

The New _____
INTERNATIONAL

NOVEMBER • 1944

**GERMANY and EUROPEAN
CIVILIZATION**

By J. R. Johnson

Opportunism and Adventurism

THE FRENCH SITUATION TODAY

By A. Arlins

Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma

By Freddie Forest

From the Bureaucratic Jungle

THE SWP CONVENTION

By Max Shachtman

SINGLE COPY 20c

ONE YEAR \$1.50

PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism

By **ERNEST LUND**

*A Popular Presentation of the
Socialist Viewpoint*

- Why There Is an Age of Plenty
- Why There Is Poverty in This Age of Plenty
- Who Controls the Wealth Labor Produces
- Why There Are Rich and Poor
- What an Equitable Society Is
- How It Can Be Achieved
- Socialism as the Hope of Humanity

Ernest Lund has provided, in this pamphlet, an indispensable instrument for revolutionary socialist agitation. Avoiding the use of technical terminology, and confining himself to a simple and forceful exposition of the basic ideas of Marxism, he has written a pamphlet that any worker can read and understand.

Sixty Pages 10 Cents per Copy

Seven Cents per Copy in Bundles of Five or More

Published by the

WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose _____ for _____ copies of PLENTY FOR ALL.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. X

No. 11, Whole No. 92

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Co., 114 West 14th Street, New York, 11, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for five copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c for five and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: **MAX SHACHTMAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes of the Month:

THE PAC AND THE ELECTIONS 355

Articles:

GERMANY AND EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION
By J. R. Johnson..... 357

THE PARTY THAT WON THE VICTORY
By M. S. 362

OPPORTUNISM AND ADVENTURISM
By A. Arlins 365

NEGRO INTELLECTUALS IN DILEMMA
By Freddie Forest 369

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE ARGENTINE
By Peter Smiles 373

KARL MARX ON HERR VOGT—II..... 377

FROM THE BUREAUCRATIC JUNGLE
By Max Shachtman 380

Correspondence:

LETTERS FROM JAMES FARRELL 384

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME X

NOVEMBER, 1944

NUMBER 11

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The PAC and the Elections

The 1944 presidential elections, from the standpoint of bourgeois politics, was no unusual event. It recorded the conflict between two capitalist political parties which exhibit as yet no fundamental differences, although beneath the surface there are reflected divergent tendencies of considerable importance. These tendencies uphold the thesis of the "Europeanization of American politics." That is, the political scene in America begins to reflect more rapidly and sharply the increasing difficulties of bourgeois economy and therefore the growing realization by the bourgeoisie of the true nature of the impending class conflicts. Thus, while the reformist imperialist bourgeoisie, in the broadest sense of the term, still dominates the American scene, opposing tendencies of totalitarianism are becoming stronger, more vocal and organized. On the other side of the fence the working class is also developing a greater class consciousness, although at a considerably slower pace.

The conflicts within the bourgeoisie over the methods to pursue in the conquest of the world, while as yet beclouded and provisional, will clear up within time. The lines will then be more readily discernible, and the divisions which now exist embryonically will be unmistakably marked. They will cross party lines. They may take the form of two realigned bourgeois parties distinctly differing on fundamental questions relating to the future of capitalism. Its concrete manifestations are not decisive.

The 1944 campaign, however, was not yet fought on such a clear basis. On the surface, it was a silly campaign. Roosevelt became the "indispensable" man, the man of experience. The Democratic Party slogan was: Don't change horses in the middle of the stream, which led one wit on the West Coast to make an experiment, successfully concluded, of riding two horses into a stream and then changing steeds without a mishap. On the other hand, the Republican campaign was about the same, but on a somewhat lower order. They wanted a younger man in office, an efficient man, a man who could choose collaborators who would not quarrel publicly with each other. As for the rest of the campaign, it was a verbal contest as to who could better execute similar policies.

While there was no doubt that Roosevelt's campaign was more skillful, that the isolationists and fascist fringe groups hurt the Republican cause, one factor decided the outcome, and from the standpoint of working class politics, this was the paramount feature of the whole election. That one factor

was not only of interest, but of fundamental importance for the whole future of the class development of the American workers. It was the emergence of the CIO's Political Action Committee as an organized force of the labor movement intervening with tremendous power to guarantee the victory of Roosevelt as President for another four years.

What the New Factor Meant

This single new factor is what distinctly marked off the 1944 presidential campaign from previous contests. The CIO's Political Action Committee emerged as a bona fide organization of labor participating in the campaign. Analogies have been made to previous activities of the labor movement in bourgeois parliamentary efforts, but even the best of these (Labor's Non-Partisan Committee) are only analogies. In this campaign, there was truly something new added to labor's rôle. Certainly the policy which dominated the course of the PAC crossed lines with previous policies pursued under Samuel Gompers and William Green. That is why it can be said that the CIO's reasoning approximated that of the AFL: Reward your friends and punish your enemies.

The CIO translated this general concept, under which the AFL never endorsed either party, into the support of the Democratic Party and the machine controlled by Roosevelt. In a few instances it did come out in support of Republican candidates (Oregon). However, in supporting Roosevelt and his machine, the CIO declared that its decision arose from the conviction that Roosevelt was labor's friend, that the Democratic Party represented progress, that the future of labor was integrally bound up with a Roosevelt victory. Conversely, Dewey and the Republican Party represented reaction, and a victory for them meant a defeat for labor. On the basis of this general thesis, the CIO, through the PAC, allied itself with the Democratic Party. In some instances, it actually went into the Democratic organization and either took it over or played an extremely important rôle in its decisions.

The PAC really went into the election campaign in the same manner that precinct, ward and city political machines go to work. It roused the voters, rang doorbells, spent a small fortune for election literature. These were merely the techniques by which it roused the labor vote. Behind the concrete activities, however, lay a power which gave strength to the PAC. That power was the CIO and its many unions, and very often too, AFL unions which joined the campaign for Roosevelt in a united effort with the CIO. In the foregoing respects, then, the PAC went further than the AFL ever did in an election campaign. The AFL never put itself out in the manner of the CIO. While its political "consciousness" was often as acute as that of the CIO, a "consciousness" determined by the bourgeois thinking of the labor bureaucrats, it never believed it to be the duty of labor actually to go into a campaign and fight it out on the same ground with the professional politicians and their organizations. The CIO leaders who organized the forces of the unions and mapped its campaign, did so with great deliberateness and thoroughness and

with a consciousness of purpose already described above as a conviction that a GOP victory meant a defeat for labor.

Reactions to the PAC

Having related what the PAC accomplished in practice for Roosevelt it is necessary to cite one additional feature of its work. The PAC demonstrated the political power of organized labor. It demonstrated its power in support of a bourgeois party and a bourgeois candidate; but it also showed what great potential power labor has in the American political arena. The election was proof that if labor had expended the same energies, forces, money and organization for the building of an independent political party of labor, with a militant working class program and a will to struggle for political power, it could have succeeded. This is the great lesson of the campaign.

But if the working class is not fully cognizant of the meaning of the PAC, which diverted labor's efforts into reactionary channels, if the same labor leaders who organized and directed the campaign remain bogged down by their own political backwardness and bourgeois concepts, the most articulate sections of the American ruling class do understand what a grave potential danger the PAC really is. When the PAC began its campaign, it was not taken very seriously. But once the campaign got going, once the tremendous power of organized labor made itself felt in the most important urban centers and in the crucial states, the politicians of both parties, the more direct leaders of the bourgeoisie and the most important newspapers of the country began a campaign of their own for the scalp of the PAC and its supposedly vulnerable leader, Sidney Hillman.

The drive against the PAC reached its height in the period immediately following the convention of the Democratic Party, after the unsuccessful efforts of the CIO to get Wallace renominated for Vice-President and its subsequent agreement to take Truman. The Republicans thought they could win the election by popularizing the bogey that the CIO ran the Democratic Party. "Clear it with Sidney" wasn't really as funny as the Republicans made it appear. As a matter of fact, the Republicans worried no little about the activities of the PAC. And the Roosevelt machine, while it had succeeded in holding off on the demands of the PAC on Wallace, was smug because it realized fully what a powerful support it had in such a large section of organized labor.

How fearful the American ruling class is about the future of the PAC was amply illustrated by the post-election editorials in the press. Grudgingly they all acknowledged the great power displayed by the PAC. They were compelled to admit that labor was a distinct factor to be reckoned with politically. But above all they exhibited great fear that the election which demonstrated the enormous political power latent in the labor movement may hasten a new party of labor into existence. It went to considerable length to caution labor against such a step, which was described as divisive and against the tradition of the two-party system. Instead it described the broad and democratic character of both capitalist parties, which permitted labor an important place in their ranks. Labor, said these spokesmen for capitalism, should not organize a party of its own but remain in the fold of the Republican and Democratic parties.

This alone should have proved to labor that the next step for it to take was exactly opposite to the advice gratuitously given by the yellow press. Unfortunately, as subsequently transpired, the CIO leaders accommodated themselves to this reactionary advice.

From the point of view of the working class, the activities of the PAC were reactionary. It mobilized the workers, used up their energies and spent their money in the interests of capitalist candidates, representing capitalist parties and programs. Our criticism of the PAC during the campaign was based precisely upon this consideration. The PAC, in its efforts on behalf of Roosevelt, did not advance the interest of the workers, but retarded them by its political program. But that particular stage in the life of the PAC is over for the time being. The important question that remains is: what next? Shall the PAC continue its existence? Shall it continue to pursue the policies it has heretofore? Shall it turn in new directions?

What About the Future?

These questions, which were in the minds of many before the recently held convention of the CIO, are in part answered by the decisions taken there. The CIO has now decided to retain the PAC (the Citizens PAC, too) and to use it in future elections as a pressure group on both capitalist parties. Thus the question of whether the PAC will remain or dissolve has been settled. But the more important question of the future of its work is only partially answered.

It is partially settled because the political situation in the country promises to become very tense. The close of the war will leave an endless number of vital problems unsolved. These problems of bourgeois economy will be of the deepest concern to a working class fully aware of the danger of mass unemployment which will begin with widespread cutbacks resulting from the cancellation of war contracts. It knows from its experience during the war that whatever concessions it receives will come as a result of struggle and the capitalists' fear of the workers' movement. It also knows from its experience with the New Deal that these concessions will not solve anything fundamental. Roosevelt's domestic war program was a heavy blow to labor. Its support to him despite that was based on fear that a Republican victory might bring about a worse situation in the country. Yet there is wide dissatisfaction with Roosevelt and his Administration. So strong is it that had it not been for the PAC and its energetic campaign, there is good reason to believe that Roosevelt would have been beaten.

A post-war period of economic stress and strain will only intensify the latent tendencies within the labor movement for independence from capitalist politics and capitalist political parties. One must not forget that in addition to its other accomplishments for good and bad, the PAC was the greatest single factor hindering the development of labor's political independence and its own party. As a pressure group upon the Republican and Democratic Parties, the PAC will not find easy sailing in the next several years. Despite its firm announcement that it is against a third party and will oppose such a development, the tendencies within the labor movement for independence will gain strength precisely because many workers have learned this lesson from the present campaign: labor has the power, numbers and finances to fight for itself on the political field as an independent force with an independent political party of its own.

The progressives and militants in the labor movement have one great task before them from now on. They must remember that the PAC has already outlived one period. Two roads remain before it despite its decision: it *can* take the road of independent political action, or it can continue the present policy of tying itself to capitalist politics, which in essence means support to the political representatives of the economic rulers whom it fights on the economic field. The militants and

progressives in the labor movement must therefore fight for transforming the PAC from an instrument of the bosses to a political instrument of the working class, i.e., to transform the PAC into a Labor Party.

How can that be done? Well, the PAC is now organized on a union basis and presumably reaches down to the very roots of the labor movement, the local unions. Its clubs can be immediately transformed into Labor Party clubs. It can begin on a city, county and state basis to enter the political struggle against the political machines of the capitalist parties. It can lay the basis for the extension of this political activity on a nation-wide basis. There is no reason at all why,

beginning now, a Labor Party could not become a factor of immeasurable importance in the 1948 presidential election in advancing the true political interests of labor.

Naturally, this would require a struggle against the political philosophy which dominates the present leadership of the PAC and its activities. It would mean a sharp break with capitalist politics and its organizations. But the existence of the PAC and its accomplishments in the recent campaign demonstrate to the hilt that labor has the strength and organization to do the job. The PAC is here to stay. What is necessary is to change its organization form, its outlook and direction.

Germany and European Civilization

The Contributions of the German Proletariat

The crucifixion of Germany proceeds, from without by the armed forces of Anglo-American-Russian imperialism and from within by German capitalism. And even while Germany is being battered to pieces the victorious United Nations are preparing further tortures and spoliation of that unhappy country. As the sponsor of a plan to destroy Germany and reduce it to the level of an agricultural country, Henry Morgenthau has earned himself an infamy which we hope will only increase from generation to generation. His retreat was but temporary. The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate appointed a sub-committee to make a report on international cartels and this committee came to a conclusion indistinguishable from Morgenthau's. How much worse could be done by Attila the Hun or Hitler, his modern counterpart?

Yet the American people, in distinction from their rulers, have changed during the last quarter of a century. In 1917 they chased dachshunds in the streets, refused to listen to the music of Beethoven and Wagner, and were unable to digest frankfurters unless they were called by some other name. Today that hysteria does not exist. It is reasonable to say that if a revolution in Germany were to achieve a spectacular overthrow of Nazi power and particularly of Nazi personnel, then in America at any rate it would be extremely difficult for the ruling class to maintain, far less to stimulate, any excessive hostility to the German people as a whole. On account of this, during the last few months, with a unanimity which could not possibly be spontaneous, the press and all public writers and speakers have been impressing the people with the idea that the German generals and the fascists are now busily engaged in preparing a third world war. Arguments from history and social psychology have faded into the background. The main emphasis is that German industry must be destroyed as the sole means of insuring that international peace which the people demand in return for the sacrifices of the war. Even President Roosevelt, in his pre-election speech to the Foreign Policy Association, found it necessary to disclaim any hostility to the Germans as a people.

