved this Absolute

Being, or philosophic state-of-being, described it thus: "The Absolute whose expression is the world and, in particular, the world of human life, is a being characterized by a complete unity or harmony of what one might call a theoretical and practical consciousness. The theoretical consciousness is a consciousness which views facts and endeavors to apprehend them. The practical consciousness is a consciousness which constructs facts in accordance with its ideals. The absolute consciousness is both theoretical and practical."

For Marx, too, that must have been the great thing in the Hegelian philosophy. We may imagine that even in youth he accepted somewhat perfunctorily Hegel's conception of thought, or "the Idea", as "demi-ourgos of the world". But Hegel's conception of "science", of the highest wisdom to which a human being can attain, as a state of mind in which he is coöperating with, or rather participating in, the forward and upward going of the world towards high ends, must have meant much to him.

At any rate, Marx believed fervently throughout his young manhood in this philosophy—or in some such philosophy as I have described, for there is no use pretending that Hegel's emotional imagination confined itself to saying things with a clear meaning. And he was awakened out of this mystical condition by Ludwig Feuerbach, who, having been a Hegelian, became a man of simple good sense, and said that the world is not really composed of a process of thought, but it is composed of objects as they appear in sense-experience. Engels describes the "rapture" with which Marx and he greeted Feuerbach. He says that no one who had not lived through it, could possibly imagine the "liberating effect" that his writings had upon them. And from that you can imagine their previous state of hypnosis, the degree of their captivity to the thought-conjurings of the "master wizard".

Feuerbach's revolt against Hegel must have seemed very drastic. He seems even now at a first glance to have grasped the animistic personification of a material world involved in regarding ideas as more completely real than the objects of sense. He declared Hegelism, and indeed speculative philosophy in general, to be nothing but "theology rationalized, realized and brought home to the mind". And he seemed to strike at the heart of this whole way of thinking when he renounced Hegel's thesis that "being is thought" and that truth is arrived at by a development of consciousness away from the obvious testimony of the senses. On the contrary, he cried: "Truth, reality, sensibility are identical. Only a sensible being is a true, a real being; only sensibility is truth and reality. Only through the senses is an object in the true sense given—not through thought in itself."

As a revolt against Hegel's idealism this is indeed exciting. But nevertheless it was not a hearty and thorough-going materialism like that of the British and French philosophers who grew up in a native atmosphere of sceptical common sense. For them not only were sense-objects the downright reality, but man himself with his gift of perceiving them was something of an incident in a vast world of these objects. For Feuerbach "sense" was the main thing in these "objects-of-sense", and man himself continued to be, as with idealists, the chief concern and substance of the world. "The new philosophy," he said, "makes man, including nature as the basis of man, the unique, universal and highest object of philosophy." Indeed Feuerbach proposed to replace that speculative philosophy which he had rejected, not with the general body of the sciences, as Comte at the same time was proposing, and not with a "philosophy of good sense" as other materialists had, but with "anthropology" regarded as a "universal science".

"In this undue prominence given to man," says Lange in his *History of Materialism*, "lies a trait which is due to the Hegelian philosophy, and which separates Feuerbach from strict materialists. That is to say, it is only the philosophy of spirit over again

that meets us here in the shape of a philosophy of sensibility. The genuine materialist will always incline to turn his gaze upon the great whole of external nature, and to regard man as a wave in the ocean of the eternal movement of matter. The nature of man is to the materialist only a special case of universal physiology, as thought is only a special case in the chain of the physical processes of life.”*

And this is true, we may add, not only to the materialist, but to the modern courageous mind in general. “Lyric experience and literary psychology, as I have learned to conceive them,” says George Santayana, for instance, “are chapters in the life of one race of animals in one corner of the natural world.” How far removed was Feuerbach’s philosophy from this natural assumption of the mind nurtured in modern science, may be seen in his statement that “The truth is only the totality of human life and being”. I do not mean to say that Feuerbach, by and large, denied to nature an existence independent of man. He spoke expressly in other places of nature’s independence. He was a disjointed, emotional, aphoristic thinker; he was moreover not trying to understand the world presented to him by science, but wholly absorbed in the effort to find in it a place for the religious emotion. To isolate a sentence like the one just quoted and impute to him all that it implies logically would be unfair and uncomprehending. Nevertheless it is obvious that the author of that sentence had only partially emerged from the idealistic philosophy. The “undue prominence given to man” in his system was a relic of that personification of the external world—or absorbing of it up into the mind—which is the essential heart of the romantic philosophies preceding him in Germany. He was in this respect—as was German intellectual culture at large—behind the contemporary march of the scientific point of view.

This becomes still more obvious as you read further in his *Foundations of the New Philosophy*, from which I have quoted. You learn that not only is “reality” identical with “sensibility”, and “truth” with “the totality of human life and being”, but that since nothing enters human life and being or becomes an object of sensibility unless it engages a man’s interest—unless it makes some appeal to his affective nature—“reality” and “truth” are, at bottom, inseparable from human feeling. “Only that is . . .” exclaims Feuerbach at the height of this argument, “which is an object of passion.”

By reasonings of this kind, Feuerbach managed to convert his “universal science” of anthropology into a religion of love. And although that religion seemed very large about accepting matters of fact, and Feuerbach’s love was not afraid of physiology, nevertheless it retained the essence of all religion, and of all theology too, and of that speculative philosophy which is but “theology rationalized”—namely, the personification of an objective reality or the universal reality of the world. His crowning aphorism, “not

*The Russian Marxist, Plekhanov, not interested in Feuerbach’s mind, but concerned only to establish the perfect truth of dialectic materialism, exclaims against this judgment of Lange’s. Plekhanov insists, even against Feuerbach himself, who expressly disclaimed the title of materialist, that his philosophy was perfectly materialistic. “Feuerbach never denied,” he cries, “that the nature of man is only a special case in the chain of the physical processes of life.” And that is true—he never denied it. He merely permitted his feelings to forget it—or, as Lange so carefully suggests, “inclined to turn his gaze”

in a different direction. To assert, as Plekhanov does, that this proposition about the nature of man “lies at the basis of his whole philosophy”—in the face of such statements as that “Truth is the totality of human life and being”, “Only that is which is an object of passion”, “Not to love and not to be are identical”, “Where there is no sense there is no being, no real object”—to make that assertion and leave these statements unexplained and unalluded to, is to confess, it seems to me, that you are not engaged in a study of the man’s mind, but in a piece of special pleading.

to love and not to be are identical”, is for the emotions substantially equivalent to the older aphorism, “God is love”. One need only approach Feuerbach with his own formula—the speculative philosopher is “a priest in disguise”—in order to perceive that he has merely once more altered the disguise.

And now let us see what was the nature of Marx’s revolt against Feuerbach. Did he point out the essential relic of Hegel’s idealism in Feuerbach’s philosophy, the making of “man, including nature as the basis of man, the one universal and highest object of philosophy”? Did he say that it was not really very materialistic to talk about “sensibility”, which is a mere function of the human body, as though it were identical with “reality”, which to the genuine materialist lies in the larger part outside of man? This was the course he must have taken in order to fulfill his wish to abandon philosophy altogether and adopt the method and the point-of-view of empirical science. He never dreamed of it. He was not himself liberated from the “master wizard”. He too did not, at least in his mature reflections, identify “sensibility” with the objective reality of the world, but he followed Feuerbach in talking about them as identical. He based his philosophy of action, just as Feuerbach had based his philosophy of love, upon a verbal assumption of their identity, repeating it in the very words of Feuerbach. His single objection to Feuerbach was that he had left out of this “reality”, this “object”, this all-too-human “sensibility”, the active element, the element of “practical human action”. He had left out of it, that is, the very essence of Hegelian metaphysics as Marx loved it—as Royce loved it—the conception that reality itself is a purposive process, and that the highest state of mind a human being can attain is one in which he conceives himself as cooperating with, or participating in, the forward and upward going of that reality towards high ends.

“The chief fault of all materialism heretofore (including Feuerbach’s)”—so Marx begins—“is that the object, the reality, sensibility, is conceived only under the form of *object or of contemplation*; not as *sensory-human activity, practise*, not subjectively. Hence the *active* side developed abstractly in opposition to materialism from idealism—[abstractly], since idealism naturally does not recognize real sensory activity as such. Feuerbach wants sensible objects genuinely distinguished from objects of thought; but he conceives human activity itself not as objective activity. In his *Essence of Christianity* he regards only the theoretical attitude as the genuinely human, while practise is conceived and fixed in its dirty-Jew phenomenal form. Hence he does not grasp the significance of the revolutionary, of practical-critical action.”

These *Theses on Feuerbach* have always presented something of a puzzle to the student of Marx, but their meaning becomes utterly clear when you realize that Marx was trying to be scientific in our sense, but having grown up in the habits of the German idealist philosophy, he did not know how.* He is, therefore, saying two different kinds of things. On the one hand he is saying things with which every modern realistic mind can agree. He objects, for instance, to Feuerbach’s retaining an exaggerated esteem for purely theoretical thinking after he has abandoned the myth of the reality of thought’s object. But on the other hand he is preserving the essence of metaphysics, and indeed religion—the conception of the objective world and the human mind as coöperating together in the tasks that are worth while. He is insisting that, although the world is made out of material objects as given in sensation, these objects or sensations are nevertheless to be “conceived subjectively” and regarded just as Hegel regarded ideas or “reason”, as *purposive activities*. With Hegel, he says, reality is to be regarded as active; with Feuerbach it is to be regarded as human-sensory. And so we arrive at “the seed of the new philosophy”—the conception

*In book form this essay is to be preceded by a discussion of the term *science*, especially the significance of its relation to

the German *wissenschaft*. The present reader will have to assume that I am not ignoring that problem.

that all the seemingly solid and external things in this world really are, and consist of, practical "human-sensory action". Instead of Feuerbach's religious philosophy, which teaches love and brotherhood by identifying it with the very substance of being, we have a revolutionary philosophy which teaches "practical-critical action" by identifying that with the substance of being. But we still have "philosophy"—and philosophy in the bad sense. We have not taken one step away from it.

In his second thesis Marx takes up the problem what to do with the idea or "object of thought" now that its superior reality has been abandoned for that of the "object of sense". And here he speaks again like an experimental scientist. Where thought adds something to the reality directly given in sense-experience, the validity of this indirect kind of reality—indeed a mere reflected image of reality—is to be tried out in action. The test of its truth, in other words, is experimental.

"The question whether objective truth reaches human thought," he says, "is no question of theory, but a *practical* question. In practise man must prove the truth, that is the reality and power, the this-sidedness, of his thought. The dispute about the reality or unreality of thought—which is isolated from practise—is a purely *scholastic* question."

In his third thesis, however, Marx again speaks the language of the metaphysician who has read his own ideal program of action into a world conceived as inherently purposive. He is now objecting not to Feuerbach, but to the materialists of the eighteenth century whom three years before he had been praising for their "profane" and "vulgar" materialism, and their insistence that men are a mere product of the environment. "It takes no extraordinary sagacity to discover," he then said, "what inevitably brings them to communism and socialism. . . . If man is formed by the environment, then we must form a humane environment." He now objects to these same profane materialists because they have not the Hegelian wisdom to merge their own program into a conception of the environment as, by its own inherent nature, forming itself humanely.

"The materialistic teaching," he says, "about the changing of the environment and education forgets that the environment must be changed by men and the educator himself educated. It is therefore compelled to divide society into two parts, of which the one is elevated above the other.

"The coincidence of a change of environment and human activity or self-change can only be conceived and rationally understood as *revolutionary practise*."

In other words, you can not understand why you should want to improve the world unless you conceive the world which produced you as in a process of self-improvement. Here a scientific mind would ask: But when you have so conceived the world, how do you explain those who don't want to improve it, but are steady on the job of making it worse? Marx had lived too long in Hegel's dialectics to be troubled by that question, or even to have it rise in his mind. Those ignorant miscreants are a negative and disappearing "phase", an essential part of the very "contradiction" which is being "resolved" by your own "revolutionary practise". The whole process is real, and it is all truth, but your part of it is more real and more true because closer to the consummation of the whole.

There is a real problem of knowledge here—the problem how there can be an objective science of social evolution when scientific ideas are themselves so potent a force in determining its course. You might call it the sociologist's fallacy to ignore this problem. But the problem certainly is not solved for any scientific mind by this partisan personification of the whole body of the facts. We know quite well—whatever the problems involved—that no man can give a scientific account of any society without standing above it. Nor can such an account of a society be applied in an effort to

guide its evolution without the problem arising how to relate those who have this scientific viewpoint to the blinder forces operating below—how to relate the socialists, if you will, to the trade unions. Marx is here merely insisting that sociology shall not become a science.

And in a subsequent thesis, numbered 6, he insists that psychology shall not become a science. Feuerbach, he says, talks about "the essence of man. . . ." "But the essence of man is not an abstraction dwelling in the separate individual." Which sounds promising, and reminds us of his announcement in *Die deutsche Ideologie* that he is going to abandon all philosophical abstractions whatsoever and study concrete actual men in their process of development. But then he straightway adds: The essence of man "in its reality is the ensemble of social relations", which is pure Hegelian metaphysics. For in this saying, and others like it, Marx is not merely insisting—as his modern champions like to pretend—upon the social nature of the mind and nervous system. He is not foretelling "social psychology". Far from it. He is eliminating psychology altogether, eliminating "man" as a problem of study, in order to make room for a sufficiently hard-and-fast conception of "society" as a single thing—an "object", "reality", "sensibility"—the history of whose "practical activity" will constitute the whole essential history of man. He is making ready, in short, for the eighth thesis which reads as follows:

"All social life is essentially *practical*. All the mysteries which lead theory astray into mysticism find their rational solution in human practise and in the idea of this *practise*."

Marx will devote his life to proving that this essentially practical object, social life, is destined by the inner law of its being to contradict itself (the class struggle) and resolve the contradiction in a higher unity (the coöperative commonwealth). True wisdom and the way out of all mysticism for man, who is but "the ensemble of social relations," will be to abandon "theory" and join in the practical procedure of this essential reality, social life, toward its dialectically inevitable goal.

Only when you have mastered this, can you make intelligible Marx's ninth and tenth theses, which read as follows:

"9. The highest point reached by contemplative materialism, that is the materialism which does not conceive sensibility as practical activity, is the contemplation of separate individuals and bourgeois society.

"10. The standpoint of the old materialism is bourgeois society. The standpoint of the new, human society or social humanity."

What Marx is saying here is that a materialism which merely contemplates the world, and does not conceive the world and the perceiver of it to be in a state of practical and dialectic action toward something better, can not be a social revolutionist. He must not only conceive of sensible objects in general as consisting of a practical process, but he must conceive of "society" as such an object, consisting of such a process. In short, these two theses merely state succinctly that unless you read your ideal program into the movement of the objective facts you can not believe in or adhere to it. What other connection can exist between conceiving sensation as a practical activity and believing in a new human society, a social humanity? Is it not a fact that millions of materialists have believed in a new human society, and in social humanity, and have adopted its standpoint, who have not had the glimmer of an idea—if indeed sixty people have up to this date—what Marx meant by "conceiving sensibility as practical activity"?

Marx concludes his theses with a brilliant epigram:

"Philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways; the thing is to change it."

In Soviet Russia this has become almost the most popular slogan in the whole literature of the state philosophy. And no wonder, for in its elusive ambiguity it epitomizes the essence of the Marxian

position, the delicate equilibrium of one who abandons philosophy for practical scientific effort, and yet preserves in that very act the essence of philosophy. On its face it seems merely to repeat what Marx had said in *Die deutsche Ideologie*: "For a *practical* materialist, a communist, the thing is to revolutionize the existing world—that is, practically turn against things as he finds them and change them." But if that is all it means, why mention the philosophers? Why not say "Poets have sung the world . . . painters have painted the world; the thing is to change it." Marx in this aphorism is not only saying that we should quit philosophizing and change the world; he is saying that a true philosophy of the world and a resolute program for changing the world will be one and the same thing. And that, as we have seen, is the very soul of Hegel's metaphysics.

Marx, then, was very accurate when he said in the preface to *Capital* that he had merely turned Hegel's philosophy other side up. Hegel had been conceiving thought, or the idea, as the real thing,

and the reality of the sense-object as illusory. Marx declared the sense-object to be real, and the idea a mere reflection of it. But he retained in his conception of that sense-object the essential virtue that Hegel had attributed to his idea, the property of purposive dialectic movement toward high ends. The only radical change was that, whereas Hegel's ideal reality was travelling toward an ideal goal in the being of God, Marx's sensible reality is travelling toward a sensible goal in the organization of the communist society. Marx thought that he had thus saved the "rational kernel" and got rid of the "mystical shell" in the Hegelian philosophy. He even thought, and tried to keep on thinking, that he had achieved his aim to get rid of "philosophy" altogether. But one does not get rid of "philosophy" by the simple device of turning a certain philosophy other side up. One does not get rid of "philosophy" without clearly understanding what one means by "philosophy", and how it differs from the scientific point of view.

Max EASTMAN

A Labor Lieutenant and Top-Seargent

DANIEL J. TOBIN, President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers, gets a \$28,000 yearly salary. Tobin has mulcted the union teamsters of the country of fabulous sums in the many years he has been a Brotherhood officer. As in the case of the New York milk drivers in 1916, he has helped smash many a teamsters' strike. It was Tobin who, at the 1934 A. F. of L. convention in San Francisco, went so far in expressing his contempt for the working man that scores of delegates booed him. "Rubbish" and "riff-raff" were the words he used to describe the hundreds of thousands who in recent years have streamed into the A. F. of L., seeking a basis for organized struggle for decent living conditions.

The "rubbish" consists of the millions of workers in the mass production industries (steel, rubber, automobiles, textiles, etc.). The "riff-raff" consists of hitherto unorganized teamsters such as have recently made labor history in Minneapolis, Minn., and Fargo, N. D., Moorehead, Minn.

Should a whole galaxy of militant locals arise in the Teamsters' Brotherhood, Tobin's star must sink, and with it his bank account. As for the influx of mass-production workers, by strengthening industrial union trends they hasten the day when the antiquated craft structure of the A. F. of L. must give way to a form of organization adapted to modern labor struggles . . . and the craft bureaucrat to an honest fighting leadership.

Tobin would prefer that the Teamsters' Brotherhood never hold a convention, but its constitution requires one every five years. Much to Tobin's disgust, there must be a convention next fall and, in preparation for it, he is scouring the country for his kind of delegates . . . and for militants to expel from the Brotherhood. Fearing that Local 574 of Minneapolis and Local 173 of Fargo-Moorehead may become the center of a progressive group in the convention, Tobin has determined to annihilate these locals. It will be the major purpose of this article to show how Tobin has striven for more than a year to suppress working class militancy in Minneapolis. That his actions in this direction have won the applause of the employers, goes without saying. Incidentally, this article will reveal the support Tobin's union-busting moves have received from the communist party.

* * *

The Minneapolis drivers conducted three strikes in 1934, affecting various sections of the general transportation industry: one in February, one in May, and one in July-August. In each,

574 won not only the endorsement of the other Minneapolis locals of the Teamsters' Brotherhood, but also the official backing of the city's entire labor movement. Furthermore, 574 forced from the Regional Labor Board and Federal mediators decisions and proposals which the employers repeatedly rejected. Central labor bodies are never anxious to endorse strikes; federal officials do not often allow themselves to be pushed into a position where their *formal* approval rests, not with the bosses, but with the strikers. That Dan Tobin opposed 574's strikes even when the union had compelled these confirmations of its claims, is telling evidence of his thoroughly reactionary character.

Tobin never raised a finger to help the strikers. Despite the fact that it had paid thousands of dollars in per capita tax into the Brotherhood treasury, Local 574 has never gotten a penny in strike relief from the Brotherhood. While 574 was striking—its members going hungry on the picket line and bleeding to death in hospitals from wounds inflicted by the bosses' agents—the Tobin clique denied all strike relief . . . and simultaneously voted Tobin \$5,085 for a European pleasure jaunt!

Worse yet: in the third strike Tobin gave the bosses the sharp blade of the knife with which they tried to cut the throat of Local 574. It is obvious that the workers of Minneapolis are overwhelmingly non-revolutionary. Moreover, when told by reactionary agitators to think about the problem of revolution, their *first* impulse is generally to dissociate themselves from everything "Red", either out of misguided enthusiasm for bourgeois institutions, or in order to get protective coloration against reactionary persecutors. Consequently the "Red scare", which the bosses utilize much as armies utilize a gas attack. Under its poisonous cover they launch the attack proper. Hoping that the gas will have incapacitated the workers' vanguard, they plan to sweep forward and force the surrender of the main body of troops, if necessary by violent means ("patriotic" vigilante raids on "Reds", *i.e.*, on the strikers' headquarters, picket lines, etc.).

Now, in time of strike struggle the worker experiences an immediate intensification of the feelings of antagonism toward his employer. The decision to fight once made and acted on, gives birth to a new confidence; the worker ceases to trust the bosses and their open agents. He trusts only himself . . . and others who appear in working class guise. The bosses must at this point find spokesmen in the workers' camp, men who, at least for a moment, do not seem to be associated with capitalist interests. This applies

to the dissemination of "Red scare" gas as to everything. The task can be best performed not by a ranking general in the capitalist army, but by a labor lieutenant.

The Minneapolis bosses' poison-gas attack was loosed by Dan Tobin, one of capitalism's most ardent labor lieutenants. The July 1934 issue of the official magazine of the Teamsters' Brotherhood contained an article by Tobin dealing with the relation of "communists and radicals" to the May strike of Local 574. Tobin "warned" the workers against these "serpents", "wolves in sheep's clothing", "low class riff-raff", etc. He threatened that the unexampled freedom "enjoyed by the workers of this country" might be endangered by communists in "newly organized local unions, creating distrust, discontent, bloodshed and rebellions".*

On July 7 the Minneapolis *Daily Star* quoted Tobin at length to open the "Red scare" locally. The *Star*, and its rival prostitutes, the *Tribune* and *Journal*, began to carry full-page ads of the Employers Advisory Committee (capitalist general staff in the strike struggles). These ads, costing \$1,293.80 daily (a sum not expended by the bosses unless they feel that the effect will repay them generously), carried the scare-headline: "LEADERS OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR EXPOSE COMMUNIST MENACE THREATENING MINNEAPOLIS." Quotations from Matthew Woll, Vice-President of the A. F. of L., and Donald R. Richberg, N.R.A. General Counsel, found places in the ads. But the feature was a quotation from Tobin's article in the Brotherhood journal. The ads wound up with the question: "Must Minneapolis be paralyzed by a strike to satisfy a handful of communist agitators who dream of making Minneapolis the birthplace of a Soviet republic?"

For some years there has existed in Minneapolis the *Saturday Press*, a notorious scandal rag whose owner was recently murdered by some scoundrel whom he had been blackmailing. This paper joined in the attack on the union leaders and strikers. Early in July, J. M. Near, its editor, wired Tobin asking him to revoke the charter of 574, to eliminate all "Reds", and to form a new union "with the coöperation of fair employers". It is impossible to state whether and what Tobin answered Near. The attack was carried further by a columnist writing for a weekly shoppers' guide; this gentleman printed the slanderous charge that union leaders had embezzled thousands of dollars of union money.

One might go on for pages giving details of the poison-gas attack of the bosses and the manner in which Tobin aided it. Suffice it to say, however, that for weeks the boss propaganda machine kept up the barrage, calling the strike leaders "Reds", racketeers, thugs and crooks.

The charges of embezzlement were easily refuted, and the shoppers' guide, dependent for circulation on the popular masses of the city, printed an apology. That the Red scare launched by Tobin (and a second edition whipped up at a later stage in the strike) failed, is a high tribute not simply to the strikers' militancy, but also to the vigorous counter-offensive unleashed by the union leaders. Especially in the pages of the *Organizer*, daily strike bulletin whose achievements have since been emulated in Fargo, in the St. Louis gashouse workers' strike, and in the Toledo Chevrolet strike (until F. J. Dillon managed to suppress *Strike Truth*), the union leaders gave the Red-baiters blow for blow, arguing as follows:

"The employers . . . wanted these leaders out because they could not bribe them or frighten them. They launched a vicious 'Red scare' campaign against the leaders of 574, under the impression that the union members were four-year-old children who could be

scared with a bogeyman. Thereupon the membership replied by giving their officers a unanimous vote of confidence. . . . In their desperation the employers are now playing their last card. . . . Don't imagine we are fooled. Bitter experience of the labor movement in the past, and the fresh experience of San Francisco—all teach a simple lesson: The 'Red scare' and the attacks upon leaders by thugs disguised as 'patriots' are the first steps in crushing the workers and driving the workers back to their jobs like cattle. . . . And don't imagine either that you can bluff us. Just come and try it! Just send down your paid thugs. . . . The leaders of 574 will be on the platform. Try and take them off of it! Yes, just look like you want to try it!" (July 20.)

The "Red scare" was beaten. Ranks held firm, and the strike ended victoriously. The bosses had to make concessions which they had taken oaths on a stack of bibles never to make. They had to deal with union leaders whom, they had sworn they would never talk to. As for Tobin, he was now confronted by the unpleasant fact that thousands of union members had followed through thick and thin a group of leaders whom he had insulted and vilified. He made up his mind to "get" Local 574, and to get it before it could raise its voice in the Brotherhood's convention as the leader of a progressive opposition to the salary-grabbing bureaucrats of the Tobin clique.

* * *

After Local 574 had emerged victorious from the July-August strike, General Drivers' Local 173 of Fargo-Moorehead asked it for organizational aid. Miles Dunne, who had done much to build 574, was given leave of absence to help organize Fargo. There he played a major rôle in building the union, which was soon engaged in a bitter struggle for existence. The bosses utilized police, thugs, vigilantes, tear gas, injunctions and every other conceivable weapon to prevent 173 from duplicating 574's successes. Dunne is today under a framed-up indictment for inciting to riot, and the general issue between the Fargo bosses and Local 173 is far from being settled.

Tobin began his attack on Local 574 late in March by indirection: he revoked the charter of Local 173, giving as his excuse the fact that the local is behind in its payment of per capita taxes. He called on the city central body to expel 173's delegates. In the central body, however, it was well known that 173's per capita tax difficulties arose from the financial drain caused by the strike: relief, hospital and legal bills. An opposition arose, led by the A. F. of L. Teachers' Union of Fargo-Moorehead, which refused to unseat 173's delegates. The central body split, and the progressive forces continue to stand solid with 173 in defiance of Dan Tobin and the bosses.

Late in April Tobin attacked 574 directly, revoking its charter and calling on the Central Labor Union of Minneapolis to expel 574's delegates. Again he pointed out that per capita taxes were overdue. This time he added the charge of violating jurisdictional regulations, i.e., enrolling drivers properly belonging in other locals, such as the ice-wagon drivers, milk-wagon drivers, etc.

Neither of Tobin's complaints bears examination from the viewpoint of a union man. True, 574 is behind in its tax payments, having conducted strikes which entailed huge costs, not only in strike relief (of which the Brotherhood gave nary a nickel), but also in legal expenses to fight boss-controlled prosecutors and hospital bills for the healing of peaceful pickets shot down by the police. The union could not deliver on the dot the huge sums demanded by the Brotherhood's Executive Board so that Tobin may be guaranteed his \$28,000 per and his European junkets. *The union had informed the Brotherhood of its financial difficulties, had paid \$500 in per capita taxes in January 1935, and had asked time to make up other outstanding sums.* The request was

*Needless to say, references in this section are to members of the Minneapolis branch of the Communist League of America (now part of the Workers Party), and not to the isolated, impotent handful of communist party members. Not one member of the C.P. belonged to or exerted any influence in Local 574—or does to this day.

never answered one way or the other.*

As for the jurisdictional question, disagreements had arisen on one or two minor points between Local 574 and other drivers' locals in Minneapolis, but all had been straightened out by agreement among the locals, with the Teamsters' Joint Council acting as referee. The truth is that Local 574 has taught a lesson to other craft locals by taking in several categories of workers connected with general transport work aside from drivers and helpers (platform men, inside workers). *It has, however, never infringed on other drivers' locals or any other A. F. of L. unions.* Quite the contrary. Local 574 has used its power in time of strike and at other times to help the milk-wagon and other drivers to extend their locals. For this service, 574 has won the thanks of the other Minneapolis drivers' locals and of the whole union movement. Incidentally, one of the jurisdictional complaints made by Tobin is that Local 574 refuses to support his effort to disrupt the Brewery Workers Union (one of the few industrial unions in the A. F. of L.) by claiming jurisdiction over organized drivers of brewery trucks!

The Central Labor Union is well aware that Local 574 is the spearhead of the movement to make Minneapolis a union town, and as such the favorite not only of the laundry workers, auto mechanics and others whose strikes it has aided in a practical way, but of all the organized workers of the Twin Cities and the surrounding territory. When 574 was able to prove that it had in no way violated union rules, the C.L.U. voted to support it in its fight. A minority in the C.L.U. advocated refusal to unseat the 574 delegation, but the plea of the conservative president of the C.L.U. that this would endanger the charter of the whole C.L.U., won a majority. The body did, however, elect committees to visit Tobin in Indianapolis and William Green in Washington in order to win the reinstatement of Local 574.