Only two currents of thought attempt consistently to preach this primitive doctrine. One bears the name of Vansittart, the English monomaniac, who up to the V-I bombings at least was no influential force in Britain, despite all appearances to the contrary. The other mortal enemy of Germans as Germans is Stalinism. Nowhere among the United Nations is

the propaganda against Germany so thorough, so all-embracing, so many-sided, so contradictory and so brazen as are the productions of the government in the Kremlin and its satellites abroad. To take advantage of a popular uprising in Germany and to insure that it be controlled and suppressed, the Kremlin formed, advertised and today has in reserve the Free German Committee. At the same time, through a pack of journalists with Ilya Ehrenburg at their head, the rulers of Russia vilify the whole German nation. They assert that the masses of the German people have degenerated into Fritzes and Gretchens; label them asses, fools, etc.; and declare publicly that if a proletarian revolution should break out in Germany and the revolutionary workers came to greet the "Red" Army, they would be the first ones to be shot down. But recognizing the dangers of a vacuum and being as unscrupulous as Goebbels himself, they have also embarked on a rewriting of the history of Germany, aiming to prove the imperative necessity for the destruction of what they call "Reactionary Prussianism." This is the title of a pamphlet of 60 pages prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute and recently published in an English translation by the International Publishers of New York. The title page claims that the authors are Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and the book consists of some 89 quotations, most of these from the books of Marx and Engels. These quotations are strung together on the theme of the reactionary characteristics of what is loosely called the Prussian reaction. The history of Germany is traced from the Peasant Revolts in the 16th century to the present day. There is a great parade of historical materialism. But nevertheless from the very beginning we get passages like this: "Had the relation of social forces in Germany been different, had the German people possessed more revolutionary energy and initiative, they might have utilized the defeat of Jena as the starting point of a nation-wide revolutionary movement for the foundation of a united and free Germany. But the German people did not take that road. . . ." (p. 26.) Here, as in other passages, the point is made that the German people, the great masses of the people, have always been helpless before German reaction.

We attempt here a brief outline of what this shamelessly mendacious pamphlet calls "Distinctive Features of the Historical Development of Germany." This has to be done, first of all, to destroy the malicious influence of these and other Stalinist publications. But at the same time we shall attempt

to provide some historical background for understanding the past contributions of Germany to European civilization and the rôle of the German proletariat in modern Europe.

The German Bourgeoisie and European Civilization

Marx and Engels always claimed that the social and political characteristics of modern Germany have their root in the historical circumstances surrounding the Reformation and the Peasant Wars. The British revolution in the 17th Century was able to establish the bourgeoisie without too much cost to the national unity. The French revolution coming a century later cut deeper national divisions than the British. The Russian revolution of the 20th century destroyed the landlords and capitalists of Russia completely. The first German revolution was historically too early. Coming when it did it could only place in power the petty princes and thus establish them as rulers over a divided people without accelerating the development of the country. This has nothing whatsoever to do with lack of initiative or energy on the part of the masses of the German people. The low economic level and the lack of unification were both cause and result of the terrible fate of Germany during the Thirty Years War which ended in 1648 and, according to Engels, "removed Germany from the politically active nations of Europe for two hundred years."

Two hundred years from 1648 brings us to 1848, the year of the first modern revolution in Germany. We do not propose here to make any analysis of the backwardness, the cowardice and the perfidy of the German bourgeoisie during that revolution and since. These characteristics and their causes have been repeatedly analysed by Marxists. We have to point out, however, that the great Marxists always emphasized that the very economic and political backwardness of Germany enabled it to make great contributions to European thought which have passed into the very foundations of European and world civilization. Calvin's doctrines which had played so great a part in the development of capitalism were drawn by Calvin from Luther. Engels has taught us that despite all the victories of British arms over the French, the 18th century was the French century, owing to the development in philosophy and social knowledge and analysis which we know today as the Enlightenment. The pronouncement is all the more valuable, coming from one of the founders of historical materialism with its emphasis on the materialist basis of society. But the ideas of the Enlightenment came from Leibnitz, the German philosopher, whose genius made him the most powerful source of ideas in the philosophy, science and mathematics of his time, and a man whose only peers in European history are Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and Marx.* The next and greatest climax of modern bourgeois thought not only began but was carried to perfection in Germany itself. For Engels the chief glory of Germany was the creation of the classical philosophy. Modern thought came of age with Kant. From the *Critique of Pure Reason* in 1781 through Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, we have the creation and development of that intellectual structure on which modern society still lives whether it knows it or not.

The German Workers and Social Theory

For Marx and Engels philosophy was no avocation of the study but a living contribution to the development of human society. With all their contempt and scorn for the philistinism of the German bourgeois, they were acutely conscious

of what Germany had contributed to European civilization between 1780 and 1830. Without German philosophy no Marxism. The German classical philosophy had not only culminated in the discovery of the dialectic. Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel had posed all questions: the irrationality of the competitive society, the relation of the individual to the community; the rôle of the state. Fichte had written a whole book to prove the necessity of a state-controlled benevolent economy as the only solution to the ills of society. Precisely because they were solving problems in thought and not in material life they penetrated boldly to the extreme possibilities of bourgeois society and (like Ricardo in political economy) their mistakes were the mistakes of genius which could not get out of its bourgeois skin. Marx was speaking the simplest truth when he said that with Hegel philosophy had come to an end. But he went on to say that the German proletariat was the heir to the classical philosophy of Germany, that the truth of philosophy was in the proletariat and the truth of the proletariat was in philosophy. The very feebleness of Germany in practice had created its greatness in theory. Germany, hitherto so great in theory, would now be great in theory and practice. But such a combination of theory and practice could be realized only by the proletariat.

Thus early, in 1848, Marx drew conclusions whose significance as with so much of that early work, can be appreciated only today as bourgeois society goes to its doom. For him the theoretical power of Germany was not a matter of historical record. Not at all. The theoretical gifts of the German people would pass to the German proletariat. Fifty years later Engels in his *Ludwig Feuerbach* confirmed this early judgment.

We do not propose to argue here about the truth or falsity of any or all of these ideas which together form Marx's integrated picture of world development. What we wish to point out first of all is that the doctrine is not only international but, in one sense, peculiarly German. Not since the classical philosophy of Germany has any comprehensive social theory had the success and the influence upon modern thought as the ideas associated with the name of Marx. From at least the time of the publication of *Capital* to the present day, all political and social thought, particularly in Europe, have revolved around the ideas of Marxism. And these ideas were nourished, developed, propagated and defended above all by the German proletariat. Not only the revolutionary movement but modern thought owes the German workers a debt which it can never repay. So far has Marxism penetrated into the thought of the time that today the ideas of hundreds of thousands of intellectuals, who consider themselves anti-Marxists, have validity only to the extent that they have borrowed or unconsciously assimilated the very ideas which they oppose. Let us give only two examples of the inexhaustible vitality of the doctrines for which the modern world owes so much to the proletariat of Germany.

Since Marx's strict economic theory of surplus value was promulgated in the middle of the last century, how many schools of political economy have come and gone? All of them differed on every conceivable point except on the fundamental opposition to Marx's doctrines. Yet with the collapse of capitalist economy in 1929 these learned men suddenly awoke to the fact that their complicated equations, their theory of marginal utility, their elaborate price structures, their speculations as to consumer desires and demands—all had little relation to the harsh realities of capitalist production. Today we have reached the stage where one of the followers of the dominant school of Keynes can write as follows:

*It is not at all accidental that any half-dozen names of the master-minds of Europe would probably contain three Germans.

"The orthodox economists have been much preoccupied with elegant elaborations of minor problems, which distract the attention of their pupils from the uncongenial realities of the modern world, and the development of abstract argument has run far ahead of any possibility of empirical verification." Is it possible to conceive a more elegant admission of the futility and folly that has distinguished the orthodox economists, and all the more effective as it comes from one of the most distinguished practitioners of the art? (Joan Robinson.) "Marx's intellectual tools are far cruder, but his sense of reality is far stronger, and his argument towers above their intricate construction in rough and gloomy grandeur."

James T. Shotwell, Professor of History at Columbia University, Director of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, bourgeois of the bourgeois, writes for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Says he: "H. T. Buckle in the *History of England* (1857) was the first to work out the influences of the material world upon history. . . . Ten years before Buckle published his history, Karl Marx had already formulated the 'materialist conception of history.' In the famous Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1848, the theory was applied to show how the industrial revolution had replaced feudalism with modern conditions. But it had little hold except on socialists, until the third volume of *Das Kapital* was published in 1894, when its importance was borne in upon continental scholars. Since then the controversy has been almost as heated as in the days of the Reformation." For how many decades did the German workers study and defend historical materialism against the organized learning, ignorance and brutality of official German society? The German working class above all must take the credit when Professor Shotwell says that "the whole science of dynamic sociology rests upon the postulate of Marx."

The German Workers and Social Practice

But great as has been the contribution of the German proletariat to modern theory, it is merely the reflection of its far greater contributions to the social life of Europe. Whereas to this day the petty-bourgeois intellectuals are blind to this, as far back as 1848 Marx had forecast not only for theory but for practice the predominant rôle of the German proletariat in the future development of Europe. The March revolution of 1848 had come and gone in Prussia and in an article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* he made an analysis of the relationship of the March attempt to the bourgeois revolutions of England and France.

"The revolutions of 1648 and 1789 were no English and French revolutions, they were revolutions in the European style. They were not the victory of a definite class of society over the old political order; they were the proclamation of the political order for the new European society. The bourgeoisie won in them, but the victory of the bourgeoisie was at the same time the victory of a new social order, the victory of bourgeois property over feudal, of nationalism over provincialism, of competition over the guild, of partition over entailment, of the rule of property of the land over the rule of property through the land, of Enlightenment over superstition, of the family over family names, of industry over heroic sloth, of bourgeois right over medieval privilege. The revolution of 1648 was the victory of the 17th century over the 16th century, the revolution of 1789 was the victory of the 18th century over the 17th century. These revolutions express more the necessities of the world of the time than of the section of the world in which they occurred, England and France.

"Of the Prussian March revolution nothing of all this."

The German bourgeoisie, thus pitilessly exposed a hundred years ago, has been the enemy of civilization in Europe to this very day. Facing the proletarian revolution of Europe in 1848, it hastened to compromise with the German aristocracy and has compromised until it capitulated to a still worse monster, Fascism. It is true that starting late, it was able to utilize the highest developments of modern technology and science in order to build an industry of an organizational and technical competence which before long made it the first in Europe. Doubtless in so doing it was assisted by that training in philosophy which made the Germans, according to Engels, the most theoretical people in Europe. But every stage of industrial progress and development by German capital brought necessarily the development of the German proletariat, a proletariat, which, in theory and organization, showed the old German mastery in a superior form with additional qualities of its own. The bourgeoisie in its fear of this formidable rival was ready to leave the solution of social and political problems in the gauntleted hands of the German Junkers and the German monarchy. Thus it was the Junkers who unified Germany as a result of the French-Prussian War in 1870 and the wars which preceded it. It was this class which organized the modern German state and the modern bureaucracy. It was this class which organized the Germany army, which was as imperative a necessity as was the Navy for Britain. And the Junkers used these opportunities to participate in the industrial development of Germany so that they maintained not only social and political power but had organic ties with the sources of capitalist wealth in Germany. This combination of bourgeoisie, Junkers and monarchy for decades cut a great figure in the world, but except for those who cannot see the world except through bourgeois spectacles, the German workers were as infinitely superior to it in the struggle for social progress as it was in social theory. *Every social and political forward step made in Germany for the past sixty years was the result either of action by the German proletariat or fear of it.* Only hypocrites and criminals can question the fitness of the German proletariat for self-rule.

In 1865 the German working class under the leadership of Lassalle gave Europe its first example of a modern mass political organization of the working class with aims and methods opposed to the theory, aims and methods of the bourgeoisie. In the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871, for the first time in European history, the workers of Germany gave organized resistance to imperialist plunder of a defeated enemy.

From 1889 to 1914 the German Social-Democracy was the cornerstone of the Second International. With all their faults, Kautsky, Bernstein, Bebel, Liebknecht and the leaders of the German-Social Democracy fought the reactionary ideas of the German bourgeoisie and Prussianism on every field, Prussian militarism, the obscurantism and anti-democratic ideas and practices of the Prussian Junkers, the exploitation of the German workers, the imperialist expansion of Germany. To this day, many of the "educated" can see in the German labor movement only an organization of workers to struggle for higher wages. Read their history books and see how superficially they treat what was the most vital and progressive social force in European society. The struggle for collective bargaining, for social legislation, for popular education, for unrestricted parliamentary democracy, for universal suffrage, for freedom of press and assembly, for the right of organization, for religious toleration, for improvement of wages and working conditions—the Social-Democracy of Germany year

after year fought an unceasing battle against the reactionary rulers of Germany. Theirs, too, was the struggle for a European social order. No European working class contributed so conscientiously and wholeheartedly to the spread of democratic and socialist ideas to every corner of the European continent. The Austrian Social-Democracy, the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, the fighters for Polish independence—all sought and were generously given theoretical inspiration and financial and organizational assistance from the German Social-Democracy. Under German guidance the European working class received its first great lessons in the organized opposition to the imperialism of the Great Powers which was to culminate in World War I. It is true that at the critical moment, for historical reasons with which we are all familiar, the German Social-Democracy failed. But when we look back at the history of Europe in the twenty-five years between 1889 and 1914, we can see that no social force exercised so powerful and so beneficent an influence toward what are recognized today as the indispensable basis for civilized life as the German Social-Democracy. Think for a moment of this immense work for democracy and the social development of a great continent and then savor the colossal impertinence of petty scribblers like Samuel Grafton, Edgar Mowrer, and all the other two-by-four liberals who sit at their typewriters and solemnly discuss the pros and cons of a "hard" or a "soft" peace for Germany, pontificate on how the Germans can be "educated" for democracy and even come to the conclusion sometimes that this is possible. We hope that the time will not be far distant when these gentlemen will be called to account.