In the meantime, since certain agreements come up in June, 574 is girding itself for further struggle against the bosses. The latter, delighted with Tobin's action, hope to get away with the violation of their agreements by isolating 574 from the rest of the labor movement. The union leaders, however, refusing to be provoked, are continuing to fight to get back into the Brotherhood. They have and are striving to maintain the formal and real backing of the Minneapolis union movement, and to get back into the Teamsters' Brotherhood.

* * *

Having traced the main lines of Dan Tobin's activities and their effects, let us turn for a moment to consider the rôle of the communist party in these struggles.

Early in the July-August strike, a C.P. leaflet entitled "Why the Red Scare?" denounced the leaders of 574 as "yellow." Here was some difference, at least, from Dan Tobin's color estimate. But the *Daily Worker* of July 13, distributed in Minneapolis several days later, declared that Miles Dunne, strike leader, "did not permit expression from the floor by the union members", *a charge made by the bosses and echoed by Tobin in order to justify the outlawing of the strike and the denial of strike relief!* The *Daily Worker* of July 25 carried a headline stating that the "Trotskyite Leaders Try to Split the Ranks of Men on Strike", thus supporting by a lie *Tobin's charge* that 574's actions were not a strike for

*Details of 574's answer to Tobin's charges may be found in the *Northwest Organizer*, Vol. I, no. 3, published in Minneapolis. This issue also contains the report of the Central Labor Union's special investigating committee which examined and endorsed 574's contentions. A report appearing in the April 19 issue of the Minneapolis *Labor*

Review (official organ of the C.L.U.), stated that, before revocation, Tobin offered to cancel 574's back taxes if it would meet current per capita obligations. The report was false. Its publication gave an impression that the C.L.U. was going to back Tobin, but it has since given its support to Local 574.

higher wages but a Trotsky-inspired "bloody rebellion". A leaflet entitled "Martial Law!" published by the District Committee of the C.P. charged the leaders of 574 with conniving at deceiving the workers with false promises—the charge made by the *Employers' Advisory Committee and echoed by the Tobin clique.* The ugly rumors of corruption and theft invented by the boss press were spread among the strikers by Stalinists—but unlike the boss press, the Stalinists never apologized for their slanders. Toward the end of the strike, the C.P. openly called for the removal from the union leadership of Vincent R. Dunne, Karl Skoglund and other militants . . . *just as the bosses, Near of the Saturday Press, and, more circumspcctly, Tobin had done earlier.*

There is no need to go on. In every possible way the C.P. tried to discredit and dislodge the leadership of 574 in the midst of the militant, successful and epoch-making July-August strike. Let us now consider the activities of the C.P. in the present fight against the charter revocation. Determined to destroy the Workers Party in the Northwest, the Stalinists recently launched a new weekly paper called *United Action* (the name being a tribute to Earl Browder's genius in discovering that all C.P. members are in favor of a united front with "social-Fascists", and a Labor party). The first issue of this "organ of the C.P., Minnesota District" contains an article which "supports" Local 574. It says in part:

"In not paying the per capita tax, the leadership of Local 574 gave Tobin an excuse to revoke the charter. If for the last few months the local did not pay the per capita tax to the International, then why was this tax collected from the truck drivers? The Minneapolis *Labor Review* of April 19 also reports that the Teamsters' International 'was willing to cancel considerable back tax if current payments were kept up'. If this is true, then why hasn't the leadership of Local 574 settled with the International, instead of giving Tobin an excuse to revoke the charter? *Every union man knows that a per capita tax must be paid to the International and reinstatement of Local 574 is impossible without settling this question first.*"

This article "advises" members of 574 that "to prevent the spreading of all sorts of rumors about financial irregularities in Local 574, a large rank and file auditing committee [should] be elected to issue a financial report". In plain language this means that the C.P. is not satisfied that the union officials are honest! The C.L.U., well aware of the reason for the delay in paying per capita taxes, endorsed 574, its position, its leaders, and *after carefully examining the entire situation* pledged itself to fight for reinstatement. But the C.P., which echoed the bosses' charges of embezzlement during the July-August strike, revives them again to justify Tobin's revocation of the charter!

All independent unionism is now considered a crime by the leaders of the C.P., who yesterday called the A. F. of L. a "Fascist organization" and were all for dual unions. The *United* (with Tobin) *Action* article "advises" members of 574 to "vote against the forming of an independent union and insist that the local remain part of the American Federation of Labor". The implication is that the leaders of 574 are trying to lead the workers into an independent union. The truth is, of course, that the leaders of 574 have neither proposed a vote on the question nor have they advocated anything but reinstatement in the Brotherhood. The spreading of this insinuation has been labelled by the *Northwest Organizer* as a blow to the whole labor movement of Minneapolis; it plays into Tobin's hands and consequently into the hands of

*The italics are not in the original. They emphasize a view which would justify the expulsion of almost every local which every goes on strike and thereby runs into debt! The reference to the *Labor Review* is to the

false report mentioned above. The C.P. does not mind quoting a false report from what it has called a "social-Fascist" paper . . . even when that paper, if only by implication, subsequently repudiates the false report.

Tobin's inspirers, the Citizens' Alliance of Minneapolis, leader of the open-shop drive.

In a handbill reproducing the article from *United Action*, and in the *Daily Worker*, the C.P. repeats its slanders and insinuations. To read this material, one would think that the leaders of Local 574 have stolen funds paid in by the workers as per capita tax, and that in order to escape from the perfectly fair and reasonable demands of Dan Tobin, these crooked rascals are trying to take the workers away from the A. F. of L. into an independent union where they can go on stealing to their hearts' content!

In short, every bit of C.P. propaganda on the current struggle against Tobin is *in support of Tobin*. It is all calculated to raise in the minds of the workers the idea that Tobin was "justified" in revoking 574's charter, and that the only way to get back into the A. F. of L. is to remove the leaders who built the union and led its historic and victorious struggles.

As during the strike, so now *the removal of these leaders is the goal of the Citizens' Alliance*, which knows that the employers can evade their obligations to 574 only if they first eliminate the militant leadership which crammed those obligations down the bosses' throats in hard-fought battles. As during the strike, so now *the removal of these leaders is the goal of Dan Tobin*, who does not want to see any of 574's militants on the floor of the Brotherhood convention next fall.

As during the strike, so now *the removal of these leaders is the goal of the C.P.*, which does not hesitate to wreck a workers' movement at any time, if it can thereby deal a blow to the Workers Party which presents a challenge to the bankrupt Stalinist movement nationally and internationally. If Dan Tobin is a labor lieutenant of the capitalist class—and who can doubt this?—Earl Browder, boss of the communist party, is Tobin's top-sergeant. The C.P. record in the case of Local 574 shows that Stalinism has *nothing* in common with progressivism in the labor movement, *nothing* in common with the ideas and practises of revolutionaries.

If Stalinism is *in any way* part of the labor movement, it is one of least progressive parts, a handmaiden of reaction *à la* Tobin. Having abandoned the internationalist revolutionary position for a program of National-Bolshevism which sees the working class as a pawn in the diplomatic chess game being played by Stalin, Litvinov and Co., *the C. P. has lost all sense of class solidarity*. In order to deal a blow at the only organization whose theory and practise enables it to expose the degenerate character of the Stalinized Communist International, the C.P. makes an alliance with Dan Tobin against the militant leaders and members of Local 574.

As for Tobin, in order to maintain his hold on the Teamsters' Brotherhood and his \$28,000 a year plus pickings, he makes an alliance with the Minneapolis employers against the leaders of 574, the members of 574, the local itself. On the very eve of a new struggle against the bosses, the local union is stabbed in the back by its International President. The bosses take heart and prepare for a finish fight. In that fight they will undoubtedly have the backing of Tobin, who looks forward to the day when, having smashed Local 574, he can issue a new charter to a hand-picked clique of scab-herders, who will collect per capita taxes for him and never disturb the plans of the bosses.

Not until the whole cabal of these bureaucrats—top sergeants as well as lieutenants—has been swept in the junk-heap, will the American working class be able to organize itself for the *final* decisive struggle against its exploiters. The militant trade unionists of the Northwest will undoubtedly be able to take a long step forward toward this goal. The Workers Party has a great rôle to play in the struggle. At the moment the continued building of Local 574 and militant unions throughout the country, the rallying of the whole labor movement to the support of such champions of its cause as Local 574, and the launching of a new counter-offensive against the Citizens' Alliance and the bosses behind it, will constitute the most appropriate and effective answer to Tobin, Browder and Co.

Harry STRANG

Art and Marxism

On the Occasion of the International Writers' Congress in Paris

THE INTERNATIONAL Writers' Congress which has just been concluded at the *Maison de la Mutualité* in Paris, has brought up a whole series of questions whose importance it is easy to understand with relation to the present epoch and to the general destinies of culture and art.

One of the sessions of the congress was devoted especially to the "individual" and to "individualism"—a problem to which, as to all others, Marxism brings us clear and penetrating views. The individual (the writer), situated "above the battle", proves to be an apparition that belongs to the same insipid fantasies among which Marx puts "the individual and isolated hunter and fisherman". "They are Robinsonads." "No more," adds Marx, "than Rousseau's *Contrat Social* which, by means of a convention, places in relation and communication subjects independent by nature." "The higher we go in history, the more the individual, hence also the individual producer, appears as dependent upon and forming part of a greater whole; first, in a still quite natural manner, of a family and of a tribe which is an enlarged family; then, of a community under different forms, emerging from the antagonism and the fusion of the tribe." Now, if it is absurd to conceive of production by isolated individuals outside of society, it is still more absurd to conceive of the development of art and culture "in the absence of individuals living and talking together". The "retreat into oneself" about which so many "independent" "intellectuals" like to

talk, is possible only because "man is a *zoon politikon* in the most literal sense of the term, not merely a social animal but an animal who can isolate himself only in society" (Marx). The higher the degree of development and of differentiation attained by social conditions, the broader become the conditions for the "retreat into oneself" of the individual, the conditions for his independence of the material forces. It is precisely in the epoch when "bourgeois society", the society of free competition, moves towards its maturity, that the point of view of the "isolated individual" appears, as Marx has pointed out.

The chains of the old feudal society having become an obstacle to the development of the productive forces, there is concealed behind the exaltation of the *individual* the exaltation of the bourgeois mode of producing, of exchanging, of living. *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, is the motto of this exaltation. But "free competition" is transformed little by little into "monopoly". The artisan is separated from his tools; the peasant from his strip of land; both are reduced to the state of wage workers, concentrated in large factories, deprived of all individual prerogatives, subjected to the machine, to the tool that has become the "master of man". "Private property" in the means of production, is changed, consequent upon capitalist concentration, from the means of freedom that it was for the individual following upon the dissolution of the forms of feudal society, into its negation, into a means of slavery.

Thence, millions of disinherited individuals arise against "private property" in the means of production. They do not want to abolish, as the *Manifesto* of Marx proclaimed, *property*, but they want to abolish the *bourgeois* form of property which has become incompatible with human development, with the development of the individual. He can not only no longer think—he cannot even feed himself any longer. Thence, those who demanded for themselves the *laissez faire*, the *laissez passer*, arise against those who *veulent faire*, *veulent passer* and endeavor to demolish the fetters which are an obstacle to the construction of a new society adopted to the newly developed productive forces. Out of this rebellion of the capitalist slaves against the social productive forces, embattled to make way for the new economic forms, emerges Fascism. Under the pretext of opposing the "right of the individual" to the collectivist spirit of socialism, Fascism really conceals its essence, which is the negation of the development of the individual, acting as it does as the régime of the absolute monopoly of big capital extended from the domain of production to the domain of the mind.

Quite different is the direction and the meaning of the march of socialism. By socializing the means of production and exchange, by having all individuals work for the whole collectivity, by putting within the reach of *each* the material and spiritual production of *all*, there is certainly no desire to lead to the *socialization of the intellect*, to the *levelling down of the individual*. On the contrary. If ever there is a possibility of speaking of the "free spirit", it is furnished only by socialism, which renders man the master of things instead of their slave. Contrary to Fascism which, emerging from the putrefaction of the society of free competition, wants to save the régime of capitalist monopoly and to suppress every critical form of thought and mind—socialism, while also marking the end of the society of free competition, finds itself on the ascending line of historical development by replacing the bourgeois mode of production and exchange by the *collectivist* mode, also founded upon monopoly, but upon a monopoly which is at the service of the whole of society and which has as its purpose to harmonize production with the needs of the whole collectivity. Which implies not the stifling of the individual, but the establishment of a régime of "free competition" under new forms, under the forms of *socialist emulation* both in the domain of production and the domain of culture.

From what has been said it follows that whereas Fascism, the dying breath of bourgeois society, is the death of the individual and of the human personality, socialism represents, in the expression of Marx himself, the restitution of man to man, the renaissance of the individual, still better, his veritable entrance into history.

* * *

It also follows how inexact and onesided it would be to confine oneself to a simple contrasting of "proletarian solidarity" to "bourgeois individualism" for the purpose of distinguishing the two forms of society: the one in birth, the other disappearing. "Proletarian solidarity" is an historic necessity (and not merely a movement of the soul), corresponding to a stage newly attained by the social forces of production; a means, in sum, of developing the production of individuals and with it their personality, their mind, their culture; whereas "bourgeois individualism" can exist only by grace of the dissociation of social individuals, of the mortification and the oppression of the human masses upon which stands the throne of the "solidarity" of knaves, parasites and exploiters. In bourgeois individualism we find the "solidarity" of conservative, anti-historical interests, enemy of the development of the individual because enemy of social development; in "proletarian solidarity" we have the voluntary, active, free collaboration of the individuals, *associated with one another* in order the better to *separate* from each other in society, that is, in order to conquer

better conditions of living, of acting, of thinking *independently*.

It is therefore in the relations and the modes of production and distribution that we must seek the key to the relations between men, their manner of living and thinking, their kind of "solidarity" and their forms of "individualism". How can and should this view be applied to the domain of art and literature? In what do *proletarian* art and literature differ from *bourgeois* art and literature? The difficulty is not in understanding, according to the Marxian conception, how the mode of production of material life conditions the process of social and political life, but also how it conditions the *intellectual* process in general. (It is not the mind of man that determines the reality, it is the social reality, on the contrary, that determines his mind, says Marx.) The really difficult point to discuss is that of knowing how the productive relations affect in general those of the mind; what, for example, is the relation between the development of material production and of artistic production. Marx notes that this relationship evolves in an *uneven manner*. "Thus, for example," he says, "the relationship between Roman private right and modern production.