If the Russian Revolution first broke through the imperialist ring in 1917, it was the German proletariat which followed in 1918 and brought the first imperialist war to a close. Between 1918 and 1933 the organized proletariat of Europe was divided into two groups, one following the Communist International, the other supporting the 2nd International. There can be differences of opinion between Marxists and bourgeois writers as to the historical causes of this division. The fact remains that the German workers in their support of the one and of the other of these two organizations were expressing their opposition to the reaction and the historical bankruptcy of the German bourgeoisie in part and the European bourgeoisie in general. *To prepare for war Hitler had to turn Germany into a vast prison and train a new generation of soldiers.* There can be no more convincing proof of what the German workers' movement represented.

The Responsibility of the World Bourgeoisie

And those who today wish to crucify the German workers, what rôle have they played in this long struggle, which, with all its failures, testifies imperishably to the democratic aspirations and capacities of the German masses? As far back as 1848 Marx had historically catalogued the future course of the existing rulers of Germany. In 1918 the German proletariat failed to achieve the socialist revolution. One of the causes of its failure was the reactionary rôle played by the Entente and the counter-revolutionary use of food and relief made by the American bourgeoisie under the personal supervision of Herbert Hoover. From 1918 to the present day the European bourgeoisie, aided by the American, shared to the full the responsibility for every crime committed by the German bourgeoisie and the German Junkers. They imposed upon the German people the moral responsibility for the war of 1914 to 1918, a responsibility which war-guilt commissions and a vast number of bourgeois historians have systematically proved false. In 1918 Wilson promised the German people

peace on the basis of his 14 points. When they made the revolution and brought the war to an end, most of these points were repudiated by the Treaty of Versailles. In 1923 the French bourgeoisie in pursuit of a fantastic claim for reparations invaded the Ruhr. In 1923 the German state had reached complete bankruptcy and the masses of the German people had risen to the pitch of revolutionary hostility against their rulers. Once more American imperialism intervened, with food and supplies, to head off the revolution and safeguard the interests of the German industrialists and the German Junkers with a long record of opposition to all that the German workers had stood for so long. Already it was perfectly obvious, first of all, that the economy of Europe needed an international regulation and, secondly, that the German economy in particular could no longer function except as an integral part of a European economy. Dawes Plan and Young Plan to squeeze out reparations were the only contribution that the international imperialists could make to the solution of the insoluble contradictions of the German capitalist economy. The peaceful unification of Germany with Austria, passionately desired by both peoples and a necessary and inevitable stage in the development of the European economy and European civilization, was bitterly opposed and actually prevented by French imperialism. The German Social-Democracy (not to mention the German Communist Party) which had borne the burdens and struggles of the day from 1889 to 1914 was never considered by the great powers of Europe and the United States as anything but an enemy. When Hitler came to power in 1933, David Lloyd George, who from 1916 to 1918 had led the crusade against "German militarism," stated openly that there should be no opposition to Hitler because he was the sole barrier between the German people and Communism: these Germans, unlike the Russians, would know how to organize their communism successfully. Hitler, starting from where he did, was allowed to progress unchecked until Munich when he received the congratulations of Roosevelt. The horror they now profess at his crimes and at the martyrdom of Europe cannot wash away the blood from their hands. Since 1933, the German bourgeoisie and the German Junkers, under the leadership of Hitler and the Nazi Party have shown to what savage depths, what abrogation of civilization, European capitalism has had to descend in order to maintain its grip upon the wealth and the people of Europe. Compare this with the record of organized labor in Germany for nearly 100 years.

All those who have directly or indirectly opposed and still oppose the coming to power of the proletariat of Germany are directly responsible for all the crimes into which German Fascism has pushed the German people. We do not minimize those crimes. There is no need to. It was the fundamental postulate of Marx as far back as 1848 that the German proletarian revolution would be not only a German revolution but a revolution for Europe as a whole and mark a decisive stage in world development. As far back as 1919 it was clear that the longer that revolution was delayed the greater would be the misery of the German people and the more abominable the crimes to which the rulers of Germany would be driven. In order to maintain the power, for which they are now historically unsuited, they were compelled to seek to bring the whole of Europe under their reactionary domination. And to prevent all possibility of the victory of the German proletariat the European bourgeoisie acquiesced in all the bravado, the impudence and the cruelty of Hitlerism. The adventure into Spain, the rape of Austria, the annexation of Czechoslovakia, they accepted all. In order to prevent the

German revolution the European bourgeoisie condoned the destruction of all democratic rights in Germany and the persecution of the Jews. Before the actual outbreak of the war every success, diplomatic and material, of Hitler only showed to the imprisoned German proletariat that the rulers of the so-called democracies were in reality in league with Hitler against them. The heroic struggles of the hundreds of thousands who actively resisted Hitler received no gesture, no word of encouragement from them. And even during the course of the war to this very day, never at any time have the ruling classes of Britain, of France, or of the United States shown the slightest inclination to recognize the past history and the potential power of the great masses of the German people for the destruction of those who have so misruled Germany during the last thirty years. Not only is it so for the past period. Now that the ruling classes of Germany have been discredited by their failure in the war, the so-called democracies are preparing to take on themselves the task of the suppression of the German proletariat. By destroying Germany they get rid of a hated economic rival and put an end, as they think, to the perpetual menace of the German revolution. Thus—taking over the tasks of the Fascists, the Allied imperialists will themselves be driven along the same barbarous road as was taken by the past rulers of Germany. What future tortures are in store for Germany and Europe we do not know. But to whatever depths the European people may be driven, the responsibility of the United Nations will become ever more clear and in so doing will light up the funereal rôle that they all have played in the relentless persecution of the German workers who for so many years fought so splendidly to lead Europe along the road of civilization.

The Stalinist Contribution

This colossal crime, the projected murder of a great people, is now being aided and abetted by the Stalinists in the name of Marx and Engels. In 1914 the leaders of the German Social Democracy, in order to cover up their betrayal of the international opposition to war which they had sponsored, gathered up all the quotations of Marx and Engels against the reactionary rôle of Czarist Russia during the preceding century. The reactionary rôle of the German bourgeoisie did not then seem to them of equal importance. Today the Stalinists gather up every statement that Marx and Engels wrote against the German bourgeoisie and seek to use them against what they call Prussian reaction and the centuries-old incapacity of the German people to defeat the conservative classes. Such parallel procedures have parallel causes. From the beginning of their careers to the end, Marx and Engels were the unswerving enemies of Czarism as the greatest supporter of feudal reaction in Eastern and Central Europe. The Czarist régime was the enemy of the independence of Poland and of all the Eastern European states. It lusted after Constantinople and sought unceasingly to gain power in the Balkans. Every revolutionary movement in any part of Europe was its mortal enemy, and it rested neither day nor night in the pursuit of both its imperialist and its counter-revolutionary aims.

What do we see today? The Russian Revolution which had begun as the enemy of every principle for which Russian Czarism stood—this revolution now is so degraded that like Czarism it is the enemy of the independence of Poland, it seeks either to annex or to dominate all countries in Eastern Europe. It seeks its "sphere of influence" in the Balkans and in Persia. It misses no opportunity of maintaining differences with Turkey with its eye on the Dardanelles. Where Czarism

stood as watch-dog over feudal reaction against democracy, today Stalinism stands as watch-dog over capitalist barbarism against socialism. Hence its bitterly unremitting campaign against the German workers as Fritzes and Gretchens, incapable for centuries of defeating German reaction. Nothing said of the German people by the Fascist liars themselves approaches the grossness, the shamelessness and the historical reaction of this interpretation of the history of Germany and the German working people.

They think, these powers, that they will be able to govern Europe, first with armed forces and then with satellites trained like lap-dogs to fetch and carry at the bidding of their masters. They delude themselves. Murder, imprison, corrupt, degrade a continent—that they can do, but only for a time. They cannot enslave it. The people of Europe have passed beyond the stage where they can endure slavery from the hands of any, least of all those who pushed them into the present abyss and then claimed to come as liberators.

Seventy years ago, after the bloody massacre of the Commune, Marx wrote as follows:

"That, after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternize for the common massacre of the proletariat—this unparalleled event does indicate, not, as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of classes and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out into civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national governments are *one* as against the proletariat!" Only a few could see it then; increasing millions are learning the lesson today.

In characterizing the International Workingmen's Association as being but "the international bond between the most advanced working men in the various countries of the civilized world," Marx expressed an unshakable faith. "The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the governments would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labor—the condition of their own parasitical existence."

The European bourgeoisie crushed the First International only to see a Second International rise in its place, rise out of the soil of modern society itself. They corrupted the Second only to see from its ruins rise a Third. To save themselves from what that represented, they had to bring Europe to the edge of destruction. In these ever recurrent, ever more Herculean efforts to free Europe from capitalism, few people have played a greater part than the Germans, from the founding of the Marxian doctrine itself and the organization of the first independent Labor Party to the terrible experiences of the last bitter years. But twelve years of Hitler cannot destroy the German proletariat which concentrates in itself the best achievements of four hundred years of German social development and nearly a hundred years of unremitting struggle in its own name and under its own banner. The German proletariat need not fear. On the day that it rises in its might and reasserts its former power, it will at one stroke tear down the imperialist structure of lies and slander and once more assume its rightful place among the European workers who owe so much to it.

J. R. JOHNSON.

The Party That Won the Victory

Lenin's Contribution to the Revolution

The rise and fall of the Russian Revolution are both linked to the Bolshevik Party.

Since 1917, revolutionary situations have developed in a dozen countries, with all the elements required for a working-class victory present to at least the same degree as in Keren-sky's Russia—all but one: a revolutionary party prepared for just such a situation and capable of utilizing it to the utmost. This difference provides the decisive reason why the revolution triumphed in Russia and was defeated everywhere else. It also provides the basis for explaining the subsequent victory of the counter-revolution in Russia itself. The more generally this fact is acknowledged, the less trouble is usually taken to analyze it.

Political parties as we know them today are a comparatively recent development. They were quite unknown under feudalism. There were *partisans* of this or that group, of this or that idea, but there were no *parties* in the modern sense. That is understandable. Even though the young bourgeoisie created rudimentary political organizations in its struggle against feudalism in some countries, these were not an *indispensable* condition for the victory of the new society and its consolidation.

Two Basically Different Revolutions

The revolution against feudalism and the socialist revolution against capitalism are alike only in that both bring a new class to power and organize a new social system. In every other respect, they are fundamentally different.

The bourgeois revolution takes place with the elements of capitalist economy already developed within, coexisting with and constantly transforming feudalism itself. The revolution consists fundamentally in undoing the feudal shackles on the existing and growing capitalist organisms. Its task is not so much to "establish" capitalist relations as to liberate them for their freest unfoldment.

The proletarian revolution does not find the socialist economic forms or relations at hand. All that dying capitalism provides it with—no trifle, to be sure!—is a tremendous economic machine, the socialization of production, and a modern working class capable of reorganizing society. Socialism itself does not exist; the revolution must first create it, establish it.

The bourgeois revolution need not necessarily be carried out by the bourgeoisie itself, that is, by the bourgeoisie as a class. The bourgeois revolution need not necessarily bring the bourgeoisie to political power. The basic requirements of this revolution are fulfilled when the main feudal shackles upon capitalist economic relations are broken. This can be accomplished by the bourgeoisie. But it can also be accomplished without the bourgeoisie and even against it. It can be carried out by the plebeian masses, with the bourgeoisie taking over power only later on by means of a counter-revolution; or it can be carried out "from above," in the Bismarckian manner, by the aristocracy, by feudal or semi-feudal lords themselves. The bourgeoisie can maintain and consolidate the social system peculiar to it and nevertheless share political power with the outdated classes; it can even be cheated of political power by the latter. What is more, it can maintain itself to its dying day without necessarily destroying *all* "residues" of feudalism; in fact, in vast territories of the world, its continued power is

based precisely upon the *preservation* of pre-capitalist economy. For the bourgeoisie it suffices that its economic system *predominates*.

The proletarian revolution, on the contrary, *cannot* be made by any other class but the proletariat itself, inasmuch as only the proletariat is capable of establishing the socialist society which is the only aim of this revolution. The *first and absolutely indispensable* condition of this revolution is "to make the proletariat the ruling class, to establish democracy." The bourgeoisie, on the basis of already existing capitalist economy, strives for political power. The proletariat, on the other hand, must *first* conquer "its political supremacy *in order*, by degrees, to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie," and *then* organize socialist production. Capitalism, the capitalist state—these are conceivable without the political power of the capitalists. The very beginnings of the transition to socialism, however, are inconceivable without a workers' state, "this meaning the proletariat organized as ruling class."

Consciousness and Revolution

The bourgeois revolution is not (not necessarily) the conscious revolution of a class. It is carried out with a false ideology (or to use the term in its original sense, simply ideology). Its victory over feudalism is assured by its fundamental nature, that is, the predominance of capitalist over feudal property is assured to the former by the "superiority of its productive methods." Capitalist production takes place, grows, goes through crises, declines, as a natural economic movement, regardless of will and in defiance of plan. The economy is automatically renewed (be it on a higher or lower level).

The proletarian revolution, on the contrary, cannot but be a conscious revolution, purposeful, planned, prepared, organized, timed. It does not have the automatic character of the bourgeois revolution. The transitional economy through which the revolution moves to socialism (above all if the revolution is surrounded by a predominantly capitalist world economy) is not automatically assured of a unilateral development to a classless society. Until the "administration of things" can replace the "administration of men," the *socialistic* character of the new economic relations depends entirely on the proletarian character of the state. Whereas capitalist production, based on "private property and competition, have been working out their own destiny," the development of the productive forces in a *socialist* direction, following the proletarian revolution, is "indivisibly bound up with the new state" as repository of the new property relations. "The character of the economy as a whole thus *depends upon* the character of the state power." The movement toward a socialist society can, therefore, take place *only* as a result of *conscious* planning. And inasmuch as a socialist society is based on production for use, planning can only mean plans elaborated by the "users," that is, democratic, socialist planning. Without consciousness and plan, the proletarian revolution is impossible; lacking them, a working class that seizes power will never hold it. Without consciousness and plan, the establishment of socialism is impossible; if socialism is not consciously planned, it will never come. Consciousness and plan imply a *self-active, aware, participating, deciding* proletariat, which implies in turn a dying-out of coercion and bureaucratism.

Consciousness (*socialist* consciousness, that is) does not, however, come unfailingly to every worker at a given age, like hair on the head on a growing baby. Some acquire it early; some acquire it late; others go to their graves without it. The acquisition of a socialist consciousness equals the acquisition of an understanding of the indispensability of joint, deliberate and planned action for the fundamental task of reorganizing society. The ingenuity of man has not produced a vehicle or an instrument for this action that equals the *organized political party*.

The revolutionary proletarian party is the repository of the socialist consciousness of the working class. Composed of the *conscious* workers, the party is a means by which the working class is saved from existing permanently in a bourgeois stupor, from living intellectually from hand to mouth. It is the organized memory of the working class. It not only connects up yesterday with today, but today with tomorrow. In every activity of the working class it keeps before it its historic goal, thus helping to unify these activities, to rid them of distortions, to give them a progressive meaning and a basic purpose.

Lenin's Most Important Contribution

Of all the great contributions made by Lenin, *none* was as vitally important as the theory and practice of the revolutionary working-class political party which he evolved. It is true that the *elements* of Bolshevism-as-a-party (Bolshevism without a party means nothing) are to be found in Marx. But Marx did not, and could not work up these elements into the rounded, systematized, theoretically-motivated and practically-tested whole which they became under Lenin's leadership.

Lenin's whole conception of the party began and ended with the idea of an organization composed, trained and activated in such a way that it could be depended upon to lead the working class to power at the right time as the first step in the socialist reorganization of society. All critics and improvers of Bolshevism, of Lenin's party, who ignore this, are guaranteed to miss the mark.

This conception meant, first of all, a party composed of *politically-educated fighters*, capable of subordinating all other interests and considerations to the cause of the socialist victory. If the party is to be the repository of the socialist consciousness of the working class, it must be made up of men and women whose *action* is based upon *understanding*. They had to understand the nature of the capitalist society whose overthrow they proclaimed; they had to understand the nature of the class that was to overthrow it; they had to understand the means, the strategy and tactics, by which it was to be overthrown.

Lenin's party was the best-educated political organization in the world. The Bolsheviks were intolerant of theoretical sloppiness; toward inattentiveness or neglect of theory, they were absolutely merciless. Lenin's "Without revolutionary theory, no revolutionary practice" was an organic concept with them. The sniggering at "theory" which became current in most other socialist parties of his time was never stylish in Lenin's party.

Lenin was an alert and ubiquitous polemist, and not a mild one. His polemically harsh and even violent language against adversaries used to shock (and still does) the delicate sensibilities of bourgeois and petty bourgeois politicians who considered it perfectly normal, however, to have the ruling class answer their "critics" with police clubs and prison sentences, to say nothing of disposing of "arguments" by slaugh-

tering millions of "opponents" in a war. Lenin's violence in polemic was due to his uncompromising fidelity to the socialist revolution and the policy best calculated to achieve it. He was deadly serious about the revolution. Those whose theories and policies led the workers off the track, reconciled them with their class enemy, frustrated their efforts, had to be challenged with a vigor that matched the peril they represented. He helped train a party which, like himself, was sufficiently confident of the superiority of its program and views to engage anyone in debate without fear of coming off second best. He understood that you often teach more by polemical presentation and criticism than by "straight" exposition—the correctness of your own views standing out more clearly when counterposed to the views of others. He understood that mere reiteration of your own views is not enough to build a firm party. These views must be constantly defended in public (or revised when they cannot be defended!) against all critics—and defended successfully—otherwise your followers either begin to lose faith in your views or else continue to support them out of blind "party patriotism." Lenin, who was a party patriot if there ever was one, had no use at all for this kind of "patriot," any more than he cared for dopes in general. His own words were even blunter: "Whoever takes anything on faith is an idiot who can be disposed of with a wave of the hand." (The epigones of Leninism everywhere do far more, alas, to raise idiots than to raise Bolsheviks.)

Lenin's polemics, like all his writings, were meant to educate the party and the working class, to clarify, enhance and steel their consciousness. He did not *substitute* harsh words for logical substance. (The epigones believe they have destroyed an opponent's argument completely, and revealed themselves as living incarnations of Leninism, when they bark: "You are a prostitute! You are an agent of the bourgeoisie!" and then sit down, exhausted but content and triumphant.) The monger of platitudes, however orotund or shiny, bored Lenin to death; the demagogue, he detested as "the worst enemy of the working class."

A Revolutionary Party of Action

The Bolsheviks built up a revolutionary party of action, not a pleasant company of salon habitués, dilettante socialists, or hair-splitting debaters. Their party was not a debating society, but a fighting army which had bloody battles to engage in and a world-renovating victory to win against the most powerful and deadliest enemy a class ever faced. Add to this the special circumstances of existence under Czarist autocracy and it is easy to understand why the Bolshevik Party was and had to be strictly centralized and disciplined. The right-wing socialists, especially of western Europe, who never envisaged battles or revolution, who looked forward to capitalist society gradually filling up with socialism by painless osmosis, shrank from Lenin's conception of centralism and discipline. The only discipline they wanted enforced was against the "ultra-leftist madmen." But Lenin, who understood to perfection the class enemy, its power, its savage capacity for self-preservation, its desperate unscrupulousness, knew that the revolutionary party challenging the enemy for nothing less than all-power itself would have to be a party of steel, disciplined, tested and re-tested, its ranks and program constantly checked for weakness, its fighting capacity kept at a high pitch.

What other conception of a party can you have *if* it is the socialist revolution you really aim for—a revolution that has not proved to be as easy as rolling off a log? Take, for example, our own Socialist Party in this country. Examine it from this standpoint and see why we cannot take it seriously (as-

suming that anyone else does). Pretty near anybody can be a member (except a real revolutionist—these are expelled). Anybody can put forward pretty near any view he wants to in public (except again, a real revolutionist). The party can adopt one position on a vital question, but the party leader, not caring particularly for this position, can put forward one of his own, even if it is the diametric opposite of his party's official stand. Pretty near any member can act as he pleases in the labor movement, follow whatever policy his heart and mind dictate, whether or not it conflicts violently with the policy followed by his fellow party-member in the same union or even with that officially advocated by his party. His party obligations are microscopic—he can attend meetings or not; if he drops into party headquarters once a month to exchange the time o' day with the other boys, he is not frowned on particularly; if his "party life" takes up two hours a month and the rest of his life is devoted to the bourgeois world, that is not a very black mark against him.

A fine, democratic and ever-so-non-fanatical a party! Of course, it never can and never will carry out the fight for socialism. It can never lead the workers in any serious struggle. In exchange, however, it offers these advantages over Bolshevism: A worker who wants to know, "Where do you, the Socialist Party, which wants to lead me, to have my support, stand on this or that vital question on the class struggle?" can always get his choice of half a dozen answers, each enjoying equal standing and validity, i.e., zero. A worker who wants to join the party need commit himself to nothing more serious than paying his dues, yawning over the pages of the party paper, and voting quadrennially for the party "standard bearer."

Joining the Bolshevik Party meant becoming a soldier in a revolutionary army. It meant discipline and centralization of efforts. It meant the ability to say: My party has this clear-cut policy, that clear-cut program, this answer to this problem; this is what it proposed to do about this situation; this is what it calls upon the people to do in that situation; if you agree with my party, support it, join it. My party means business; it is serious; it doesn't fool around with the interests and struggles of the working class; it calls upon labor to act as one man and it sets an example of how to act like one man.

The Distortion of Lenin's Views

In the last twenty years, there has been so much intellectual devastation in the revolutionary movement that Lenin's views on this point have been twisted and deformed beyond recognition. His insistence on discipline *in action* has been made to read discipline in *thinking*. His abhorrence of a "debating society," which he contrasted to a party capable of discussing policy thoroughly, coming to a decision by majority vote, and then unitedly executing the policy, has been made to read "no debates" in the party. The rich, even tumultuous, intellectual life of the Bolshevik party, for which there is no parallel anywhere; the continuous, passionate—and passionately interesting—and fruitful discussions of basic as well as topical questions which characterized it; the wide freedom of viewpoint which always prevailed in it as a matter of course, and not as a magnanimous bureaucratic dispensation once every two—three—four years, and even the freedom of political groupings and factions—all this has been wiped out by the not very sedulous apes of Leninism and its very opposite consecrated. Leninism, it now seems, boils down to this: We are rough and tough. We are hard people. We spit bullets. Shut up. Stop thinking. End debate—don't even start it. We

know best. Our program is finished, amendments not admitted. Etc., etc. A party built on these "principles of Leninism" will do no more to bring about the socialist revolution than Norman Thomas' *laissez-faire, laissez-aller* party.

With the breaching of the world capitalist front in Russia, we have had, as Trotsky often noted, no lack of revolutionary situations. There has likewise been no lack of revolutionary initiative by the working class, resourcefulness, epic heroism, and repeated demonstrations that it is ready to extirpate the plague consuming civilization. This has showed that capitalism is doomed, inasmuch as it can no longer maintain peace, order and social equilibrium, and that the force called upon to dispatch it is irrepressible. All that has been and still is lacking is . . . a party of the Leninist type, not an artificial copy of the Bolshevik party, but a party of that *type*, built and schooled in the same way.

Having one, the Russian proletariat was able to accomplish more than anyone had a right to expect of the working class of any one country, and of a backward country, to boot. Having lost it, the Russian proletariat lost all its revolutionary achievements. That it lost its party is not due to that mysterious "fundamental defect" in Bolshevism which its critics have yet to explain to us, but to the fact that the working class of the advanced countries failed in time to build parties like it and remained under the domination of the anti-Bolshevik parties of labor.

With this loss, the center of revolutionary gravity has shifted further and further to the West. From Moscow there no longer come the liberating legions of the socialist revolution—as is unbelievably claimed by the self-patented "Trotskyists"—or the liberating ideas of Lenin, but the rolling waves of black reaction. Once, Leninist Russia almost freed the West. Now only the West can free the Russia of Stalin, not the West of today but of tomorrow. Success depends *entirely* upon how well and how soon a party of Bolshevism is built in countries like the United States. We have, it would seem, more time than many others. Every hour of it must be utilized to prepare for the inevitable revolutionary crisis.

The Urgent Task of the Day

If we do not succeed in having, at the crucial moment, the kind of party the Bolsheviks had in Russia in 1917, the absolutely inevitable catastrophe that would befall us all would have long-lasting effects. There is good reason, however, to believe that we shall not fail. The American working class has shown the most encouraging ability to move forward, not at a snail's pace but with leaps and bounds. It has not spoken its last word—only its first. Our bourgeoisie, "the most powerful in the world," has so little confidence in itself that it squealed with terror for months just at the sight of so limited and contradictory a step as the organization of labor into an independent political force in . . . bourgeois politics! How will it feel when labor really declares its political independence as a class?

The difference between how it feels and what it really gets, depends primarily and decisively upon the building of the revolutionary party. We have not been hurled back to the starting point. We have learned what is important to learn from Lenin in the period of the rise of Bolshevism; we have learned what is important from Trotsky, in the period of Bolshevism's crushing by the counterrevolution. The vanguard now knows more and knows it better. It must now clothe the skeleton of its program with the flesh and sinews of tens of thousands of workers who are breaking intellectually from capitalism. That is the task of tasks of the Fourth International today.

M. S.

Opportunism and Adventurism

The October issue of the *Fourth International* prints a report, under the title "The Real Situation in France" ("By Our Paris Correspondent") which deserves the greatest attention in more than one respect.¹ Whoever the author of this report may be—the interests of the movement as a whole do not allow us to pass over in silence the fact that it would be hard to write a skimpier and politically more grievous document than that of the "eye-witness." In the analysis of what the author describes and what he presents as his appraisal or political view of the events, our interest is concentrated upon the two most important points.

The National Question

The first point is the by now fateful "national question." It is no accident that the report on the occurrences in Paris is colored from start to finish by this question, which has impressed its mark upon the entire movement. The only astonishing thing is how unaware the reporter is of it, how incapable he is of coming to grips with it, and how helplessly he confronts the situation as a result of his false position. Nowhere can you find a clearer picture of what it means in practice to approach events without correct theoretical equipment. Nowhere consequently, can you discern more unmistakably the disastrous fault of those (we mean primarily the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party) who so obdurately and maliciously prevented the clarification of the extremely important national question and the problems linked with it. In the more than three years since the emergence of the national question, the SWP leadership has piled confusion upon confusion, and done everything in its power to stay off on the sideline of every event and to absent itself. The failures in this period are having catastrophic repercussions in the International and are crippling the remnants which were sparse enough to begin with. Judged by the results that three years of unified agitational, propagandistic and political work would have yielded without any difficulty, the SWP leadership stands out as exclusively guilty. The false consciousness not only of the International but primarily also of the broad masses, may be traced directly to it. But for its pernicious attitude in the political and theoretical discussion of recent years, the report we are dealing with could scarcely have been written, let alone been accepted uncritically.

The National Question in Practice

It is convenient, cheap and possible for adventurism and pure opportunism alike, to see a "proletarian" revolution break out somewhere or other every week, as do the *Militant* and the *Fourth International*. This commits you to nothing more than a perpetual re-chewing and jumbling up of the same phrases, so that in the end nobody knows where he is at and simply lets the whole thing drop. Thus, the events in Italy, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, France, etc., were greeted and commented on in the same stupid way. The honorable article-writers of the organs named have the task, subsequently, of explaining why the "proletarian" revolution actually wasn't one, or why it finds itself, as a result of the obstreperous facts, in its first, second, third and hurled-back stage, and how it will undoubtedly raise its purely proletarian head

1. The same report, signed Girand, appeared in the supplement of *The Socialist Appeal* (organ of the British section of the Fourth), mid-October, 1944, Vol. 6, No. 7.

again any day now from that point on and achieve victory as surely as the Amen in the church. After having enjoyed this sublime spectacle, bathed in the sauce of the "defense of the Union" and the "United States of Europe," for a good fifteen months, in the case of Italy, for example, its real content may now be tested in the example of France.

For years it has been clear to everybody who was not running around with an extremely thick board in front of his head, that the movement in France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, etc., would group itself around the so-called *national liberation*. Only the S.W.P. leadership has ventured to continue quibbling around about a situation which even comrade Daniel Logan describes as follows in the *Fourth International*:

Undoubtedly the Parisian workers carried along with them large strata of the petty bourgeoisie, not only its lower ranks, but also civil servants, students, sons and daughters of bourgeois families. The insurrection, the immediate objective of which was the overthrowing of the German yoke, thus took a "popular" and "unanimous" aspect. With its democratic and patriotic illusions, the atmosphere was somewhat reminiscent of that of the nineteenth century revolutions.