"For art [Marx pursues] it is known that definite periods of bloom stand in no relation to the general development of society, nor, consequently, to the material base, the bone structure, as it were, of its organization. For example, the Greeks compared to the moderns, or even with Shakespeare." Whence these contradictions? And how much greater do they appear to be when the artistic and cultural wealth of the *ancients* is compared to the poverty, the dessication, the uniformity of the contemporary world, however, the world of the airplane, the radio, electricity. But the difficulty, according to Marx, lies only in the general formulation of these contradictions. It is quite evident that one cannot conceive of Greek art without assuming Greek mythology, "that is, nature and society, themselves already fashioned in an unconsciously artistic manner for the popular imagination". Achilles is no longer possible after the appearance of powder and lead. Jupiter is effaced by the lightning-conductor. The singers of popular legends are abolished by typography. In any case, continues Marx, "the difficult thing is not to understand that Greek art and the epic poem are tied up with certain forms of social development, *but to understand that they can still bring us aesthetic enjoyment and be considered, in certain respects, as norms and as inaccessible models*". On this "difficult" point, the fragmentary and incompleting indications that Marx himself gives us are so perspicacious as to enable us to get to the heart of the question and to understand it.

"A man," writes Marx, "cannot become a child again without falling into childishness. But is he not delighted with the naïveté of the child, and should he not *aspire to reproduce, on a higher level, the sincerity of the child; does not the very character of every epoch live again in its natural truth in the child's nature?* Why should not the social childhood of humanity, at the finest point in its flowering, exercise, like a forever vanished phase, an eternal attraction?" The attraction of the Greeks, the "charm we find in their art", must therefore be sought not in the materials at their disposal in their *sincerity*, in their *naïveté* in representing the world where their art was born. The grandeur of Achilles, of Jupiter, of the whole Iliad, lies not in the gestures of the personages, but in their *representation*. There is the key with which we can penetrate into the secret of art. The charm we find in the works of the ancient Greeks, in the masterpieces of later epochs, in the monuments of ancient literature—mediæval of modern—rests neither in their content nor their purpose, but in the spontaneity, in the sincerity, in the manner of expressing and representing the life from which the materials are drawn. The attraction and charm we find in the art of every epoch depends upon the degree to which is displayed the capacity to reproduce "the sincerity of the child". And, as Marx points out, "there are badly-

reared children and precocious children. Many ancient nations belong to these categories. The Greeks were normal children".

* * *

What is called the decay of the writer in the West is only the fact that many are "badly-reared" or else "precocious" children. Bourgeois civilization has given us not only machines, the locomotive, the airplane, the telegraph, the radio but has also brought forth giants of thought and of art: from the immortal Dante to the luminous Encyclopædists. But since then, the prodigious child has aged, and in aging it has lost its attractiveness. The avidity for profit, the law of the market, the price variations have also become the laws of culture, art and literature. Mæcenasism was undoubtedly a source of toadyism in art and literature in the days of antiquity and the Middle Ages; nevertheless, without forms of Mæcenasism many masterpieces of antiquity and the Middle Ages could not have seen the light of day. A Leonardo da Vinci could never have displayed his artistic virtues without his "independence", without the "disinterestedness" which his position at the court of the Sforzas obtained for him. The reign of capital has since established the worst form of Mæcenasism: it has suppressed the independence of the writer and the artist, subjecting them to the sway of the market, to the allure of gold. Result: there has been a degradation of art and literature, having become by this fact sources of gain for the musician, the painter, the sculptor, the author. To top it all, we now have the institution of Fascist Mæcenasism, that is, culture openly prostituted to capital; the institution of the *auto da fé* for every critical, independent work, the library under the surveillance of the police, the book controlled by sbirri, the portrait of the Leader deified. It is because the bourgeois capitalist conception of the world and of social relations has become incompatible not only with the development of material production, but also with the rise of artistic and cultural production. Hence, a new road must be sought.

To the artist and the writer must be restored their freedom and their sincerity, their spontaneity, their independence. And that is possible only in a newly organized society, in a society where exists not only the most developed, the most differentiated organization of production, but where all differences between manual and intellectual labor is abolished, where the power that dominates society is not capital, but labor; in brief: in a socialist society. But here lie the greatest number of ambiguities and misunderstandings.

We have seen that the attraction, the charm in which lies the value of all artistic and literary production in every epoch, are not given by the materials out of which it is composed, but by its sincerity, by its natural sincerity of expression. Proletarian art, proletarian literature are not opposed to Greek art, but on the contrary must aspire to reproduce on a higher level the charm, the sincerity which we find among the Greeks, children born of a world that can never return. Now, one can (and often enough does) do a work of political propaganda, of "socialist" and "communist" agitation, without thereby attaining the domain of art. Let us take, for example, the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels. Here we also have, without doubt, a monument, an inaccessible model of proletarian art and literature, both by the power and vigor of the style and by the invincible and expansive force of the arguments. Yet the essential character of the *Manifesto* is not in its artistic and literary value: it is historical, scientific—that of being a program, an exposition of the doctrine and the method of the party of the working class. Proletarian art is a new effort of the imagination, a new product of the creative activity of thought, allied with the renovation of social conditions, with the effort to liberate the working class. But as this effort implies different stages, and has as its final goal the creation of a classless society, hence, the abolition of the working class itself—then proletarian art itself proves to be transitional art, and art of transition towards an art, finally, without abjectives, towards an art which will simply be the eternal attraction of an eternal childhood of humanity won back to itself; in brief: towards Art. But this transition can take place only with the preventive accomplishment of that collective work of art known as the socialist revolution, the expropriation of the expropriators, the conquest of power by the proletariat.

The rôle of the writer in the accomplishment of this prodigious task is not to face the workers as a "schoolmaster", but to educate himself in their school, bringing them his own collaboration, his aid, his services in the new construction. The interests of truth, of art, of all of human culture coincide today with the interests of the working class, the most advanced class of our epoch. Whoever says culture must say today: socialism. And conversely, whoever says socialism, says at the same time: culture. Without culture, no socialism. Socialism is culture in action.

FEROCI

PARIS, June 1935

Luxemburg and the 4th International

Cursory Remarks on an Important Question

EFFORTS ARE now being made in France and elsewhere to construct a so-called Luxemburgism as an entrenchment for the Left Centrists against the Bolshevik-Leninists. This question may acquire a considerable significance. It may perhaps be necessary to devote a more extensive article in the near future to real and alleged Luxemburgism. I wish to touch here only upon the essential features of the question.

We have more than once taken up the cudgels for Rosa Luxemburg against the impudent and stupid misrepresentations of Stalin and his bureaucracy. And we shall continue to do so. In doing so we are not prompted by any sentimental considerations, but by the demands of historical-materialist criticism. Our defense of Rosa Luxemburg is not, however, unconditional. The weak sides of Rosa Luxemburg's teachings have been laid bare both theoretically and practically. The S.A.P. people and kindred elements (see, for example, the dilettante intellectual "proletarian cultural" French *Spartacus*, the periodical of the socialist students appearing

in Belgium, and oftentimes also the Belgian *Action Socialiste*, etc.) make use only of the weak sides and the inadequacies which were by no means decisive in Rosa, they generalize and exaggerate these weaknesses to the utmost and build up a thoroughly absurd system on that basis. The paradox consists in this, that in their latest turn the Stalinists, too—without acknowledging or even understanding it—come close in theory to the caricatured negative sides of Luxemburgism, to say nothing of the traditional Centrists and Left Centrists in the social democratic camp.

There is no gainsaying that Rosa Luxemburg impassionedly counterposed the spontaneity of mass actions to the "victory-crowned" conservative policy of the German social democracy, especially after the revolution of 1905. This counterposition had a thoroughly revolutionary and progressive character. At a much earlier date than Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg grasped the retarding character of the ossified party and trade union apparatus and began a struggle against it. Inasmuch as she counted upon the

inevitable accentuation of class conflicts, she always predicted the certainty of the independent elemental appearance of the masses against the will and against the line of march of the officialdom. In these broad historical outlines, Rosa was proved right. For the revolution of 1918 was "spontaneous", that is, it was accomplished by the masses against all the provisions and all the precautions of the party officialdom. On the other hand, the whole of Germany's subsequent history amply showed that spontaneity alone is far from enough for success; Hitler's régime is a weighty argument against the panacea of spontaneity.

Rosa herself never confined herself to the mere theory of spontaneity, like Parvus, for example, who later bartered his Social Revolutionary fatalism for the most revolting fatalism. In contrast to Parvus, Rosa Luxemburg exerted herself to educate the revolutionary wing of the proletariat in advance and to bring it together organizationally as far as possible. In Poland, she built up a very rigid independent organization. The most that can be said is that in her historical-philosophical evaluation of the labor movement, the preparatory selection of the vanguard, in comparison with the mass actions that were to be expected, fell too short with Rosa; whereas Lenin—without consoling himself with the miracles of future actions—took the advanced workers and constantly and tirelessly welded them together into firm nuclei, illegally or legally, in the mass organizations or underground, by means of a sharply defined program.

Rosa's theory of spontaneity was a wholesome weapon against the ossified apparatus of reformism. By the fact that it was often directed against Lenin's work of building up a revolutionary apparatus, it revealed—to be sure, only in embryo—its reactionary features. With Rosa herself this occurred only episodically. She was much too realistic in the revolutionary sense to develop the elements of the theory of spontaneity into a consummate metaphysics. In practise, she herself, as has already been said, undermined this theory at every step. After the revolution of November 1918, she began the ardent labor of assembling the proletarian vanguard. Despite her theoretically very weak manuscript on the Soviet revolution, written in prison but never published by her, Rosa's subsequent work allows the sure conclusion that, day by day, she was moving closer to Lenin's theoretically clearly delineated conception concerning conscious leadership and spontaneity. (It must surely have been this circumstance that prevented her from making public her manuscript against Bolshevik policy which was later so shamefully abused.)

Let us again attempt to apply the conflict between spontaneous mass actions and purposeful organizational work to the present epoch. What a mighty expenditure of strength and selflessness the toiling masses of all the civilized and half-civilized countries have exerted since the world war! Nothing in the previous history of mankind could compare with it. To this extent Rosa Luxemburg was entirely right as against the philistines, the corporals and the blockheads of straight-marching "victory-crowned" bureaucratic conservatism. But it is just the squandering of these immeasurable energies that forms the basis of the great depression in the proletariat and the successful Fascist advance. Without the slightest exaggeration it may be said: The whole world situation is determined by *the crisis of the proletarian leadership*. The field of the labor movement is today still encumbered with huge remnants of the old bankrupt organizations. After the countless sacrifices and disappointments, the bulk of the European proletariat, at least, has withdrawn into its shell. The decisive lesson which it has drawn, consciously or half-consciously, from the bitter experiences, reads: Great actions require a great leadership. For current affairs, the workers still give their votes to the old organizations. Their votes—but by no means their boundless confidence. On the other hand, after the miserable collapse of the

Third International, it is much harder to move them to bestow their confidence upon a new revolutionary organization. That's just where the crisis of the proletarian leadership lies. To sing a monotonous song about indefinite future mass actions in this situation, in contrast to the purposeful selection of the cadres of a new International, means to carry on a thoroughly reactionary work. That's just where the rôle of the S.A.P. lies in the "historical process". A Left wing S.A.P. man of the Old Guard can, of course, summon up his Marxian recollections in order to stem the tide of theoretical spontaneity-barbarism. These purely literary protective measures change nothing in the fact that the pupils of a Miles, the precious author of the peace resolution and the no less precious author of the article in the French edition of the *Youth Bulletin* carry on the most disgraceful spontaneity nonsense even in the ranks of the S.A.P. The practical politics of Schwab (the artful "not speaking out what is" and the eternal consolation of the future mass actions and the spontaneous "historical process") also signifies nothing but a tactical exploitation of a thoroughly distorted and bowdlerized Luxemburgism. And to the extent that the "Left wingers", the "Marxists" fail to make an open attack upon this theory and practise of their own party, their anti-Miles articles acquire the character of the search for a theoretical alibi. Such an alibi first really becomes necessary when one takes part in a deliberate crime.

The crisis of the proletarian leadership cannot, of course, be overcome by means of an abstract formula. It is a question of an extremely humdrum process. But not of a purely "historical" process, that is, of the objective premises of conscious activity, but of an uninterrupted chain of ideological, political and organizational measures for the purpose of fusing together the best, most conscious elements of the world proletariat beneath a spotless banner, elements whose number and self-confidence must be constantly strengthened, whose connections with wider sections of the proletariat must be developed and deepened—in a word: to restore to the proletariat, under new and highly difficult and onerous conditions, its historical leadership. The latest spontaneity confusionists have just as little right to refer to Rosa as the miserable Comintern bureaucrats have to refer to Lenin. Put aside the incidentals which developments have overcome, and we can, with full justification, place our work for the Fourth International under the sign of the "three L's", that is, not only under the sign of Lenin, but also of Luxemburg and Liebknecht.

Leon TROTSKY

June 24, 1935

A PRAISEWORTHY PROGRAM

WE ARE glad to call the attention of our readers to the publishing program which Pioneer Publishers is now announcing. The support which the plan is sure to arouse will guarantee, we feel, the realization of this ambitious program. It is planned to issue a series of six volumes of selected works of Leon Trotsky, the bulk of the material in which has never before been printed in English. The volumes are to include Trotsky's writings on the 1905 revolution, the revolution of 1917, a new collection of unpublished material on China, a book on the Third International after Lenin, a thoroughgoing reply to all the falsifications and libels of the Stalinists, and so forth. Each volume will be standard size, and with expected aid, it is planned to print the volumes at popular prices. Also included in the program is the publication of classic works of Lenin, Plekhanov, Mehring, Luxemburg and others. Interested readers should communicate immediately with Pioneer Publishers, 96 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Anti-Calles Drive in Mexico

THE SELF-PERPETUATING political machine for dictatorship headed by General Plutarco Elias Calles and manned by his clique of new-rich Mexican business men has suddenly, surprisingly collapsed. It has collapsed because of the tacit alliance, on the single issue of Exit Calles, of the following:

1. Three generals of considerable military power and varying popularity: Cardenas, Almazan, and Cedillo.
2. One politician master-puppeteer, with a strong political machine of his own: Emilio Portes Gil.
3. One "insurrectionary" anti-clerical peasant leader: Jose Adalberto Tejeda.
4. Assorted politicians, leaderlets and minor messiahs nursing personal anti-Calles or anti-Callista grudges.
5. Assorted intellectuals and others who feel the Mexican revolution has been betrayed, and dream of sneaking it in by way of advanced legislation and government support.
6. The clergy and Catholic aristocracy, who bank on Cedillo's friendliness—assumed for anti-Calles political purposes.
7. The majority of trade union leaders.
8. The communist party.