The correspondent from France, too, arrives at the same statements of facts:

The general slogan was the purely nationalist one: "Out with the Boche"; and the general [!] idea in the minds of the insurrectionists who fought and died on the barricades was that the sole purpose of the uprising was the ejection of the Germans from the city.... The actual street fighting was done largely by the FFI (FTP and others) in the city itself, aided on the barricades by elements of the petty bourgeoisie (the local shopkeepers, functionaries, housewives, etc.) and workers in the proletarian districts (XIth, XIVth and other districts).²

All the complaints, lamentations, airy constructions (and above all the meditations on the "purely" proletarian slogans and tactics of the Fourth, as they appear in the heads of the S.W.P. leaders) thus had no effect whatsoever upon the fact that the entire movement was forced to orient itself on the national question, to pass, as it were through the national movement and to take on the character of a people's movement for the elimination of the obstacle that was decisive for the time being. Theoretical understanding, in so far as it really aimed at advancing the labor movement and the Fourth, should have concluded from the very outset that under the given conditions there is no other means of standing the beaten labor movement on its own feet again. It should have been recognized that it was precisely the broad working masses and the oppressed strata in the first place who would necessarily be interested in national liberation, if indeed they were ever to gain the ability to express their desires and their hopes. The broader the mass movement, the better the situation for the labor movement and the Fourth itself, for it would then be all the easier to outgrow the control and the influence of the bourgeoisie and to fling aside its agents. The same theoretical understanding that recognized all this would naturally have to start from the simple fact that the elimination of national oppression, the expulsion of the foreign conqueror, was in itself a primary democratic demand, a necessary step under all circumstances, a goal that required realization in every case. If this goal could not be achieved, it is precisely the labor movement that would be unable to take a single real

2. In this curiously vague report, the question arises: Where were the workers, especially of the XIXth and XXth districts?

step forward. Still more: the expulsion of the German oppressor was the indispensable premise for the inauguration of a movement inside Germany, for a decisive weakening of Fascism, for a heavy blow against the German and Allied bourgeoisie.

An Example of Practical Propaganda

A Fourth International capable of doing more than covering heaps of paper with evidence of its incompetence and with patent nonsense, would therefore have promptly taken the leadership of the movement and conducted its propaganda somewhat as follows:

"German soldiers! We have no intention of tolerating German oppression on top of oppression at the hands of our own bourgeoisie. We have the burning desire to settle accounts with our own bourgeoisie and to run them out, but the German military machine stands in our way. You, German soldiers, are allowing yourselves to be placed by your bourgeoisie between us and our bourgeoisie—this obstacle we must remove, no matter what the cost. We say to you that we are fighting for a democratic aim when we come out for our national independence. We would continue the most unrelenting struggle for the principle of the right of self-determination of all nations at the very moment when we would get back the oppression of our own bourgeoisie. If you wish, we will press this principle to its very limit and to the point of paradox, by saying: It is a democratic right to be oppressed by one's own bourgeoisie and to shake off foreign oppression, for oppression at home is an internal affair which we must settle ourselves and which is no business of yours. Only when foreign powers hinder the settlement of our internal affairs do you have the duty to rush to our aid and to defend our democratic rights. That is the only possible 'just' war. In any case, we consider your expulsion to be the pre-condition of the settlement of our internal affairs: we shall support any and every endeavor, *even of our own bourgeoisie*, in so far as it *amounts in practice to actual emancipation from your yoke*. It goes without saying that we know what to think of our own bourgeoisie and we have our own view of the seriousness of its will in this fight. It is all a practical and not a theoretical question—what is important to us is the action and not the words. So, wherever the struggle for liberation actually flares up, we shall march in the forefront. Following the democratic rules, every stratum of society conducts the propaganda that corresponds to it, and each seeks to attain a majority in the competition of propaganda, otherwise it would be senseless to talk about 'united action.' So long as it is a question of an immediate goal, of a necessary partial advance, an act of commonly possible defense, etc., a 'united front' of the most variegated strata or classes is possible. The more elementally necessary the goal, the broader the front—that is the rule.³ Perhaps you are real opponents of democratic principles and do not share our views. In so far as you impose your views and your system upon us by force of arms, we shall battle against you with force of arms for life or death. We call upon you to come over to us and to join us against the common oppressor, for it is the greatest disaster for the oppressed masses to continue letting their bourgeoisie bait them against each other. In every country, there are even corrupted, bedraggled, backward strata of workers who fight for the interests of the ruling class in case of a civil war and who stab their class comrades in the back. Should you act in the same way, we shall crush you according to the laws of civil war wherever we lay hands on you. At the same time we tell you what you may expect from us once we

have driven you out and regained our freedom. We tell it to you now, loud and clear, so that the whole world can keep us to our word: We shall fight with all the means at our disposal against anybody violating your national independence and your democratic right to self-determination. History takes its implacable course and you will learn. We for our part do not believe we can improve anything if we allow ourselves to be misused the same way as you yourselves. Our aim, to be sure, is the United Socialist States of Europe and of the World.⁴ However, it is up to you yourselves to decide upon joining this union—we haven't the slightest idea of forcing you to do so."

The National Question and Its Practical Consequences

This is naturally only a tiny clipping from the agitational and propaganda work that a competent organization would accomplish. What is saddening about the present situation is the fact that it is still necessary to explain to "Marxists-Leninists," by means of examples, what it is all about. "Our" Paris correspondent, who described for us "the *general idea* in the minds of the insurrectionists *who fought and died on the barricades*," adds, with regard to the patriotic atmosphere: "In fact, the French Communist party...deliberately fostered this mood." Unfortunately, he does not spend a single word on telling us how our French section conducted *its* propaganda. In exchange, he gives us examples of how, for lack of theoretical understanding and correct analysis, the finest situation can be passed up:

The workers of the banlieue [suburbs] of the big factories, Renault, Citroen, SNAC, Gnome et Rhone, etc., did not in general [!] descend into Paris. They intervened in quite another way. They occupied the factories, arrested or forced the arrest of the collaborating directing factory personnel and in the most advanced cases prepared [prepared! Let us take note of this word!] the given factory to start production again under their control.

In most [!] factories the initiative was taken by Communist Party factory militants, and the Trotskyists. For example, at one [at one!] factory employing over 1,000 workers, about fifteen workers assembled at the plant. Among these were some ten CP members and supporters and two or three Trotskyists. These fifteen occupied the deserted factory [it certainly was a great exploit and an intervention in "quite another way" to occupy the "deserted" factory while the others "fought and died on the barricades"!], sent messages to call the workers to a factory meeting in order to elect a workers' committee. [So these workers were sitting at home during the struggle, waiting for the "call"!] A "Commission d'Épuration" (Purging Committee) was set up to "try" all the collaborating managing personnel [to "try" this personnel was, it seems, again "quite another way" to participate in the patriotic atmosphere!], directors, managers, etc. Supply committees were likewise elected to take over the factory canteen.

And the "general" result of these daring undertakings? Ah, the general result is good, from one factory to the other:

"The workers' committees appointed new directors, foremen, technicians, etc., to work under their control and prepare [prepare!] the factories for the resumption of production; and they sent delegates to de Gaulle's Ministry of Production, Ministry of Labor, etc., asking permission to start work and laying out detailed plans. They were told that it was impossible to start production as there was no power for the machines. The government, they were

3. We have inserted the remarks about the united front and united action here in order to titillate certain "theoreticians" who have discovered in our attitude toward the national question nothing more and nothing less than a "People's Front policy." These super-wise-aces, who freely give instructions in the ABC of Marxism, actually have no idea of what the ABC of Marxism consists. We will therefore enlighten them on the "People's Front" in a subsequent article.

4. But, it should be added: We are not SWP theoreticians and we do not write about the "reactionary boundaries" of the national states when the bourgeoisie is destroying them for reactionary reasons and in the interests of preserving its rule. It is independent and free "states," and not enslaved peoples, who enter voluntarily into a union.

told, would appoint administrator-delegates to take over the factories whose directors had been arrested. In the meanwhile, nothing was to be done.

We call the reader's express attention to the fact that Frank Lawrence devoted no less than three special articles to this report on "The Real Situation in France" in the *Militant*, and carefully deleted the sentences in the above paragraph which we have put in italics. The "real" situation, which he otherwise accomplishes with Hurray, must have appeared sort of dubious to him at this point. "Revolutionary workers took lead in Paris Insurrection," he exclaims rashly. But for a man like him: who (as we have said) shakes a "proletarian revolution" out of his sleeve every week, it must nevertheless be painful that the terribly revolutionary workers first "prepare" production, then ask the government for "permission to start work," and are forced to acknowledge at the end: "In the meanwhile, *nothing was to be done.*" That, dear comrade Lawrence, is what comes of being so proud that Trotskyists occupy "deserted" factories, restrain workers from the tasks that correspond to the situation (instead of guiding them correctly) and thereby prove themselves conspicuously backward.

To be sure: anyone who is as "radical" as an SWP theoretician must necessarily be a full-grown opportunist in practice and shrink from the consequences of the national question. God gave him a post so as to deprive him of political understanding which would have enabled him to make an analysis of the situation as a whole and led him to perceive that: with our propaganda and our program at our back, the movement may take on as "national" an appearance as it will. As soon as it has reached its goal, it will disclose its class character and *automatically* (for that is the secret of the *situation as a whole*) move beyond itself. It is necessary to estimate the movement, to utilize the situation intelligently, and to direct the workers where the revolutionary consequences of the movement must stand revealed. We must not occupy "deserted" factories, but seek in living struggles to take over the leadership and lay hands on the real weapons which decide the question of power.

"Dual Power" as the Result of the National Movement

"Our" Paris correspondent and comrade, Lawrence, show us the best way of not understanding anything whatsoever:

The FTP and [!] workers had to arm themselves mostly from arms captured or stolen from the Germans. Secondly, the Stalinists urged the workers to leave the factories and join the Maquis, where invariably the workers were integrated under the leadership and control of ex-officer cadres.

Although the armed workers had all the less need to listen to the advice of the Stalinists (and in case of need had nothing to fear from the ex-officer cadres, once arms were in their hands) the better they were taught by the Trotskyists, "our" correspondent got scared to death at the mere word "ex-officer" and proclaimed triumphantly:

The Trotskyists, on the other hand, urged the workers to stick to their factories [which was a shameful thing to do to the workers fighting on the barricades] which were their stronghold and not to allow themselves to be dispersed and thus lose their class coherence.

"Our" Correspondent must be, it might well be said, in damned great need of "class coherence" if he has it in the factories (where meanwhile "nothing was to be done") and loses it the very minute he finds himself among the same fighting workers on the barricades. In return, we now hear phrases about "own class organs" and see "our" policy in all its pitifulness:

Thus, although the Paris insurrection took place under nationalist, "classless," slogans [in passing, a proof of the great influ-

ence of "our" correspondent!] and although all tendencies in the Resistance Movement, from ultra-reactionary royalists to the Communist Party, tried to give it a national and classless character, from the very beginning the working class, basing itself on the factories [further above, however, "our" correspondent reported that "the" working class, in the persons of the workers of the XIth, XIVth and "other" districts did "the actual street fighting" and therewith were on the barricades "from the very beginning"] spontaneously threw up its own class organs—factory committees, factory militias, etc.—and began to put forward class demands, thus creating the elements of dual power.

Thus "creating" the "elements" of dual power! The only trouble is that the "real" dual power in the "real" situation in France lay elsewhere:

In the districts (*arrondissements*) of Paris, a form of dual power as between the Resistance forces (mostly Stalinist FTP) and the de Gaulle authorities exists [exists!]. During the fighting, detachments of the FFI, FTP, etc., took the local town halls by storm and once the Germans were ejected, contrived to occupy them and to assure the municipal services. At the same time, housewives' committees sprang up to control the food rationing.

Thus, "our" correspondent clings to the factories and is creating "elements," while the fighting workers are *establishing* the dual power. He does this because he does not want to go along with the "purely" national liberation, may it have ever so much the peculiarity of leading to *genuine* power. Unfortunately, this is not the way to reinforce the *existing* dual power. Less so is it the way for the Fourth to win influence, to bring the masses on to the right political path, and to take over the leadership in the struggle against the assaults of reaction upon the dual power. The report says:

Undoubtedly the French Communist Party had a decisive influence on Paris and on the course of the insurrection. ... If [!] it had pursued a policy of "Build soviets everywhere" and actively pushed the workers' committees, etc., and called upon the workers to build up their committees as the basis of workers' power as an alternative to the Provisional Government, the insurrection would have very quickly developed into a workers' revolution. In fact, all the necessary conditions for a revolutionary situation existed, except for the presence of a sufficiently strong revolutionary party.

The CP, by its very nature, and the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy, *could not but play* an altogether different, counter-revolutionary rôle.

The existence of a sufficiently strong revolutionary party is rightly counted here among the necessary conditions of a revolutionary situation.⁵ Should such a party be lacking, the problem is to create it in the course of the events or else to perish. There is no point in philosophizing on what would have happened "if" the Communist Party, etc. We have seen, in any case, that the *intentions* of the Communist leadership and the *mass movement* are two different things and that they produced, in the political reality, the phenomenon of the *existing* dual power. The task, therefore, was to find a basis in the objective dialectic of the situation and the events, to separate the masses from the Communist leadership through the sweep of the movement, and to create the broadest foundation for the genuine dual power. To achieve this, however, the masses should have been summoned and accompanied to the "town halls" which were stormed. The report shows clearly that the dual power in the town halls, in spite of the Communist party, is the main target of the assault of the reaction:

5. Comrade Frank Lawrence, in his three articles, does not concern himself with the problem of the *existing* "dual power" either. This time he too is forced to acknowledge what we sought in vain to prepare the SWP leadership for: "... the uprising was a genuinely popular revolt in which various class forces participated." For that, he pursues his playing at revolution all the more zealously, unconcernedly ignores the necessary conditions, and proclaims: "The second (!) stage of the revolution which erupted (in Frank's head!) last August is now opening." As we learn from him, *The Militant* has "presented in previous issues" this estimate of the French situation. Who can still marvel at the blithe optimism of *The Militant*?

It is very nice to see the counterrevolutionary interests of the Soviet bureaucracy unambiguously nailed fast in the *Militant*. But once again, it is unfortunately not a matter of the Communist party but of the mass movement and the objective logic of things which made it possible to discredit the Communist party before the masses. The report confirms this immediately:

By pursuing a "Popular Front," national unity policy, and calling for a purely "national" insurrection, by exciting to the highest pitch the nationalist and chauvinist sentiments of the masses, it [the CP] confused the class issues in the minds of the workers. It now finds itself on the horns of this dilemma: It is faced with an offensive by the reaction to liquidate—"legally" and peacefully if possible—the duality of power, and it is equally afraid of leaning on the support of the masses.

Now instead of mobilizing all forces for the defense of the "duality of power" and to squash the CP with its dilemma in struggle against the reaction, the correspondent unfolds "his" program:

The Trotskyist organization, on the other hand, calls for strengthening of the workers' committees in the factories and their coordination on first a local and then a regional and national plane. It points out that the only way of legalizing [!] the power of the municipal councils is to base them on the "district committees," on the housewives' and factory committees, through democratic elections, thus confirming them as the real expression of the will of the masses. It is because these demands correspond to the needs of the situation and the real interests of the masses that they are being followed even by rank and file members of the CP in the factories. In several big factories of the Paris region, the initiative in occupying the factories and forming the workers' committees was taken by the Trotskyists who received the support of the CP militants. *In such fluid conditions as existed in Paris, it has been shown by the experience of the French Trotskyists that a small body with a correct orientation [presumably in a deserted factory where meanwhile nothing is to be done!] can definitely contribute to the development of the situation.*

In the interest of the cause we wish to make this prediction here: If the report really reflects the policy of our French friends and their views, they are on the best road to committing political suicide. We say this in the first place to the SWP leadership and we shall remind them of our prediction later. In actuality, the simplest problems still remain unsolved, and the national question is far indeed from vanishing from the scene. This has become clearest in Belgium, where, with reference to the interventions of the Allies, the positively classic phrase has been uttered: We took up arms against the Germans—we can do it again!

Meanwhile, our friends seem determined, according to the report, to add physical suicide to political. This appears from a passage which constitutes the second point in the report of interest to us. This point may be called:

The "Legalized" and "Democratic" Selection of Your Own Butcher

In the "Conclusions," the correspondent comes to the "problem that poses itself in France." The "problem" is a simple question with him, which we put to ourselves, too, after reading the report: "Who will triumph?" After having reflected on a few more things, and then recognized the struggle for all democratic liberties at least correctly (even if without indicating the "how") as being "in France today of paramount importance," the correspondent still does not seem to feel just right about his many factory committees. Suddenly disturbed by the gloomy presentiment that the struggle for democratic liberties is after all also a *practical* question, he writes a postscript at the end of his report. Comrade Frank Lawrence, in his three articles, again deemed it wise not to quote this postscript. However, we cannot make him a present of it, for as a

practical conclusion it is a declaration of bankruptcy and of "paramount importance":

If in Britain the question for the coming period is "Labor to Power," then in France one might similarly say: "Thorez to Power," and let the masses in each case learn from their own experience.

To present the slogans "Labor to Power" and "Thorez to Power" as "similar" and to help raise Thorez to power, is positively the pinnacle of opportunistic, thoroughly irresponsible adventurism. First, they have a "correct orientation," then they contribute "definitely to the development of the situation," talk down to the masses pedantically according to all the rules of political ultra-leftist sectarianism, and then speak up in a decisive question in exactly the same way as someone who in his innocence has nothing whatsoever to say: "Let the masses in each case learn from their own experience."

The masses, however, learn from their own experience only if they are enlightened at the same time by the revolutionary organization on the meaning of the events. Secondly, the *necessity* of this experience in the situation as a whole must be motivated, i.e., it must be *an inevitable and historically still possible experience*. While in England the slogan "Labor to Power" as the next stage after the fall of the Churchill régime is obvious, and *has not the slightest thing to do with the rule of the GPU in England*, the question in France is the direct reverse. The secret of the situation as a whole, which the SWP has passed by in absolute blindness for three and a half years, consists, among other things, in the fact that the national movement in France has already *exhausted* the inherently limited experience with Stalinism.⁶ The development is now moving more every day in the direction of the accentuation of the antagonism between the French bourgeoisie, the Allies (the continuation of the national question in modified form) and Stalin. In such a situation, which brings Stalinism, in the national question, too, into direct opposition to the interests of the masses and robs it of all possibilities, the French Communist party can become only what Jacques Doriot once tried to make of it: its paid agents, its unemployed, its petty bourgeois and slum-proletarian support (it was infinitely richer in these elements as far back as 1936 than certain "analysts" know), and the rest of its hireling crew will supply the armed storm-troops of the Bonapartist-Fascist reaction and bloodily crush the masses in the name of the Stalin-de Gaulle alliance or other combinations. The abstract formulation of the correspondent can even be accepted, when he answers the question "Who will triumph?" in these words:

Will it be the workers and peasants through the development of their own class organs, workers' committees, peasants' commit-

6. Frank Lawrence himself knows this and quotes Jacques Duclos, who unfolded the "program" of the CP, whose secretary he is, to the correspondent of the *London Evening Standard* on September 15:

"French capitalists are 'idiots' if they are afraid of Communism. We are not even interested in the question of a forty-hour week. As far as we are concerned, the workers (the very language shows the manner in which this swine of a "communist" simply disposes of "the workers") will work sixty hours weekly if it is necessary for the rehabilitation of France." Duclos disposes of the French colonial peoples no less "communistically": "The natives in the majority of these colonies are backward people" (whereas Duclos is in addition a common criminal) "and it is France's responsibility to give them a helping hand." And then says this "communist," who helps hang the colonial peoples again with his helping hand, with regard to the Stalinists in Indo-China, "they would not be opposed to French troops fighting to regain it for France."—Is it still necessary to emphasize that this program already gives more than can be obtained from all the "experience of the masses" that our correspondent has in mind? Frank Lawrence simply commits a political crime when, on the one hand, he stigmatizes the *exclusively counter-revolutionary possibilities* of Stalinism in France, and on the other hand, passes over the disastrous slogan of his correspondent in diplomatic silence. Such a thing is possible only with people who settle their political problems and discussions (as at their last "convention") with brutality and the "iron hand of discipline," which is Father Stalin's special stock-in-trade.

tees, etc.—into a Soviet government—or will it be the bourgeois reaction in the form of a military Bonapartist dictatorship? There is no middle road possible.

There is no middle road possible, and yet the absurd contradiction does not lie primarily in what the correspondent continues to say:

A Constituent Assembly might be elected, but the internal contradictions and antagonisms in France are too acute to permit of France going through a more or less lengthy period of parliamentary democracy. Even before the elections for a Constituent Assembly can be held, it is quite possible that the contradictions will have developed to a stage that makes the holding of "free" elections impossible.

The thing becomes absurd only when the correspondent seeks to issue the slogan "Thorez to Power" in such a sharpened situation, and does not know *that its realization signifies the rule of the GPU in France*. As to the political program of the French section of the Fourth, the report does not whisper a single word. The vastly important question of foreign policy in the form of the French colonial question seems to have been "dealt with" only by Jacques Duclos. Evidently, they think they have plucked the stars out of the sky when they talk about "own class organs," of A-committees, B-committees, C-committees, "Soviet government" and similar window displays. But you don't show the remotest feeling that the problem now boils down in *practice*, in this accentuated situation, to counterposing the masses to the program of the Stalinist-bourgeois reaction, and to preventing the adventure with Thorez at any cost. *Mutatis mutandis*, things stand today in France the way they did in Germany twelve years ago.

There we had a "communist" party whose leaders, in the interests of Stalin, contemplated handing the German masses over to the hangman Hitler. These rascals in the leadership boasted loud and long, and lulled the masses with the assurance: "Just let Hitler come to power. He won't keep it for as much as four weeks and then—then it will be *our* turn." And it was "our" turn indeed! Namely, in the concentration camps, on the scaffold, in the prisons, in the mass graves of the battlefields of the second world war!

We can only warn most emphatically against a repetition of the German adventure in France, where Hitler's rôle has shifted directly to Stalin's agents. "Thorez in Power" would be the most grewsome and bloody reaction France has ever seen. If a slogan crops up along this line, what must be done is precisely what the German "communist" leaders prevented in the case of Hitler: Battle against the Thorez-Stalin system to the victorious end! Woe to the masses if, *on the counsel of the "Trotskyists,"* they go through their allegedly "own experience" with Thorez, which will only be the experience of their incompetent counsellors. They, along with the Trotskyists, will have to pay dearly for it, all too dearly. In all seriousness: we most cordially hope that the French masses will send such schoolmasters packing to the devil himself, and never allow them to gain influence over themselves. May they cry out. Draw back, and hold still in your wretched impotence, but do not suggest to us in the name of a great man and a great goal that we fling ourselves into the arms of our own butcher!

A. ARLINS.

Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma

Myrdal's Study of a Crucial Problem

Over four years were needed to complete this study.* It is a product not only of the Swedish scholar, Gunnar Myrdal, and his two associates, Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose, but of some seventy-five intellectuals, both white and Negro, who gave full or part time to the gathering and analysis of data. Some of these supplementary studies were elaborated and published separately. The outstanding of these are: *The Negro's Share*, by Richard Sterner, *Patterns of Negro Segregation*, by Charles S. Johnson, and *Organized Labor and the Negro*, by Herbert R. Northrup. Other manuscripts prepared for the larger study have remained unpublished, but have been placed on file at the Schomburg Collection, where they are available to the public. Even without these more detailed studies of separate aspects of the Negro problem, the Myrdal work comprises the most comprehensive thus far produced on the subject, and makes it possible to clear our shelves of many of the earlier volumes on this topic. This assertion, which has been made by the Negro intellectuals in their reviews of *An American Dilemma*, is not, however, repeated by the present reviewer as unqualified praise of the book. On the contrary, that this work makes such a clearing possible is only further testimony as to the paucity of adequate books on the subject. There is not a single outstanding work dealing with the Negro problem "in general," although there are good studies of specific facets of the Negro problem. In the present research we get an over-all view of the entire field.

However, in some instances, as on the Reconstruction period, it is a retrogression. I speak of retrogression because, whereas Myrdal states that no comprehensive scientific study of the Reconstruction period has yet been written by American historians, and urges that such a study be made, he is not helping the case along by more or less dismissing the Negro studies of the Reconstruction period as mere counter-balances to the prejudiced reports by the whites. W. E. B. Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction*, which is a first-class piece of research and analysis in a field barely touched by our venerable white historians, can in no way be dismissed so cavalierly.

One of the most serious shortcomings of the Myrdal book arises from the fact that in those cases where no study of a field had ever before been made, as on the Negro rôle in the Populist movement in the South, those unexplored fields are not only further neglected but are ignored. At the very height of the prejudice-ridden post-Reconstruction period, when the South was supposedly solidly white in thought and action, the Populist movement that was sweeping the country found its most radical expression in the South. The National Colored Farmers' Alliance alone numbered one and one-quarter million members and, although separately organized from the white agrarians, waged their class battles as one. It was a power to be reckoned with both in state and national politics, and was instrumental in the elections of Populist governors as well as national and state representatives. There have not been many Negro organizations with so large a membership. Any "social scientists" seriously studying the Negro problem, as Mr. Myrdal surely did, could not have escaped becoming in-

**An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. By Gunnar Myrdal, with the assistance of Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose. Harper & Bros., 1944; 2 volumes, 1,483 pages, \$7.50.

terested in and probing to the end this outstanding example of class solidarity across racial lines. However, Prof. Myrdal seems to be ignorant of this movement. In a bibliography of thirty-five pages, no reference is made even to such popular works as the scholarly and sympathetic study, *Tom Watson, Agrarian Rebel*, by C. Van Woodward, or the scholarly but prejudiced study, *The Populist Movement in Georgia*, by A. M. Arnett. The bibliography does include John D. Hicks' standard *The Populist Revolt*, which contains one reference to the Negro Farmers' Alliance. If that left any impression on Mr. Myrdal, however, it was insufficient to induce him to pursue the study of this phenomenon through primary sources.

This failure must be analyzed. It was surely not due to lack of money or unavailability of scholars to undertake such a study, if an awareness of the need for such research had been felt. Mr. Myrdal neither searched this field nor even indicated that it should be searched because his outlook could not encompass the possibility of such a movement. Mr. Myrdal emphatically rejects the Marxian concept of the class struggle. He writes:

Our hypothesis is that a society where there are broad social classes and, in addition, more minute distinctions and splits in the lower strata, the *lower class groups will to a great extent take care of keeping each other subdued*, thus relieving, to that extent, the higher classes of this otherwise painful task necessary to the monopolization of the power and the advantages. (Page 68.)

Clearly, this means that Mr. Myrdal thinks that the white and Negro masses, rather than turn against their common oppressor, will fight each other. "The Marxian scheme," he argues further, "assumes that there is an actual solidarity between the several lower class groups against the higher classes, or, in any case, a potential solidarity which as a matter of natural development is bound to emerge." (Page 68.)

Mr. Myrdal maintains that that "scheme" has influenced Negro intellectuals, and has thus evidently blurred *their* vision. As an example of this he calls attention to Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction*, where it is stated:

The South after the [Civil] war presented the greatest opportunity for a real national labor movement which the nation ever saw or is likely to see for many decades.

Mr. Du Bois is wrong. No such possibility existed then for the simple reason that the industrial development in the South was of insufficient scope to allow the proletariat in heavy industry to become the leading social force and act as a bridge for the whole area with the more developed industrial North. Mr. Myrdal, however, is entirely wrong when he attributes the failure of a national labor movement to have arisen then to racial differences.

From our point of view [he writes] such a possibility did not exist at all and the negative outcome was neither an accident nor a result of simple deception or delusion. These two groups, illiterate and insecure in an impoverished South, placed in an intensified competition with each other, lacking every trace of primary solidarity, marked off from each other by color and tradition could not possibly clasp hands. (Page 69.)