This list is an easy key to the widespread popular pressure that in reality unseated Calles. And this pressure springs from four major sources. First, and most overwhelmingly important, the peasants are still, with minor exceptions, waiting for the land which has been repeatedly promised. The process of rapid industrialization that is now going on in Mexico, tending to raise labor wages and the prices of some commodities, brings out in intolerable contrast the coolie wages and conditions still mainly prevalent in the fields. The 1910-1920 revolution, bringing a new class to political power, has nevertheless not destroyed the old economic relationships on the land. The landowners, in alliance with the Church, are still fighting to maintain these relationships and to recover political power. The new capitalist class, represented by Calles, while struggling against the landowners and the Church, and while advocating higher wages in order to have a market for their products, are at the same time landowners themselves, producing for export, and hence interested in maintaining the semi-colonial land situation. Hence, the paralysis of land reform, and hence the fruitfulness of the peasant question for Cardenas, and his petty bourgeois, landless followers.

The industrialization of Mexico, brought about almost entirely by American capital, weighs heavily on the petty bourgeoisie. They are the small manufacturers, artisans and store-keepers forced out of business by the cheaper and more efficient production of monopolies under Calles—example, the sugar trust controlled by him—and Cardenas can count on the support of this class on the basis of anti-Americanism, "nationalization" of resources, coöperatives, and the whole vague collection of cotton-wool arguments devised to protect native capitalism while fighting imperialism.

The trade unions, having forced through a considerable body of advanced legislation—minimum wage-laws, insurance, pension, and laws pulling labor disputes out of the regular courts and under the jurisdiction of labor boards supposed to defend labor interests, found the functioning of these laws hamstrung chiefly because of the weight and power of foreign capital. *Callismo*, its representative, destroyed the powerful C.R.O.M., erased civil liberties, outlawed the communist party, and made all activity outside of the official *Partido Nacional Revolucionario* and its trade unions and peasant blocs, practically illegal; certainly dangerous. It was as regards labor a kind of incipient Fascism. Therefore Cardenas could be sure, if not of labor support, at least of neutrality in the struggle between himself and the Jefe Maximo.

These three forces: the peasants, the trade unions, and the petty bourgeoisie, mean in Mexico pressure to the Left, because their most visible enemy is imperialist capital. The Church and the landowners, who constitute power No. 4 in the anti-Calles drive, simply hoped to take advantage of the struggle, on the assumption that once Calles was out of the way, they could proceed more easily to dispose of Cardenas.

Given the lineup, it is quite clear that struggle is bound to break out among the Cardenistas as soon as the job of wrecking the Calles machine has been accomplished. Wrecker No. 1, and the shrewdest manipulator in the whole combine, is Emilio Portes Gil. His power is based on agrarian blocs and communities in the North, organized by him and working land distributed when he was governor of Tamaulipas; and on the port workers of Tampico, controlled by the dock-workers' "coöperative", a strong ex-coöperative capitalist enterprise in the hands of conservative trade unionists.

Since Mexican sources of production are now about 70% in foreign hands, and this includes a considerable portion of the best lands, the rock on which the Cardenas ship is sure to founder is imperialism. The history of the Obregon-Calles régimes, both of which also began by an apparent move to the Left foreshadows the same development for Cardenismo, of course notwithstanding Cardenas' own idealistic Leftism and personal honesty.

In other words, the Cardenas triumph is analogous to a triumph of social democracy, though there are no political labels to indicate it. The men now in power can be compared to the Rooseveltians, with the difference that imperialist pressure pushes them farther toward the Left—much farther, in speech; a little farther, in action. Nevertheless they provide the opportunity for organization and struggle, and for victory in immediate gains, true of a social democratic régime. In this sense the exit of Calles constitutes a step forward for the Mexican working class; not, as C.P. theorists assert, the prelude to Fascism.

However, obviously the thing called *Callismo*, which is big capital in alliance with imperialism, cannot be expected to swallow its temporary defeat and digest it quietly.

Nor can the landowners and the Church remain satisfied with a negative victory. At the same time the native capitalist elements in the Cardenas blocs are already becoming alarmed at the possible consequences of Cardenas' demagoguery—which, taken seriously, has brought hundreds of peasants to the capital demanding land, and has unleashed a series of strikes to enforce labor legislation and raise wages.

The Calles-Cardenas duel came out into the open because some of these strikes involved powerful foreign concerns. The same issue will bring the latent struggle within the Cardenas group to a head, and will also give shape to the truly Fascist embryos now engaged in small-time strike-breaking, financed by Callistas. The working class needs to keep its eye on that danger, and on two extremely likely candidates for dictatorship: Morones, the ex-trade union leader being financed by Calles to fight the Leftward pushing workers in the Toledano unions; and Portes Gil, operating under his own steam towards a personal goal that certainly is not socialism.

To meet the day when these struggles reach a climax, the Mexican workers and peasants need an essential instrument which they now lack: a militant working class revolutionary party. The Right wing of the *Partido Nacional Revolucionario* belongs to the big bourgeoisie. The Left wing, to the petty bourgeoisie, with peasant and some labor support. Tejeda has a small, confused, semi-anarchist troop called the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc. The Communist party is small and apparently impotent; completely misunderstanding the historical moment, it advocates the overthrow of Cardenas, to be replaced by a confused something that it calls "agrarian anti-imperialist revolution"; it talks patriotism, makes united fronts with the clerical pro-feudal students, and singles out for vitriolic attack the most Leftward trade union body, Toledano's *Confederacion General de Obreros y Campesinos*.

If no revolutionary, disciplined party is organized urgently soon, to take the leadership of the new phase of the Mexican revolution, then communist party theorists are right: the Cardenas régime is a prelude to Fascism. The stresses and strains within American capitalism, breaking out first as they must, in its colonial extensions, puts revolution in Mexico—as in Cuba and the Caribbean countries—on the calendar as the first parts of the American revolution. A party that understands this, and acts militantly upon it, signifies that the Cardenas régime is indeed a prelude. But a prelude to socialism. Jean MENDEZ

Unser Wort

Halbmonatsschrift der Internationalen Kommunisten Deutschlands (Bolschewiki Leninisten)

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

Humanism in One Country

Another Columbus on the Humanist Horizon.

IN ITS leading article, *Pravda* (June 21, 1935) hails the dawn of "Soviet Humanism". First came the great lover, Joseph Stalin, then came the dawn:

"The teachers of the ruthless class struggle — Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin — are all great lovers of humanity, the great humanists of the proletariat. . . . The dawn of the new Renaissance has already risen over mankind. It is being newly established in the Soviet land. . . . It engenders heroes and titans. . . . This, the wonderful dawn of a new humanity. . . . But it does not come by itself. . . . Cherishing the human being has become the most important, the primary task of socialist construction, and this new epoch of world history was *discovered and underscored* by comrade Stalin's speeches on the need of lovingly cherishing the human being, on the value of new cadres — the supreme value of emancipated humanity. . . . With revolutionary intransigence, with redoubled class vigilance, burning out all the weeds that are alien to his class, the Bolshevik is rutybound preciously and lovingly to nurse the budding and new human being, assuring to the latter the full measure of a free, happy and rational life. . . . The great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics raises high over the world the banner of humanism. . . ." (Our Italics)

Humanizing the Feotus

The first "Bolshevik crusade under the banner of humanism, with Stalin-Lorenzo the Magnificent at the head, was launched against abortion. In the self-same issue of *Pravda*, "A Mother Speaks" (in two columns). She is Taisya Platonovna Fomenko, age 46, with five children, all living. Her oldest daughter, age 21, married a physician ten years older. One year married, and already pregnant. Husband away on vacation. The daughter, in tears over her discovery: "I don't want to! I don't want it! . . . I want to study. . . I haven't begun to live yet!" So the mother speaks, and the question is, what to do? It is up to the father. "Will he be willing to be the father to his own child?" But let the mother speak for herself:

"I do not dwell on this point at such length because I wish to arouse interest in my daughter. But because her case is very typical. That is just how we get so many abortions.

"Take my own case. I had four children. And all girls. And I am a rural teacher, earning very little. And my husband—not meaning to cast aspersions on the male sex—is not a helpmate but a burden. He doesn't drink, he doesn't smoke, nor is he unfaithful, but he is a loafer, and refuses to work.

"So there am I with four kids, when hopes for a fifth arrive. So my girl friends say to me, 'What's the idea? You ought to be ashamed of multiplying the poor! And, do you think anything good will come from your children? We'll raise the money for you, and you go and have an abortion. Don't bring shame upon our profession.'

"So I took the money. And I walked on foot to the city, 17 *verst*s away. I came to the Polyclinic. The physician there—a woman. She examined me, and gave me permission. Says she, 'Well, four are alive. That's enough.' Seemed even to approve. Gave me a slip with instructions where to go. So I started walking around with the instructions. Ashamed was I to lift my eyes and look into people's faces, as I walked around the different offices. When I was about to give birth—everybody was so polite to me. But now I was walking the road of shame. I walked and walked and then I spat on it. I came back home and gave the money back to my friends. And, if you please, I gave birth to a son. My only one! How sorry I would have been had I aborted him. Now he is 8 years old. Such a solid gentleman. . ." etc. etc.

And in conclusion the mother insists that men are responsible: ". . . the root of abortion lies in the male."

HUMANISM ON THE THRESHOLD OF "CLASS SOCIETY"

But even the Humanist Dawn is not all roses. It has its somber shades, if not clouds. From the back pages, and obscure corners of the *Pravda*, we learn:

"*Rostov on the Don*. June 10. On June 10 the school sessions in the rural schools came to a close. However, the teachers in many districts are unable to take their leave because they have failed to receive their wages and their vacation money. Arrears in pay to the teachers in the region amount to 665,000 roubles. . ." (*Pravda*, June 11, 1935.)

"*N. Tagil*, May 27 (by telegraph). The workers of the central electric station at

the Ural railroad car plant, division of the *Zentrenergostroy* Trust, have not received wages for two months. The arrears for April and the first half of May already amount to 500,000 roubles. Telegram sent to V.Z.S.P.S. received no answer. Ask your assistance.

"*Partorg* of Central Electric Station, "Yakovlev." (*Pravda*, May 28, 1935)

"*Leningrad*, May 27. The Bureau of the Leningrad District Committee, C. P. S. U. (Bolshevik) passed a resolution on the question of the revolting facts recently uncovered in several enterprises relating to chiseling on the workers' pay, and also violations of labor laws.

"Chiseling assumed particularly large scope in the knit goods factory, *Krasnoye Znamya* [Red Banner], the textile plant, *M. Gorki* and the glass factory, *Bely Bychok*. For the month of January [!] 1935, 300 cases of chiseling were revealed at the factory, *Krasnoye Znamya*, and at the *Gorki* plant—50 cases. At the *Bely Bychok* plant overtime work is assigned without the permission of the Organs for the Protection of Labor, and it is paid for at the same rate as ordinary labor. . ." (*Pravda*, May 28.)

If these facts seep into the pages of *Pravda*, what must be the actual state of affairs?

Anyway, the humanists of *Pravda* issue a stern warning that all cases of chiseling and holding back pay, to say nothing of increasing the length of the working day will be brought—to justice!!! The managers of the above-named factories received—a censure. Nothing could be more humanitarian, in the Stalinist sense, that is.

J.G.W.

BOOKS

A Reply to Olgin

TROTSKYISM. Counter-revolution in Disguise. By M. J. OLGIN. 160 pp. New York. Workers Library Publishers. 15c.

To page for the physical destruction of Trotsky and the "Trotskyists"—this obstacle, and danger to the power, policies, and privileges of the venal bureaucracy—the falsifiers of history, now turned social-patriots, are preparing to go one crime further: to frame up Trotsky and his co-thinkers as assassins, as terrorists whose aim is to murder Stalin. The G.P.U. was involved in the assassination of Kirov (see, *N. Y. Times*, Jan. 24, 1935). But this attempt to link Trotsky with the terrorists through a provocateur failed. Is there another, a bigger and better frame-up in preparation? There is:

I

S. V. Kossior, reporting to the Kiev party membership, on June 13, 1935 stated:

". . . it is absolutely clear to all of us that both Zinoviev and Kamenev were not only the inspirers of those who shot at comrade Kirov. They were the direct organizers of this vile assassination of comrade Kirov. They acted in complete harmony with the counter-revolutionist Trotsky. Recently, in his statements abroad relating to the assassination of comrade Kirov, *Trotsky openly revealed his terrorist position, openly called for terror against the Bolsheviks, against the leaders of our party*. All distinction between him and the White Guards has long since disappeared." (*Pravda*, June 22, 1935.)

And here is Olgin, in America: "He [Trotsky] has a dream now. To see . . . the leaders of Bolshevism assassinated." (P. 22.) The seventh, main, and final feature of "Trotskyism" is: ". . . support of intervention and killing of Soviet leaders." (P. 49.) "From this to the decision of some inflamed follower to kill the leaders of the revolution—is only one step." (P. 137.)

“. . . The extreme logical followers of Trotsky resort to the revolver.” (P. 65.) “Do the Trotskyists knowingly create a psychological atmosphere that would fire some madman to attempt the murder of Stalin?” (P. 149.)

There is no mistaking the sort of atmosphere Olgin is trying to manufacture in his *Trotskyism*, the 160-page book by him issued in carloads, at a ridiculously low price. Unlike Kossior, Olgin can only insinuate about the “connection” of the Trotskyists in the assassination of Kirov: “Did the Trotskyists of America maintain a direct connection with the ‘Leningrad Center’ out of which came the assassination of Kirov, or were they only appraised [*sic!*] of its existence?” (P. 136.) But, like Kossior, he, too, states openly what his job is: “Today one exposes Trotsky as a counter-revolutionary renegade who inspires [in Moscow, they say: *organizes*. J.G.W.] the murder of revolutionary leaders.” (P. 144.) Here we have the literary-provocateur at work.

And Olgin’s qualifications? Suffice to mention here that Olgin is no novice at “exposure”, nor at getting the proper emotions across the footlights, and of presenting a “character” in his proper relation to the “plot”. He is the author of at least one produced play, and even a hack’s knowledge of stage-effects comes in handily in plying the art of Stalinist provocation.

Some forty years of Trotsky’s life have been spent under the banner of revolutionary Marxism. It is an impossible feat to palm off a Marxist for the advocate of individualistic terrorism. This contradiction must be resolved. Olgin must therefore “build up” a suitable character, for he is not in Alice’s Wonderland where one may “skip forty years”. Hence arises the need for a “brief” 160 pages.

Olgin has to explain away how Trotsky became a revolutionary figure. Sheer coincidence. A petty bourgeois, with talents as a talker and scribe, collided with the revolution, and was swept along. “When the revolutionary labor movement in Russia was young, a man with a sharp pen and an oratorical talent such as Trotsky could easily become noted.” (P. 9.)

The Russian revolution and all the Olgins were then young and inexperienced. Ah, credulous youth! But the Russian revolution grew a little older. How to explain away experienced age? Olgin crawls out of his skin, producing quotations from old controversies, distorting history, and undertaking psychologistic excursions into the petty bourgeoisie to prove that Lenin never “considered Trotsky a Bolshevik”; that Trotsky was an “alien body within the organism of the Bolshevik party, even when he was a member of its Political Bureau” (p. 15); that Trotsky only assumed the name “Bolshevik”, but remained a petty bourgeois, (once a petty bourgeois always a petty bourgeois) and therefore, logically, and artistically, a consistent character for a White Guard assassin.

In 1907 Lenin said, “A few words about Trotsky. There is no need here for me to dwell on our differences with him. Suffice to mention that Trotsky in his booklet, *In Defense of the Party* has publicly expressed his agreement with Kautsky, who wrote about the economic community of interests between the proletariat and the peasantry

in the present revolution in Russia. . . . *These facts suffice so far as I am concerned to recognize the closeness of Trotsky to our views.*” (*Minutes of the London Congress of the S.D.L.P.R.*, Paris, 1909, p. 329. Our italics.)

On November 14, 1917, at the session of the Petersburg Committee of the S.D.L.P.R., Lenin said, “I cannot even speak about this seriously [agreement with the Mensheviks and the S. R.’s]. *Trotsky has long ago said that unity is impossible. Trotsky has understood this, and since then there hasn’t been a better Bolshevik than he.*” (*Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*, No. 7, 1929, pp. 33f.)

But what are photostats or Lenin? Or any number of facts and documents to the contrary? “Lenin did not consider Trotsky a Bolshevik”—(signed) Olgin (p. 10).

And the provocateur must next rewrite the history of the October revolution to fit his “character”. Who led the October insurrection? “Wasn’t he [Trotsky] the leader of the revolution in 1917?”

In Vol. XIV of Lenin’s works, published in 1921, the following note is to be found on page 482: “Following the July days he [Trotsky] was arrested by the Kerensky government, and indicted for ‘leading the insurrection’. After the majority of the Petersburg Soviet passed into the hands of the Bolsheviks, Trotsky was elected its president and in *that position organized and led the insurrection of October 25.*” (Our italics.)

On November 6, 1918, Stalin himself admitted as much: “All the work of practical organization of the insurrection was conducted under the immediate leadership of the president of the Petrograd Soviet, comrade Trotsky. (*Pravda*, No. 214. *The Role of the Most Eminent Leaders of the Party.*)

So what? “He who knows the ways of the Bolshevik party will easily understand why Trotsky was not among the leaders appointed by the Central Committee to direct the uprising”—(signed) Olgin (p. 12).

Next, the civil war. “Wasn’t he at the head of the Red Army between 1918 and 1921?”

Twist and twirl as he will, the Stalinist forger has to explain away, not a single episode this time, but the entire crucial period of the civil war. Observe, how the Stalinist squirms: “Time passed. Trotsky worked with the Bolsheviks. . . . But he was a stranger in the Bolshevik party. The civil war came and [!] Trotsky was given a high post. [Evidently, another coincidence. J.G.W.] *He was, so to speak, propagandist-in-chief of the Red Army.*” (P. 13. Our italics.)

And Olgin describes how Trotsky “played General” during the civil war: “Trotsky travelled up and down the front . . . went into the trenches to talk to the Red Army men; he made great public orations—but he never led the civil war.” (P. 13.) It was just a delusion on Trotsky’s part. Olgin, the military expert, has to admit that Trotsky was the “Military Commissar”, just as he has had to admit Trotsky’s revolutionary career. The facts are too well known. So they must be explained away. And we hear again the now familiar melody. Just a coincidence! The civil war was young, incredulously inexperienced, and an adult man with a sharp pen—“issuing crisp orders

that can be quoted as examples of military style” (p. 13)—and an oratorical talent such as Trotsky’s, could easily become—not “noted” this time but—the Commissar of War. Just as Trotsky played at being a revolutionist in 1905, so he was now deluded “into believing that he was the whole moving spirit of that tremendous historic combat. . . . The actual facts are just the reverse. The facts are that *Stalin and Voroshilov* [what? no Frunze?] were the great fighters on the various battle fronts—leaders with clear revolutionary vision and strategists of the first order” (p. 13).

Let us allow for the moment that Stalin-Voroshilov-Olgin are correct. Let us allow that Trotsky “knew nothing about the organization of the army, he had wrong ideas about revolutionary strategy. . . . As a matter of fact, his ideas about the strategy of the civil war were so wrong that, had they been carried, the enemies would have triumphed. . . . etc. etc.” (p. 13). We want to know: why did the party tolerate such an ignoramus, and the whole Revolutionary War Council? Why wasn’t Trotsky removed from his post during the years of civil war? Why was neither Stalin nor Voroshilov—both these “strategists of the first order”—appointed as the leaders, but why were they instead removed on more than one occasion from difficult sectors? Why did Lenin send telegram after telegram* to Trotsky insisting on his going to the most critical sectors?

Olgin has had to explain away too much. His forged version of the civil war compromises the party, vilifies the C.E.C. and Lenin. For, were his lies and monstrous exaggerations true, it could only imply that the C.E.C. led by Lenin, was guilty of the gravest, and absolutely inexcusable crime before the revolution: supporting, as they

*“August 22, 1918, Svyajsk. To Trotsky. Betrayal on the Saratov front, although discovered in time, has resulted in vacillation—extremely dangerous. We consider absolutely necessary your immediate departure for that sector, for your appearance at the front reacts upon the soldiers and the entire army. . . . Lenin, Sverdlov.”

“April 10, 1919. To Trotsky. Nijny Novgorod. In view of the extremely critical situation at the Eastern front, I think it best for you to remain there. Lenin.”

“May 7, 1919. Shikhrana. To Trotsky. I have just asked the whole Political Bureau of the C.E.C. and in agreement with them I am decisively for your immediate and quickest possible departure for Khar'kov where it is necessary to put an end to disorganization and immediately give aid to the onetz Basin. Lenin.”

“May 21, 1919. . . . I personally would insist on your going once again to Bogachur and completely crush the insurrection, otherwise there is no hope of victory. Lenin.”

(One day later) “May 22, 1919. . . . I insist again on your unflinchingly going a second time to Bogachur and putting an end to the matter, because Sokolnikov obviously cannot handle the situation. Lenin.”

And here is Trotsky’s answer. “Kharkov-Lugansk (*en route*) Moscow. To Sklansky for Lenin. Leaving for Bogachur, where will try to put an end to the matter. Trotsky. May 22, 1919.”

are charged, an ignoramus and bungler as the head of the Red Army. The leader of the victorious Red Army was removed by the Stalinists *after* the civil war from his post.

II

Having provided his "brief" with the required White Guard Villain, Olgin must also supply the "Red Hero". That is to say, he must explain away the decade of crimes, defeats, and betrayals under the leadership of Stalin.

The "world-charlatan", the petty bourgeois adventurer in the revolutionary movement, turned into a White Guard, finds (in Olgin's fertile imagination) his nemesis in Stalin, the Heroic, "the world leader whose every advice to every Party of the Comintern on every problem is [was and will be —J.G.W., J.C.] correct, clear, balanced, and points the way to new, more decisive class battles" (p. 149).

This hero in the Kremlin, who like Jehova has a promised land to his credit—the Land of Socialism in One Country—is likewise responsible for the ripe fruits of the "bloc of four classes in China", the Anglo-Russian Committee, the theory of social-Fascism, the victory of Hitler in Germany, etc. etc. . . . down to the ripest fruit of all, the Franco-Soviet pact. And the latter-day Moses of this latter-day Jehovah has a lot more explaining to do than was necessary in the Bible to establish Jehovah's infallibility.

Naturally enough, Moissaye J. Olgin prefers to do most of his explaining in China, which is however not quite so far removed as Heaven. The glamor and "mystery" of the Orient, as we know, covers much filth and squalor, but not even China will screen a Stalin.

In China, if you please, there are Soviets "Led by the C. P. of China, which early in 1935 counted over 400,000 members" (p. 86); there is the Red Army, "the wonder of the world . . . in the neighborhood of one million men" (p. 86); and "the Red Flag with the hammer and sickle is waving over a territory embracing a population of some ninety million—about one-fifth of the total population of China" (p. 86). Then, why didn't the one-sixth of the world which is communist at least recognize the Chinese Soviets, in one-fifth of China? Why not a Soviet China-Soviet Union pact against the threat of Fascism and war? Why doesn't Litvinov demand at least that this great ally be accepted into the League of Nations?

Because Olgin is covering up the betrayal of the Chinese revolution in 1925-1927, by the "Chinese Soviets", peasant bands and peasant armies, the remaining echoes and repercussions of the 1925-1927 revolution who are still able to maintain themselves due to the peculiar conditions in China, with its vast vestiges of feudal economy, the resulting economic isolation of provinces in the interior, the absence of inter-province railroads and other means of communication, etc.

Trotsky, Olgin yowls, "assumed a Menshevik position as regards the very nature of the Chinese revolution". The essence of Menshevism is class collaboration, support of the "liberal bourgeoisie". The Mensheviks in Russia not only frowned upon the peasant seizure of land, but they supported punitive expeditions against the insurgent

peasants. They discouraged as provocation and adventurism strikes of workers during the revolution because all this would break the united front with the bourgeoisie. They rejected the theory and practise of the proletariat wielding the hegemony in the revolution: that democratic tasks would and could be only the results of the *proletarian* revolution; that only the proletarian dictatorship could and would lead to the emancipation of the peasantry and the oppressed peoples.

What was the Stalinist policy in China? Stalin subordinated the C.P. to the Kuo Min Tang in the name of the "bloc of four classes" (the bourgeoisie, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the proletariat). After Chiang Kai-Shek's betrayal, the C.P. was subordinated to the "bloc of three classes"—only three "faithful allies remained". So the communists entered the Wuhan government and assumed personal and direct responsibility for the punitive expeditions against the insurgent peasantry!

There is no hiding the betrayal. It seeps out even in Olgin's own version. According to him, Chiang Kai-Shek "betrayed" in March 1927. "When the imperialists began to bombard Nanking in March 1927, Chiang Kai Shek joined hands with them against the revolution." (P. 103.) But Olgin does not utter a peep about what the communist party did after this betrayal was as obvious as is Olgin's venality. One month later, an April 13, 1927, the workers in Shanghai, under the Stalinist leadership were compelled to hand over the city to "their revolutionary" General, Chiang Kai Shek, to be drowned in blood by "their leader".

As a matter of fact the first open act of betrayal on the part of Chiang was not in March 1927, *but one year prior to it*, on March 20, 1926, the occasion of his first overturn in Canton. For years, this fact was kept from the international working class, and Olgin remains true to tradition. There is no other way to justify adherence to the Kuo Min Tang, the party of the butcher Chiang. How else but by fraud can he justify Stalin's "clear, correct and balanced slogan": "We shall never drop the banner of the Kuo Min Tang." And they didn't! Chiang cut the throats of Chinese workers, drowned the revolution in blood, and soaked the banner of Kuo Min Tang into a "red" banner.

What did the Stalinists order the Chinese C. P. to do after March 20, 1926? What was the reaction of the masses? We give the floor to the co-reporter on the Chinese question at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in 1928. The speaker is Strakhov: "Even after March 20, we did our utmost to get along with the March 20 régime so as to keep the united front with the bourgeoisie, with Chiang Kai-Shek, with the nationalists. As far as the masses were concerned they could not be reconciled to the March 20 régime." (*Inprecorr*, October 4, 1928.)

The Stalinists, like the Mensheviks, refused to break the united front with the bourgeoisie, and they were "taken by surprise" in March 1927.

After they finally did "break" with Chiang Kai-Shek, the Stalinists sought to maintain at all costs their "faithful" alliance with the petty bourgeoisie. Again, Strakhov, the co-reporter on the Chinese revolution: "Al-

though we were then already fighting against Chiang Kai-Shek and the national bourgeoisie, we had not yet realized the inevitability of a disruption of the united front with the petty bourgeoisie for the sake of which we obstructed the development of the mass struggle. (*Ibid*, p. 1251.)

In the Wuhan bloc, in its alliance with petty bourgeois generals and politicians, Stalinism discouraged rebellions and seizures of land. The Stalinist ministers in the coalition Wuhan government violently suppressed peasant uprisings, "obstructing the development of the mass struggle" as part of their Menshevik delusions.

Nauseating as Olgin's picture of "Soviet China" is, he surpasses himself in painting the Canton Soviet of December 1927. "The first Soviet was organized in Canton after the armed rising of December 11, 1927." (P. 106. Our italics). Soviets organized after the rising! But doesn't the Soviet, the highest organ of the united front, also function as the *organ of insurrection*? Olgin denies the "Trotskyist slander" that the Soviet was "created in a hurry" (Trotsky).

But Strakhov himself admitted that "there were very few people at the mass meeting in Canton". This meeting elected the delegates to the Soviet. The revolutionary wave had already waned. To Trotsky's charge that the Canton uprising was an "adventuristic putsch", Olgin replies by screaming that it "was one of the most heroic uprisings of the workers and peasants. . . . Over 7,000 fighters were shot in Canton alone after the crushing of the uprising." (P. 107.)

The blood of heroic workers and peasants has served more than once before as a cover for crime and treachery.

After one-sixth of the book devoted to the falsification of Chinese history—*two pages* on the "third period"! "We must confess, we never found in Trotskyite writings anything resembling an explanation of why they disagreed with the 'third period' analysis. They just scoffed." (P. 112.) France, imperialist France, some seven years ago was placed *first* on the order of revolution. Then, France was in a pre-revolutionary situation; in 1935—there is no "revolutionary" situation in France, the military ally of Stalinism.

But the "third period" of the mistakes of the Stalinist was only meant as a cover for the defeat in China and the betrayal in the Anglo-Russian Committee. So it is best passed over in silence or with a squeal—by all the Olgins.

And next—12 pages on Germany and . . . the "question of social-Fascism". After their "united fronts" with the Chiangs and the Purcells, the Stalinists decided to play safe—no more united fronts with anybody! Only the united front from BELOW!