The fact, however, is that the "negative outcome," that is, the first appearance of the Solid South, was shattered but a few years after it was instituted due to the onslaught of the Southern agrarian movement in which white and black fought together against the planter-merchant-railroad vested interests. In the previously cited work on Tom Watson, Mr. Van Woodward traces this period of white and black unity, and comments: "Never before or since have the two races in the South come so close together as they did during the Populist struggles." Yet Mr. Myrdal, in a sum total of 1,483 pages on the "Negro problem," finds no space for so much as a footnote to

refer to the Negro rôle in this tremendous mass movement. This is the result of his "non-class struggle" approach. In this respect it is not devoid of interest to note that the sponsor of this study is the Carnegie Corporation.

Myrdal Justifies His Selection

The present study was projected by this corporation, which sank over a quarter of a million dollars into the venture. So prejudiced are the American "social scientists" that, in order to get the facts on the Negro problem impartially set down, the corporation found that it would need to engage a foreign scholar. Not accidentally, however, its search for one unprejudiced in racial questions ended when it found one who was anti-Marxist in political outlook. Mr. Myrdal's anti-Marxism colors his approach to the entire work as well as to his co-workers. Mr. Myrdal's insistence on the invalidity of the Marxian theory shows that he knows quite well where the "main enemy" is and who his sponsor is.

Mr. Myrdal denies that "the economic factor" is the primary one in the development of society, or rather, in the existence of the Negro problem. To him the Negro problem is a moral problem arising out of the conflict between the "American creed," that all men are created equal, and the American reality, in which the Negro minority is so unjustly treated. However, it is clear from the 1,000-odd pages of text, that, if the Negro problem is in the "mind and heart" of America, it has nevertheless a most solid *economic* foundation, and it is precisely the chapters that deal with the economic foundation that are the best in the two volumes. A particularly admirable job was done with the section on the Negro laborer. That section was under the general direction of Mr. Sterner, who also is the author of the appendix relating to this section. This appendix is entitled "Pre-War Conditions of the Negro Wage-Earner in Selected Industries and Occupations." It deals both with the industries in which the Negroes are the predominant labor force, lumber milling, fertilizer manufacturing, turpentine farming, etc., and with the industry which practically excludes any Negro labor, the major Southern industry, textiles. From it we also get a glimpse of the difference between the conditions in a non-unionized industry and a unionized one. In turpentine farming the Negro earns little more than \$200 a year and some forms of peonage are still extant. In mining, however, the worker gets comparatively high wages, being unionized in the United Mine Workers, where no discrimination exists. In fact, even in Alabama, the Negro union member talks as freely as the white union member, and the local union itself is generally administered by a white president and a Negro vice-president.

The study of the Negro worker is preceded by an examination of the plight of the Negro share-cropper. The chapters on Negro and Southern agriculture are on as competent a level as those on the Negro in industry. Anyone who has entertained any illusions as to what the New Deal meant to the poor farmers, white and Negro, in the semi-feudal conditions of the South, will have them quickly dispelled by the accumulated weight of evidence. This shows that the governmental agricultural policies had graver consequences in uprooting the Negro farmer than soil erosion, the boll weevil and the Southwestern shift of cotton culture combined.

The above citations indicate that the value of *An American Dilemma* does not reside in its "value premises" but in the fact that it offers up-to-date informational summaries of the economic, legal and social status of the Negro in America.

No criticism of Mr. Myrdal's "value premises," however,

could have dealt them so fatal a blow as was struck by the author himself. This occurs when his thesis reaches the South, where, after all, four out of five Negroes still live, where the Negro problem was created, where it still has its roots. It is there that the contradiction between the "American creed" and the economic reality is sharpest. It is therefore not at all surprising that it is there that the contradiction between Mr. Myrdal, the scholar with "value premises," and Mr. Myrdal, the "social scientist," becomes not only acute but ludicrous.

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, writes that with the entrenchment of slavery in the South, the blackout on independent thinking was so overwhelming that Southern thought to this day suffers from lack of free intercourse with the varied currents of thought since the early nineteenth century. "... The region is exceptional in Western non-fascist civilization since the Enlightenment in that it lacks every trace of radical thought. In the South all progressive thinking going further than mild liberalism has been practically non-existent for a century." (Page 469.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, further demonstrates that the war, which has increased the militancy of the Negro, has scared these Southern white liberals into an outright reactionary position. They would not continue their coöperation with the Negro intellectuals against discrimination unless the latter accepted, nay, avowed, social segregation. So benighted is that region that the following passed for the words of a liberal! It is Mark Etheridge, ex-chairman of the FEPC, who writes in July, 1942:

There is no power in the world—not even the mechanized armies of the earth, the Allied and the Axis—which can now force the Southern white people to the abandonment of social segregation. It is a cruel disillusionment, bearing germs of strife and perhaps tragedy, for any of their [Negroes] leaders to tell them that they can expect it, or that they can exact it, as the price of their participation in the war.*

This, then, is the "American creed" when expressed in Southern lingo. What happens now to the scholar's "value premise," that the Negro is entitled to full participation in American democracy? Overboard goes the scholar and out emerges the "social scientist," who turns out to be a bourgeois politician. Mr. Myrdal, the "social scientist," begins to appeal to his Southern bourbon class brethren. Since, says Mr. Myrdal, the good bourgeois, "changes should, if possible, not be made by sudden upheavals but in gradual steps" (page 518), the South had better start enfranchising its Negro citizens now. Mr. Myrdal pleads that this "is truly a conservative" conclusion. And just to prove to the Southern bourbons that it is not a wild-haired Marxist who is asking them to take this plunge, he writes that they can, to begin with, start enfranchising "the higher strata of the Negro population" (page 519). The appeal of the "social scientist" is not a challenge; it is a whimper.

Here you have the political formula of this massive work in a nutshell! Here is a scholar who has digested the major part of the available literature on the subject of the Negro problem, who has conducted field studies and case histories, all of which lead him to uphold "value premises" that demand the full participation of the Negro in all aspects of American life, who holds no brief for intellectual Uncle Tomism of either Negro or white variety, who says the South is as backward intellectually as economically, that its ignorance is, in fact, unique in non-fascist Western civilization, and yet so bourgeois is he that his class instinct prevails upon him to pro-

*Cf. *The Virginia Quarterly Review* (Autumn, 1942) for view of Southern "liberalism," ("The Southern Negro and the War Crisis.")

duce so impotent, so ludicrous a "solution" as to turn the American tragedy into a Swedish farce! What is so elementary that even British imperialism has granted it to a colony like Jamaica—universal suffrage—Mr. Myrdal, "the social scientist from non-imperialist Sweden," is not yet ready to demand from the Southern bourbons!

"The Treason of the Intellectuals"

One might have supposed that the Negro intellectuals would arise one and all in criticism of *An American Dilemma*. But any such supposition is, unfortunately, quite unfounded. Mr. Du Bois, for example, who considers the "acculturation of the masses" to be the task of the "talented tenth,"** did not consider it the task of the "talented tenth" to criticize a work saddled with so much high-brow talk and so little high or low-brow action. On the contrary, he considered it to be a "monumental and unrivalled study" whose scientific approach should be emulated (*Phylon*, second quarter, 1944). In general, the Negro press met the work with pæans of praise. A sadder commentary yet on the state of the Negro intelligentsia than the Negro press is the manner in which Mr. Myrdal got from it its staff members. These intellectuals were at his beck and call at all times, although some of them seem to be so far to the left of him as to be on the opposite side of the fence. Mr. Myrdal's chief complaint against them is that they have been influenced by Marxism. Consider, then, the case of Charles S. Johnson, who has been so influenced and who considers the Negro problem to be rooted in economic factors. During the extensive Negro migrations northward in the period of World War I, Mr. Johnson saw the solution to the Negro problem in the urbanization and proletarianization of the Negro which, more or less automatically, would shift the problem from a racial to a class plane. When the depression interrupted the continuity of this development, Mr. Johnson seemed to rely upon the impact of the crisis to cause such an upheaval in the Southern economy as to unseat King Cotton. When the AAA pumped some subsidies into cotton culture and propped up the collapsing régime of cotton tenancy, Mr. Johnson still had his eyes on some "automatic" economic revolution to be caused by the introduction of the mechanical cotton picker. Mr. Johnson the scholar seemed blissfully unaware of the significance of the political alliance of the New Deal-Wall Street North with the bourbon semi-feudal South. Or perhaps not so much unaware as unwilling to give up the quiet of an academic chair for the hubbub of mass activity which would "induce" the "economic" revolution. Yet he continued to write radical words:

The acuteness of the industrial and relief situation in the cities of the North will find white and Negro unemployed making their demands together. There is, however, one disturbing possibility. It is that the anti-Semitism generated in Europe, in response to a hopelessly depressed economic situation, will find in the urban Negro an emotional scapegoat. In this event anything can happen.

Ever so often in the works of Mr. Johnson one finds a situation described so lucidly that the revolutionary answer to "anything can happen" seems clear enough. But it is never stated in so many words. The reason lies partly in the fact that the majority of the research projects or economic and social analyses regarding the Negro have white guardian angels in the form of some bourgeois fund, whether it is Carnegie, or Rockefeller or Rosenwald or the government. It is only nat-

**In connection with this section of the review, the reader should consult *The Journal of Negro Education*, July, 1939, the entire issue of which was devoted to "The Position of the Negro in the American Social Order," and to which Messrs. Du Bois, Bunche and Johnson made contributions.

ural that the studies stop short of their implicit conclusions, if indeed the professors ever breathe the conclusions even to themselves and thus jeopardize the comfort of the academic chair. Researchers, of course, are paid to indulge in "educational treatises," not to carry on revolutionary propaganda. Thus it happens that the attacks of the "radicals" on Uncle Tom Negroes does not encompass them, and the struggle against Booker T. Washington's philosophy of "cast down your bucket wherever you are" does not get far beyond the academic hall, while the Negro masses continue to be ground beneath the millstone of class and racial oppression.

The sorriest spectacle of the Negro "talented tenth" is presented by Ralph Bunche. Mr. Bunche is critical not only of the economic, political and social status of the Negro, but of all existing Negro organizations that strive to ameliorate this condition. He calls them "philosophic and programmatic paupers." He is critical likewise of all Negro leaders who, he says, "think and act entirely in a black groove." In his pamphlet, *A World View of Race*, he even comes up with a solution to the Negro problem:

The Negro must develop, therefore, a consciousness of class interest and purpose and must strive for an alliance with the white working class in a common struggle for economic and political equality and justice.

Yet this most radical of radicals found it permissible to shelve his more radical conclusions in the Schomburg collection, while his research data is used by Mr. Myrdal for his own conservative ends. This is not at all accidental. Mr. Bunche's revolutionary thunder is no more than radicalism of the chair.

Mr. Bunche may not attack Mr. Myrdal, but Mr. Myrdal does not hesitate to attack Mr. Bunche:

In passing it should be observed that the academic radicalism of Negro intellectuals exemplified by the citation from Mr. Bunche, can easily come to good terms with the type of liberal but skeptical *laissez-faire* [do nothing] opinion so prevalent among white social scientists, writing on the Negro problem. . . . Since neither party is very active in trying either to induce or prevent an economic revolution, it does not make much difference if the Negro radicals look forward to an economic revolution and the white sociologists do not. (Page 1398, footnote 13.)

The Proletarian Way

Of the Negro intellectuals who have reviewed the Myrdal volumes, the only critic so far has been L. D. Reddick, curator of the Schomburg collection. Mr. Reddick has written two reviews, one for the *Journal of Negro Education*, spring, 1944, and the other for *Opportunity*. In both reviews he offers three criticisms of the book. He rejects Mr. Myrdal's sociological concept of caste. He shows himself aware of the weaknesses of the historical sections of the book; and he is critical of Mr. Myrdal's solution. The best thing in the reviews is his recognition that the ultimate solution of the Negro question is along class lines. However, the way in which Mr. Reddick phrases this is extremely significant. He writes: "Finally, Dr. Myrdal is unduly pessimistic over the possibilities of Negro and white workers uniting and struggling together for common goals." If Mr. Myrdal is unduly pessimistic, it is clear that Mr. Reddick is not unduly optimistic.

Thus far we have not considered George S. Schuyler, who in the past has done one of the finest reportorial jobs in popularizing the CIO to the Negro workers and the Negro community as a whole. Mr. Schuyler for some time has shown himself a believer in managerial society. He condemns both sides of the war as imperialist. He has turned away from the revolutionary movement, but retains some Marxism. It is not surprising that, although he considers the Myrdal book a super-

rior work, he is cynical of any solutions. In his review of the book in the July issue of *Politics* he writes: "He [Mr. Myrdal] is modest enough to predict no solution, for the problem may well be insoluble."

This brings us to one of the most significant omissions of this book. If even Mr. Myrdal is unaware of the Populist movement, no one who thinks of the Negro question at all is unaware of the Garvey movement. This is the most remarkable phenomenon in the history of the Negro in the United States. Mr. Myrdal recognizes its importance. He writes:

For one thing it proves that it is possible to reach the Negro masses if they are appealed to in an effective way. It testifies to the basic unrest in the Negro community. It tells of a dissatisfaction so deep that it mounts to hopelessness of ever gaining a full life in America. (Page 749.)

Mr. Myrdal himself does not analyze the Garvey movement, although he states that this, along with a thorough study of the movement, ought to be done:

Negro intellectuals, for understandable reasons, show certain inhibitions in dealing with the topic, as do the white students of the Negro problem. But it is worthy of intensive historical investigation and careful reflection. (Page 749.)

Why Mr. Myrdal has not done so in a study lasting four years and covering 1400 pages of text remains inexplicable. Mr. Myrdal further observes that the

Negroes are beginning to form a self-conscious "nation within the nation," defining ever more clearly their fundamental grievances against white America.

America can never more regard its Negroes as a patient, submissive minority. Negroes will continually become less well "accommodated." They will organize for defense and offense. (Page 1004.)