In talking about Germany, Olgin prefers to speak—about Austria—for the purposes of reducing the theory of "social-Fascism" and its fatal consequences into a mere verablism. "In the very same way as Lenin, after the betrayal of the proletariat by social democracy at the beginning of the war called the social democratic leaders *social patriots* and *social chauvinists*, so the Communist International called its leaders *social-Fascists*—in the sense of paving the way for Fascism." (P. 114.) Lenin did it.* Stalin did it. That is all.

And with this piece of sophistry and hypocrisy Olgin thinks to dupe workers, who have not experienced themselves the actual essence of the theory of social Fascism—not in the sense of “paving the way for Fascism”, but as the very instrument of fascism.

In 1929 Pieck, one of the leaders of the C. P. of Germany, declared that the social democracy “is growing more and more ripe to play the chief part should a Fascist form of government be established” (*Labour Monthly*, June 1929).

At the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., Bela Kun (the present head of the C. I.) stated: “. . . the evolution of the social democracy towards social-Fascism has not yet sufficiently advanced to enable us to determine whether social-Fascism constitutes a special and final form of Fascization in a number of countries, or if it constitutes a step towards the complete development of Fascism also in countries like Germany, Poland, Rumania, etc., which are on the road towards Fascization.” That was the only thing in question! Whether social-Fascism is a final form of Fascism or a step towards complete Fascism! And Bela Kun proceeds to attack the Right wingers: “The Italian development is no argument against the possibility for social democracy to evolve into pure Fascism. . . . If there is a sham fight between the social democracy and these open Fascist organizations it is by no means a fight between two principles but rather a clash between two methods of Fascization. . . . I believe, that in the present stage of the development of social-Fascism we have to be prepared rather for armed clashes with Fascism and its social-Fascist organizations, more than ever before. . . . we should do our utmost to combat the social democracy and in the first place, the Left wing of the social democracy”. (*Inprecorr*, August 21, 1929, pp. 872f.) Comment is unnecessary.

Trotsky and the Bolshevik-Leninists repeated time and again that the social democracy “paved the way for Fascism” and they attacked the theory that the social democracy is compatible with a Fascist government, or that in advanced countries the social-Fascist dictatorship would be the final form of Fascism. Trotsky insisted that the social democracy would be crushed by Fascism. Now Olgin changes the story. The Stalinists labelled Trotsky a “counter-revolutionist” for proposing a united front of struggle against Fascism. Now, Olgin, quotes extensively from Austria to prove that the Stalinists did want a united front, but that it was impossible to make it. Why? Because “prior to the advent of Hitler the social democracy did not believe this [i.e., that Fascism would crush it.—J.G.W.]” (p.

119). Proof: Otto Bauer in Austria.

Did the Stalinists understand this before the events smashed the skulls of the German workers? The theory of social-Fascism is the answer! The united front from below is the answer! Even today the Comintern still holds that the beaten and crushed German social democracy remains “the main support” of Fascism.

Olgin himself has to admit that between 1929-1932, the C. P. did not propose the united front to the S. P.—it did engage in the Red Referendum. He tries to cover it up by underscoring that “in 1929-1932 it repeatedly proposed joint action against Fascism? The real position of the Stalinists was, however, clearly enough stated at that time:

“There is and can be no united front with any group of social democratic leaders. The anti-Fascist united front can and will be brought about to the exclusion and against the groups of social democratic leaders”—(Willi Münzenberg, *Rote Aufbau*, December 1, 1931.)

From bureaucratic ultimatism and exaggeration of their strength prior to Hitler's seizure of power, to shabby sophistry in apology for the betrayal after the victory of Fascism . . . down to social patriotism today—such is the itinerary of all the Stalinists, all the Olgins.

Where are the Stalinists leading the Soviet Union? In his “exposure” of Trotskyism, Olgin tries to hide behind the achievements of the workers in the Soviet Union, and argues, if you please, that Trotsky denies “the possibility of a victorious proletarian revolution in one country” (p. 28). Trotsky, who with Lenin led the October revolution is “proved” to have led it by mistake; he never believed in it anyway.

But today one no longer argues the subtleties of the theory of socialism in one country, or explains the permanent revolution. The Stalinists have promised the workers socialism in the Soviet Union, if only they shut-up, endure and toil—for 10 years.

Long, long ago, the Stalinists proclaimed their “entry into the period of Socialism” (see, for example, *Inprecorr*, March 21, 1931). More in October 1932, Manuilsky, the then leader of the C.I. told the working class of the world: “Do not forget that we shall enter classless society only with the completion of the second Five-Year Plan.” (*Report to the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.*)

The workers in the Soviet Union have certainly not forgotten. Today, on the eve of the completion of the second Five-Year Plan, the Stalinists have to prepare to account for the frightful discrepancy between reality and their theory. They are preparing to settle the accounts by more repression, and more pogroms, and greater and better betrayals.

Today, the question is put squarely: Are we the willing slaves of “our own” imperialism or the implacable foes of imperialism and its ally Stalinism? Upon the answer to this question depends the fate of the workers' state in the Soviet Union and the fate of the world revolution. Their “clear and balanced” social patriotic betrayal will not be masked by the literary and actual

pogroms in preparation by Stalin, and all his Olgins.

John G. WRIGHT
Joseph CARTER

England's Intellectuals

THE INTELLIGENTSIA OF GREAT BRITAIN. By DMITRI MIRSKY. 248 pp. New York. Covici, Friede. \$2.50.

The Intelligentsia of Great Britain is an instance of what might be called dialectical irony. Whether D. Mirsky was commissioned to write it or volunteered to do so I do not know. But it is certain that to acquire the requisite methodology he had to undergo a severe “Marxian training”, that is he had to study the then recent theoretical publications of the Third International. He diligently soaked himself in the products of the “Third Period” and in his opus applied them on the grand scale.

In the meantime, however, the policy of the International, under the pressure of events, performed one of its customary changes into its polar opposite, and so Mirsky's book appears on the scene—a stillborn but grandiloquent last Mohican of the theory of social-Fascism which in Moscow has just expired.

To understand what the resultant product actually is and how it came to be what it is, we must lay bare its main traits:

(1) The theory of social-Fascism as a method of social analysis.

(2) Vulgar Marxism of the most vulgar sort.

(3) The author's ignorance of his subject matter which is partly natural (for instance, when he deals with science of philosophy); and partly conditioned by 1 and 2.

(4) The author's complete inability, in consequence of 1, 2 and 3, to present his work as a chronologically or logically coherent whole.

(5) The author's personal attitude to his subject matter which is one of bull-headed impudent ignorance—an unsavory combination of the adolescent schoolboy and an average army officer.

Superimposed on all this is the pompous hollow tone of the typical Stalinist theoretician absolving or condemning with papal infallibility.

It might seem that a book like this is in reality harmless. Its total inadequacy should be self-evident to its readers—among whom there will be no workers for the simple reason that this Philippic against the intelligentsia is composed largely in a jargon the intelligentsia alone can understand.

But this, although true in itself, is on the whole a short-sighted view. At present, when the contradictions of capitalism are becoming more and more unbearable, the intellectuals of all kinds—students, technical specialists with a university training—are becoming vividly aware of them and beginning to look for a solution. In short, a large scale radicalization of the intellectuals is taking place. They start reading “Marxism” and on the whole they will begin, not with Marx and Engels, but with what has immediate present-day application. Now, if we allow to pass unchallenged the claim of the Stalinists that their productions alone are revolutionary Marxism,

*And many Stalinist dupes will fall for this sophistry! The social democrats during the war actively supported their capitalist fatherland. Their social basis, the labor aristocracy organized into trade unions, was not incompatible with imperialist war. On the contrary, it was precisely this social basis, integrated with the bourgeois state and imperialism, which Lenin cited as the historical reason for the conversion of social democracy into social chauvinism. Fascism, however, exterminates the social democracy.

Leninism, etc., then a process of unnatural selection will begin. Those who are intelligent enough to recognize the stupidity will for a long time fight shy of what they believe to be Marxism, whereas those to whom the tone and the intellectual level appeals will rapidly become oud-mouthed "champions of the working-class" under the leadership of the 3rd International. It is our duty, therefore, to raise our voice not only against the strictly political publications of the C.I. but against such "cultural" attempts. They demonstrate once more the truth of the materialist conception of history; Stalinist theoreticians are now totally unable to produce a theoretical work which is more than a miserable persiflage of Marxism, because the political views they are compelled to hold, views whose glaring self-contradictions are but the intellectual expression of the ultimate concrete contradiction between the rational "socialism" of Russia and the international revolutionary necessities of the world proletariat.

The book begins with an account and explanation of the genesis of the intelligentsia in England. This chapter is the best and, considering the rest is in fact a surprisingly good analysis.

But with the 20th century the general confusion begins. It is impossible to give a detailed analysis of it. It is not even worth the trouble of following the author along all his zigzags. A few illustrative quotations should suffice.

The effect of the war on the intelligentsia is described in the following charming sentence:

"... and hand in hand with the agonized individualism of 'war victims' there grew up another current contributed by the parasitic bourgeoisie—that of a pure morbid revelling in their individualism and estheticism. There had, of course, been something of all this before, but it was only now there were the social conditions for such individualism to couple with this individualism of intellectuals who had lost all illusions which had become a social phenomenon of very wide significance". (P. 30.)

Later, he says: "Catholicism took the van and there was a marked tendency to neglect its emotional tricks and make more use of rigid mediæval scholastic dogmata. The barren intellectuals here found salvation from the burden of individualism and went through a schooling which was a preparation for the class discipline of Fascism." (P. 35.)

Of the general strike Mirsky says:

"The revolutionary vanguard of the working class was defeated in 1926—by the reformist leaders." (P. 37.)

We do not learn of the existence of the Anglo-Russian Committee, or are they included in the sentence quoted?

Analyses of representative intellectuals are given. Those which are of any value are simply paraphrased from Strachey's *Coming Struggle for Power*.

But Mirsky can be creative too: "... not that Russell is unable to take the step [to dialectics] because he is a believer in mechanistic materialism, but rather that he is a mechanistic materialist because he is incapable of coming over to the proletariat". (P. 84.)

On page 188, again speaking of Russell, he says:

"He has no clear-cut logical discipline—fruit of direct study of the pre-German classics of philosophy—nor do we find in him either an open identification of Machism with idealism, nor any connection with Right wing bourgeois currents."

From Lytton Strachey's *Elizabeth and Essex* he can draw great conclusions:

"... in his *Elizabeth and Essex* [Strachey] attempted to serve up to the British public a queen more in keeping with their imperial hearts than one who was completely wrapped up in her world of industrial capitalism. Thus did the liberal æstheticism of Bloomsbury reach the season of moulting its ironical feathers disappeared and the world beheld it in a banal senile coat of imperialist worship of 'greatness' and 'grandeur' and 'the picturesque'". (P. 121.)

Malinowsky serves British imperialism "very faithfully", but how he does it we are not told.

But individuals are not all. We have passages of broad movement:

"The opening era of imperialism was the period of rapid growth of the American intelligentsia . . . and their growth found expression in a luxuriation of literature that one of the leaders of the time called 'our first national art'. This new reading matter first reached Great Britain after the war, and as a cry of protest it was found to fit in with other influences of the order of dissatisfaction. Together with America's first 'national art' the word 'highbrow' came to Europe." (P. 91.)

The army officer with his eyeglass:

"Both writers [Jeans and Eddington] are particularly *épatés* by the part played by Planck's quantity 'h' as a stable unit in quantum mechanics. This astonishment and delight is the very starting-point of Eddington and Jeans philosophizing." (P. 199.)

Finally, the Stalinist theoretician:

"They [the social democrats] act as a sort of feint, a manœuvring body to divert the working class from its proper path, to confuse it and disorganize and disarm it, and that is why we describe them as social-Fascists. It is scarcely an honorable job, and German events have shown that it is even rather an unsafe one. But then all *agent-provocateur* work is risky. Fascism when victorious will immolate these gentry."

About Dmitri Mirsky little more remains to be said. On page 199 he dismisses symbolic logic (one of the many sciences of which he knows nothing) as "mathematical cretinism". There can be no doubt left as to who the cretin is. Hans V.

Woman's Place

FACTORY, FAMILY AND WOMAN IN THE SOVIET UNION. By SUSAN M. KINGSBURY and MILDRED FAIRCHILD. 334+xxv pp. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$3.50.

"Every cook must learn to rule the State."—Lenin.

"The woman who scrubs our floors must be enabled to pursue the highest education if she so desires and if she had capacity."—Krupskaya.

"The Soviet order has established a position for women as human beings, as work-

ers, as mothers, as citizens, such as exists in no other country. The women in the Soviet Union are not only free, not only do they enjoy culture in the fullest meaning of the word—no! The institutions established show us that the women themselves have become a force creating freedom, creating culture. If the men are sometimes weak, if they should hesitate and falter, let us women drive them forward into the struggle—and show them by our resolute action that we prefer death to slavery."—Klara Zetkin.

The Russian revolution started on International Woman's Day, and from its very inception tackled one of the worst contradictions of capitalism—that between the wretched useless doll-woman on the one hand and the purposeless drudge on the other. The "free" women of the bourgeois feminist movement who achieved a career, or a "free" love-life, or both, found that there was still an unanswered question—freedom—for what? The Russian revolution gave the answer—freedom to build a world fit for children to live and grow and work in—in short, freedom to build.

Under Lenin, one of the first tasks the revolution set itself was the solution of the woman question, and it has been one of the most consistently and satisfactorily carried out, so that a book like the present one, primarily on woman's world, has a better chance of being objectively and accurately presented to foreign students, and by them to the rest of the world, than other phases of Russian life that have one off the Leninist track.

As planned economy comes to replace the profit motive, and to the extent that it does, the laboratory from which a good deal of social psychology has been drawn will have to be re-written. In the words of the Communist Manifesto: "The bourgeois claptrap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor." In fact, it is only in the Soviet Union that there is adequate protection of motherhood—such as enforced paid absences from work for several weeks before and after childbirth, factory laws supplying time and place for nursing of infants, crèches connected with the place of work, limitations on the weights women may carry, and so forth.

To carry on the subject of the family, again from the *Communist Manifesto*: "The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement (the practical absence of the family among the proletarians) vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital." How is this prophecy being fulfilled in the Soviet Union? As we might have expected—this book, like its predecessors, by Alice Withrow Field, Jessica Smith, Fannina Halle, and others, shows that: divorce is no more frequent in the Soviet Union than elsewhere; abortions are less, and ill-health following them is greatly reduced; the birth rate has risen (how that must rile Mussolini!), child health is excellent (every writer on the Soviet Union, even liberal and conservative writers—comments on the hap-

py, well-fed, busy children.) After some years of experimentation with other forms, monogamy is being officially approved by the enrouragement to license all marriages, and the literature of the times shows an increasing trend toward the biologic family—father, mother and child—as the most economical arrangement for everyone's emotions. Of course, the other forms exist, and there is no direct pressure of any sort except insistence that the children be provided for by the father if he is employed, otherwise by the mother with assistance from the state. There are plenty of women who find self-expression in having numerous children by different fathers, there are women who change their lovers frequently, women who despise love or still carry on under the discredited "glass-of-water" theory so violently attacked by Lenin (the idea that sex is a simple biological function like drinking when thirsty, and to be treated in the same casual way). There is, in short, every type of relationship known to western civilization—but the ideal partnership of which every woman dreams and which can exist under capitalism only in the most exceptional circumstances, is in the Soviet Union an every-day affair, with both partners working for the same goal, together, and where each is not only allowed but encouraged to contribute his or her maximum to social work.

Clearly under these changed conditions so-called feminine psychology has to be studied anew, including the Nietzschean dictum about the "slave nature of woman". In the U.S.S.R., where women suffer few economic handicaps and only certain hangovers due to "cultural lag" in the emotional field, there is an opportunity to see what they are good for. And they are good for plenty, though to date they have produced no major composers and only one major scientist.

The corollary to Lenin's statement about every cook learning to rule the state is this, also from Lenin: "Very few men, even among proletarians, think how much labor and weariness they could lighten for women, in fact save them altogether, if they would lend a hand in 'woman's work'. No, that is incompatible with man's rights and dignity, which require that he should enjoy his peace and comfort . . . our communist labors among the masses of women . . . involve a considerable effort to educate the men. We must root out the ancient outlook of the lord and master to the last fibre." And that patently is being done, as this book and all the others show. Women are being released from the "little prison", the kitchen, without altogether sacrificing the home life of the family. After a certain initial distrust was overcome, communal laundries have made their way; there are innumerable communal kitchens and infirmaries in connection with the factories, on the farms and in residential districts—and of course everywhere the crèches—day crèches, night crèches, and even summer crèches. Of course, the housing shortage still prevents anything like an ideal situation, or even a tolerable one, from the western standpoint. Dr. Fairchild notes that the greatest hardship from which the intelligentsia suffer is inadequate privacy, and the greatest privilege that can be granted

them is extra space.

The book is a careful objective study, from the liberal position. The first part, "Industrial Life", is done by Dr. Mildred Fairchild, the second part, "Social Life", by Dr. Susan M. Kingsbury. The whole is full of tables and statistics, with an explanatory note limiting the reliability of certain of the statistics, with bibliography and an index. The authors of course suffer under the disability of any outsiders—they did not see everything, and it is hard for us to evaluate what they did not see. Undoubtedly the picture errs on the side of optimism, but even so it is a heartening thought that, however faultily, with however many limitations, somewhere in the world human nature is having half a chance.

On the whole, there seems reason to believe that the authors were allowed to see enough to make their conclusions valuable, but at one point inevitably they were fed with dishes of stale poison—the so-called four positions on the trade union question. The authors were told that Trotsky's position was not feasible and the position of Lenin was that of Stalin. The old myth of Trotsky wishing to militarize the trade unions and subject them to the party apparatus is amply dealt with in *My Life*: "If industry rests on the state's insuring the supply of all the necessary products to the workers, the trade unions must be included in the system of the state's administration of industry and distribution of products. This was the real substance of the question of making the trade unions part of the state organizations, a measure which flowed inexorably from the system of war communism, and it was in this sense that I defended it." The other canard about "Lenin's trade union system versus Trotsky's" is also dealt with both in *My Life* and in *The Real Situation in Russia*, and need not be gone into here. Dr. Fairchild may be excused for not having found the answers to these questions—it may be supposed that she was not exactly escorted to the source material—and she does record differing points of view, which after all is the function of a liberal professor.

The book as a whole is a text book, and reads like one. It is a full and careful reference work, but for anyone who is not actually preparing a report and needing statistics, the same facts are much more vividly presented, for instance, in Fannina Halle's *Women in Soviet Russia*. Nothing in Dr. Kingsbury's long and careful study of the status of education in Russia compares with Frau Halle's vivid portrait of the woman ticket collector, aged fifty, who has just earned to read and who says "Now I know what Darwinism is! Till I was forty-nine I thought God had created man. Now I'd like to learn everything and know everything." Since we are pushing on toward a new world anyway, there is no good reason why the writing of textbooks should not be revolutionized also, until each one is as readable as, for example, *Middletown*.

But with all criticisms and limitations, and there are plenty, this book and many more like it should be circulated. If it were possible for a couple of liberal professors, male or female, to make a similar study of the lot of woman under Fascism—

assuming that a liberal would have access to facts in a Fascist country—it would make it easier to mobilize an international woman's army for the defense of the Soviet Union.

Florence BECKER

On Good Intentions

AN EXAMPLE of the hopeless position into which a false line of policy can drive a group is offered by the depths of contradiction into which the Lovestone group has now fallen, particularly in the face of the openly chauvinistic turn taken by the Third International. In a pre-convention discussion article printed in the *Workers Age* (August 10, 1935), K. Kalmen writes:

"While our draft resolution correctly attacks the present false position of the C. I. it fails in one respect—namely, in sharply differentiating the present false position of the C.I. from the traditional policies of social democracy. Why is this differentiation essential? If the C.I. is guilty of abandoning communist principles, if the C. I. is guilty of 'social chauvinism', if the C.I. is pursuing a 'lesser evil' policy then both the C.I. and the L.S.I. are guilty of betraying the interests of the international working class and the only correct logical conclusion would be: *'The Second and Third Internationals are dead as instruments for the furthering of world revolution and therefore we must issue the slogan for the building of a new, revolutionary International.'*

"Would it be correct on our part to take this position? Is it correct to classify the present policy of the French and Czechoslovakian parties as 'social chauvinism'? In my opinion it is not only incorrect but also confusing and misleading.

"While the practical results of this policy may lead to the same conclusions as that of the social democratic parties the position of the communist parties still flows from an international orientation, is a result of their devotion to the cause of proletarian solidarity, possibly falsely conceived, but still based on the desire and intention of defending the U.S.S.R., the only fortress of growing socialist construction. The position of the social democratic parties, however, was the result of their leaders' desire to preserve the rule of their own respective bourgeoisie under the cover of vague and meaningless slogans of 'Democracy vs. Teutonian barbarism' or 'Culture vs. Czarism'.

"The same applies to the 'People's Front' slogan of the C.I. . . ."

How fortunate we are that there is someone able to shed so much clarity on the subject. The difference between the socialist chauvinists and the Stalinist chauvinists, "the practical results of [whose] policy may lead to the same conclusions", is that the latter, you see, are animated by . . . good intentions. So are thousands of Fascist workers who join the Nazis in order sincerely to fight big capital, even capitalism, and for socialism. How do Kalmen and other Lovestoneites know that the Stalinists have "good intentions"? He has invented what Lenin, in 1921, declared that the ingenuity of mankind had not yet succeeded in producing: a "sincerometer" which measures the sincerity and intentions

The Press

"OUR STAR-SPANGLED REDS"

UNDER this title, the Tory New York *Herald Tribune* observes editorially (July 29, 1935) on the Seventh Congress of the Third International:

"The Third International was for some years the skeleton in Soviet Russia's diplomatic closet. In theory the fountain head of communist authority and in practice an organ of the government of the Soviet Union, the Comintern passed resolutions periodically, between 1920 and 1928, which made bad faith in foreign relations a moral obligation on the Kremlin. Stalin all but abolished the Comintern in 1928 after the dismal failure of its agents to convert China and other Asiatic nations to communism under Lenin's ruinously expensive 'pot-boiling' program. So, while ardent Reds throughout the world continued to draw moral support from Moscow, the Third International had not in latter years interposed the insuperable obstacle of organized subversion to the Soviet Union's honest negotiation and execution of treaties. But now Moscow is again entertaining a Comintern congress; so what about it?"

"The fact that such a congress sits, together with the news that Mr. William Z. Foster has been telling the assembled delegates how the cause can best be promoted in the United States, is certain to stir old hostile memories and to focus a good deal of American suspicion on this session. The closer that its discussions are studied, however, the less reason does it give even Moscow's inveterate enemies for worry. In contrast to the old Comintern, which was forever declaring holy hates against the non-communist world and exhorting its agents to an unscrupulous offensive, this body seems to be interested solely in defense. The militant missionary spirit is dead. The whole inspiration of present discussion is a panicky fear of Fascist absolutism. Mr. W. Z. Foster would forestall

ANY BOOK

reviewed or advertised

in THE NEW INTERNATIONALAL

or elsewhere

may be secured post-free from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

96 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

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

of persons. Only, Lenin added that such an instrument was not necessary in politics, for the political line was sufficient for a judgment. In the case of the Lovestoneites, their political line having failed to justify their position of "reforming the C.I.," they must now resort to psychology and sincerometers.

the growth of the Fascist spirit in America by tendering an olive sprig, meekly and humbly, to the hitherto contemptible socialists and 'liberals', to the end that an anti-Fascist labor front may be formed in America for purely defensive purposes. Mr. William Pieck, the German communist spokesman, pleads in a keynote speech to the congress for loyal Red support of the 'remnants of democratic freedom'. The great Soviet war machine has this jittery gathering's full authority to go into action abroad (where the Red Army was never to have been used in alliance with the armed minions of a capitalist régime), in defense of any capitalist state that fights Fascism,

however opaque it may be to the Red light.

"Strange as it may seem, the Soviet Union and its communist congregations throughout the world have really allowed Fascism to get as much on their nerves as these Comintern discussions indicate. There has probably never been a time since the Brest-Litovsk peace, therefore, when the poor tattered remnants of democracy in these United States have had less to fear from Union Square's conspiracies. The prospects have never been so fair as they are now, indeed, of catching William Z. Foster in the act of leading a choral rendition of 'The Star-Spangled Banner' at a Bowery recruiting station."

An Announcement from Pioneer Publishers

THE most important writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Mehring, Luxemburg, Plekhanov and other outstanding Marxists, many of them never before issued in English, are now being made available by PIONEER PUBLISHERS.

TEN volumes, each about 400 pages, are scheduled for publication during 1935-1936.

IN order to finance this undertaking as well as others for which plans are now being completed, a special PUBLICATION FUND is being established through the sale of PIONEER PUBLISHERS CERTIFICATES at \$10.00 each.

THE holders of PIONEER CERTIFICATES, in addition to being contributors to this essential work, also have an opportunity to purchase books at low cost. PIONEER publications will be made available to them at a discount of 30%, and the books of all other publishers at 15% discount.

To Be Published During 1935-1936

SELECTED WORKS OF LEON TROTSKY:

1. The 3rd International After Lenin.
2. The Stalin School of Falsification.
3. The Revolution of 1905.
4. The Revolution of 1917.
5. Seven Years of World Politics.
6. Problems of the Chinese Revolution—II.

PIONEER MARXIST LIBRARY:

FRANZ MEHRING:

Selected Writings

GEORGE PLEKHANOV:

Selected Writings

MARXISM AND ART:

A Collection

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

OF V. I. LENIN.

Free A prospectus with complete details will be mailed on request.

A copy of THE WEB OF THOUGHT AND ACTION (\$2.50) by H. Levy (author of *The Universe of Science*) will be sent to every reader of the NEW INTERNATIONAL who mail their subscription by October 1st.

DON'T DELAY — MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION AT ONCE

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

96 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

Enclosed please find \$..... for the PUBLISHING FUND. I understand this entitles me to 30% discount on all Pioneer Publications and 15% on books of other publishers. Send my certificates to:

Name

(please print)

Address

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
96 Fifth Avenue, New York City

For A Stronger Press

READERS of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL will undoubtedly hail the decision to enlarge the *New Militant* to an eight-page weekly. A perfect combination will thereby be available: A monthly review, incomparable in its penetrating Marxian analysis and a weekly organ reflecting the everyday issues of the class struggle. Both will merit your wholehearted support.

MANY comrades and friends make it a point to get THE NEW INTERNATIONAL every month so that they may follow the development of the theoretical position of our movement. Our monthly periodical has already established a considerable popularity for itself among the thinking radical workers in the labor movement, and each month it is read by an increasing number.

OTHERS are just as anxious to follow the development of the daily work of our party, its struggles, its reports of the news, its interpretation of the events of the hour. The *New Militant*, our weekly paper, has already been the means of satisfying this desire.

NOW we can say to all who value the revolutionary message carried forward by our press that the projected expansion and improvement of the weekly organ should more than satisfy even the most exacting and the most critical amongst them. Double space will be available for more news from the field of the class struggle, for news about activities of the trade union militants and for new features as well as for analytical and theoretical articles. The *New Militant* should become doubly effective—in reality a popular paper and yet fundamental in its character.

MANY militants have made generous contributions to help make this expansion possible. The campaign to launch the eight-page weekly is on. Is it possible to enlist the aid of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL readers and thus put the campaign over more speedily? If your answer is in the affirmative, here are three simple suggestions for you to follow.

1. You may make a pledge for a regular monthly contribution toward the eight-page weekly security fund, with the first installment payable when the first issue appears.
2. You may send greetings from yourself and a few friends to appear in the first issue at 25c per name, or more if you wish.
3. You may secure a combination subscription for THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *New Militant* both at the price of \$2.00.
3. You may avail yourself of the joint subscription rate specially arranged for yourself or a friend and obtain a yearly subscription to both publications for \$2.00.

THIS is a special combination offer and the low price remains in effect only until the eight-page weekly *New Militant*

appears. The price will then increase. In other words, it is good still for only a few weeks.

The regular yearly subscription to the *New Militant* is \$1.00.

The regular yearly subscription to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is \$1.50.

Ordered separately they would cost you \$2.50.

Ordered together, under the special joint arrangement, you can get both the *New Militant* and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for \$2.00—a saving of fifty cents—thus guaranteeing yourself the regular receipt of the weekly paper for fifty-two issues and the monthly organ for twelve issues.

Ordered now, you help us to put over the campaign for the eight-page weekly at a low cost and you are already on the subscribers' list when it appears.

To get a completely rounded view of the activity and the opinions of the Workers Party of the United States, you should read both its official publications every week and every month. Whatever other labor periodicals you may read from time to time, these two will prove themselves to be indispensable.

OUR readers and friends can help us by acting immediately. If you are already a subscriber to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, send in \$2.00, get the *New Militant* for a year and have us send THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for a year as a gift to a friend. If you are not a subscriber to either publication, take advantage of the special offer now.

Get on our subscription mailing list beginning with the very next issue by filling out the blank below:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
55 East 11th Street
New York, N. Y.

Enclose please find \$2.00 in payment for one year subscription to both THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *New Militant*.
Send them to

Name

Address

City .. State