To anyone who is concerned about the Negro question today, this neglect of the Garvey movement has just about reached its end. There is stirring in the Negro people in the United States today a racial consciousness which has at present found its most extreme expression in the writings of Richard Wright. Wilfred H. Kerr, co-chairman of the Lynn Committee to Abolish Segregation in the Armed Forces, has noted the phenomenon, which he calls "Negroism." These are portents on the horizon which can be ignored only to the peril of the labor movement. But they must be approached upon the indispensable basis of the revolutionary struggle for socialism and of the proletariat as that social class which will solve the Negro problem along with all other major problems that capitalist society cannot solve. From the very fact that scholars like Mr. Johnson and Mr. Myrdal make such valuable contributions to the Negro question, it is necessary for Marxists to attack and expose without mercy their false philosophical premises.

F. FOREST.

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA:

'INDIA IN REVOLT'

By HENRY JUDD

Order from the
WORKERS PARTY
114 W. 14th St., N. Y. C.

PRICE: 25 CENTS
In Bundles of
Five or More—20 Cents

What Happened in the Argentine

Col. Peron and the 'Good-Neighbor' Policy

The situation in Argentina having been placed on the order of the day in the world press, it deserves some attention by us to keep the readers of *The New Internationalist* informed of some preliminaries and details in this situation.

The Present Situation the Result of Past Circumstances

The political situation of the country before the *coup d'état* of June 4, 1943, can be defined exactly, and without fear of exaggeration, as one of complete chaos. To the purely domestic questions of local politics whose monotony was interrupted from time to time by resounding administrative scandals and the not always secret activities of a conglomeration of public thieves of varied political hues, who profited from all that came their way, were added the complicating factors stemming from the international situation on the outbreak of the Second World War.

The Argentine bourgeoisie and its political representatives—including the Socialist Party—were closely linked with the British. They were, in large part, despite their appearance of independence, pure and simple administrators for British interests. Which is not to say they did not oppose their superiors, nor fight among themselves, to obtain a greater share of the spoils. From the onset of the hostilities of the war, this section of Argentine society was on that side which called itself so arbitrarily the "cause of the United Nations."

One outstanding, though not honorable, exception, can be mentioned here: the Stalinist party, which at the time of the honeymoon with the Hitlerites and their creole counterparts (here known as "nationalists") was stridently out of tune in the midst of the chorus of praise to "the nations fighting for freedom and democracy." It accused the latter of being the promoters of the war and of pursuing "plutocratic and imperialist" aims. Copying faithfully that celebrated editorial which appeared in the Moscow *Pravda*, it added: "To carry on a war over ideology or political systems would be a criminal stupidity. One may or may not be sympathetic with Nazism. It is a question of taste. But to wage war to destroy it is complete folly." Of course, a little later these gentlemen were to change the record of their not always prudent or clear warnings and intone hymns of fervid praise to those whom yesterday they had vituperated.

The "old and glorious" Socialist Party was continuing its collaborationist policy, completely unaware of the changes occurring on the political front and the condition of the labor movement in general, due to the existence of a strong movement of clerical-fascist opposition. The numerical strength of the latter was shown in the demonstration they staged on May Day, 1943. To the astonishment of many, the fascists surpassed greatly the traditional demonstration of the Socialist Party. Confronted with this hitherto unsuspected fact, the leaders of the party now became panic-stricken and thus impotent to formulate a program of immediate recovery which would mobilize the masses of workers against the real danger which had been revealed in the demonstration—that of native fascism.

On the contrary, fearful of any action and any criticism "which might give arms to reaction"—as if this reaction did not have its own ideological arsenal, further reinforced by the corrupt prostration of the pseudo-democratic forces—they

compromised themselves seriously by their silence, if not by their participation in all the plunder and dirty deals which had been carried out in the past, such as that of the Palomar lands, the matter of the government program for agriculture, that of CHADE, the Ordnance Division,* etc., etc., covering them up politically for the "purpose of not injuring the cause of democracy," and not giving "arms to the enemies of the parliamentary system of government who would use them for their own political advantage." The fascists, neither stupid nor lazy, immediately seized upon this silence, and with evidence on their side, launched a venomous campaign on the corruption of the political parties and the vices of the parliamentary system.

Of course, in the ranks of the Socialist Party there were some weak and quavering voices raised against this silence, but in general its leaders persisted in their sapient policy of fending off the storm with a sieve.

The Role of the Stalinists

In all of this, the Stalinists went beyond any known or imagined limits, not merely of collaboration, but of utter abandonment of class position or class feeling, in word and deed. They were the first—a thing never before seen in this country—to hoist "the sacred flag of the fatherland," a symbol here as in any other country of the national bourgeoisie and its institutions, in the May Day celebrations of the workers. (Such a thing the Socialist Party had never dared.) Their large meetings in Luna Park they began with the national anthem. Their movements in behalf of progress they carried on in bureaucratic fashion in the anterooms of cabinet ministers, in spite of the opposition of the workers, as in the cases of the metallurgical and construction workers. And one frequently observed the Stalinist leaders, in their search for allies for the working class, presenting themselves, full of unctious and Christian fervor, to kiss the episcopal rings of the Monsignors De Andrea and Fassolino. The blue and white colors of the national flag often appeared on the first page of their newspaper, rivalling those of the Nazis. Their papers also competed with the latter in using such slogans as: "We want a great and powerful country," or "For the national unity of all Argentinians." (Who was the fool who once spoke of the class struggle and the irreconcilable antagonism of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat? Bah! Undoubtedly some counter-revolutionary Trotskyite!)

In order to treat the malady that was racking the country in the form of a growth of the Nazi forces, the Stalinists at best applied the homeopathic therapy of *similia similibus curatur*. Without any success, it may be noted, as they had to admit later. Like does not cure like. . . .

(Although things did not go to such extremes in the unions, where there was active opposition the situation was not much better. There was some success in awakening the sleeping conscience of the workers in the convention of the CORS, in which one of our Fourth Internationalist comrades participated, but without great practical results.)

To the policy of prostitution and atomization of working-class sentiment which the Nazis pursued, and continue to pursue, nothing was opposed save the same prostitution and the

*Various and corrupt administrative scandals.

same atomization. This contemptible policy was called *Realpolitik*, "a clever tactic to deceive the fools." The end result of this "political realism" was that its sole beneficiary—and it could be no other—was the Nazis. And the "deceived fools," the self-deceived, were the authors of this "clever tactic" themselves."

With these things in mind, one can understand how confused and ideologically disarmed the workers are. Their spirit of resistance and struggle has been patiently—we do not say treacherously—destroyed, or at least numbed. Accustomed for some time to see their economic problems solved through the intervention and negotiation of their leaders with the ministers, bishops or at time the Department of Labor, the workers remained passive, hopeful or, like the Israelites in the desert, waiting for the manna of better economic conditions to fall graciously from heaven. All of these things formed the preconditions for what was to occur later. The effects could be foreseen from the causes. (We might mention, in passing, that the present Department of Labor and Planning is nothing more than the Argentine model of the Hitlerite "Labor Front" or of "Mussolini's" "corporative unions," and has its ideological base in the "political realism" of Stalinism. It is its organizational and political embodiment.)

The Military Seize Power

Things had reached this stage at the end of the term of former President Castillo when the numerous efforts of the pseudo-democratic parties to present a common candidate in the election of the new President, ended, after many deals, conferences and maneuvers, in a resounding failure. The Stalinists participated in these negotiations, represented by the unfortunately celebrated Codovilla (the Medina whose share in the Spanish successes was known and who was arrested after one of the many secret meetings held for the purpose of presenting a joint candidate, and who was freed a little later by the Farrell government, apparently on the intervention of the British Embassy). "National unity," so dear to the Stalinists, did not look so promising. . . .

Institutional and administrative breakdown, tremendous confusion among the workers, uncertainty and inactivity on the part of the political parties, scandal after scandal, collegiate bodies converted into business exchanges, business houses where everything, concessions, rates, etc., were offered and sold to the highest bidder—showed any intelligent observer that the country was dangerously adrift. The only organized force, and the least compromised, was the military, which found itself in the position of taking the helm for the purpose of avoiding—according to an expression actually in vogue at the time—the sinking of the ship of state, and in so doing, we add, safeguarding the permanent and general interests of the Argentine bourgeoisie and their good friends, the imperialists. Thus the action of the 4th of June. The military seized political power due to the lack of activity, program and real democratic and socialist sentiment on the part of the pseudo-working class parties. *Those who lack a program are always exposed to having the program of others imposed upon them.*

That the new rulers lacked a program to solve the social and political problems on a national as well as an international scale can be demonstrated by adducing one eloquent and symptomatic fact: in a period of months only we have had three Presidents of the Republic without counting the ministers, state governors and other high officials who have been continually replaced.

There is no doubt that the pressure of the warring impe-

rialist powers, as well as the antagonisms between the Yankee and English groups had much to do with these successive changes.

Finally, after many vacillations, lobbyings and pressures, we come to the break in relations with the Axis powers. It would seem, according to the first of the Presidents and leader of the movement of the 4th of June, General Rawson, that this break was one of the objectives of the movement. These declarations were immediately met with disapproval and indignant protest by the Nazi elements. But anyhow relations with the Axis remained broken.

It is natural that when a man trespasses the bounds of holy matrimony and the absolute, though not very practical, fidelity which the latter implies, and goes on a spree with a mistress, and his legal wife is aware of this, she diligently applies the rolling pin to make her unfaithful spouse feel her humiliation in his fleshly weakness. And something like this occurred after the break was made. The Nazis—the outraged wife—made the weight of their disgust felt; they worked for, and obtained, the punishment of the guilty, that is, the "resignation," or more strictly, the dismissal of General Ramirez. The latter had succeeded General Rawson to the Presidency by imposition of the Nazis themselves, according to popular comment. This imposition was followed by other attempts to take control of the situation. The Nazis took over education, primary, secondary and university, and immediately afterward introduced religious education in the institutions of learning, giving rise to the "purge" and in many cases, the imprisonment of professors, teachers and students suspected of "unpatriotic" ideas. Actually they were only liberal bourgeois, socialists and, here and there, a Stalinist sympathizer.

But these demands and pressures of the Nazis (preached in the endless sermons in the Nazi dailies: *El Federal*, *Cabildo* or *La Fronda*) were not to the liking of some of the military men, who, more for reasons of professional pride and the habit of giving orders than for opposite ideas, do not like to receive orders; and they liked it even less when these orders were given by civilians.

The Rise of Colonel Peron

And now there appears on the stage a character who until this moment remained a modest prompter behind the scenes in the Department of Labor and Planning: Colonel Juan Peron.

He was a dynamic person, and in contrast to his governmental confreres, of considerable intelligence. He understood that to break with the insolent demands of the Nazis it was necessary to have a definite policy and through it a support among the masses which up till this time the government, i.e., he himself, lacked. And then, advised by some corrupt and bureaucratic union leaders, among whom some "socialists" and Stalinists were outstanding, this man launched a wild, demagogic campaign, designed to capture working-class opinion. He constantly turned up in workers' meetings, proclaiming himself a "unionist," insisting that "It is time for the workers to abandon the foreign ideas of the political parties who have betrayed them"—not an untruth—"and likewise the union leaders who sold out"—which was in part true—"and take over directly through the trade unions"—not as a class, but as "corporations"—"the defense of their own interests." Naturally, in the printed words that followed, he added: "Strikes will not be tolerated because they disturb the economic life of the country," and that in the future "National unity will be achieved, since the revolution of the 4th of June was undertaken to convert the state into a representative and defender

of rich and poor within a great and powerful country."

Inevitably this medley of "ideas" brings to memory some of the platitudes of Dr. Ley, or the blustering speeches of Mussolini. But it is undeniable that in the state of confusion reigning in the minds of the workers, and owing to the causes we have already mentioned, this fraternal and conciliatory "trouvaille" uniting wolves and lambs had its seductive power—always with such happy, substantial results—for the wolves.

Withal and notwithstanding, we must say in all fairness, that just as it is not possible to make a cake without breaking some eggs, so this sermon was not preached without obtaining some beneficial results. These were in the form of wage increases, and although these were insignificant in comparison with the high cost of living, they were effective enough for propaganda purposes (thunderously proclaimed by followers of the Colonel). These increases were easily achieved at the slight expense of the exorbitant profits of a few industries, such as refrigeration, transport, gas, etc., all property of the Yankees or British. *Je höher der Affe steigt, je mehr es den Hindern zeigt.* He doth as the ape, that the higher he climbs, the more he showeth his rear.

Profiting by this political demagoguery ("Demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class"—Lenin) and some satisfactory results, relatively speaking, the actions of Colonel Peron were recognized in high government circles, proof of which is that from Secretary of Labor and Planning he stepped into the office of Minister of War. And here occurred an episode which would have repercussions of international importance.

But before we go further we must add, to be completely truthful, *à tout seigneur tout honneur*, that this neo-syndicalist and demagogic policy was accompanied by mass arrests and imprisonments, among whom were some of our Trotskyist friends, confined in jails and concentration camps, together with the dissolution of the parties, student unions and democratic organizations. Let us mention that accusations (for which the spiritual authority of the sacristans is sometimes used) are easily fomented and rewarded. Parties, unions and democratic institutions are deemed unnecessary and harmful, given the "state as guardian of the unity and well-being of all Argentinians."

And now let us pass to the famous incident of which we have already made mention. It consists of a memorable speech given by the resplendent Minister of War, Peron, at the Universidad de la Plata, which was to occupy the precious time and the valuable energies of Cordell Hull. Colonel Peron, as a professional soldier and since he already held a strategic portfolio, and naturally, pursuing the aim that has taken the name of "the defense of the permanent and general interests of the nation," which are synonymous with the general and permanent interests of the bourgeoisie, tried in the same way as any other group of bourgeois in the government to favor the interests of the group he represented. To accomplish this end it was necessary to carry out a campaign of "national defense" for the two-fold purpose of manufacturing the weapons of war and augmenting the resources of the army. This program of vast military expansion was announced by the dynamic and "pro-labor" Colonel in the memorable meeting held in the Universidad de la Plata, and was heralded as though it were a matter of great cheer as well as importance. We will not reproduce the text here, since it is too well known already inside and outside the country. For the sake of brevity, let us report that the speech resembled greatly a speech of Goebbels badly translated into Castillian. Shortly after this, despite a

memorandum from Cordell Hull, the Colonel became Vice-President of the Republic. But, like the proverbial monkey, the higher he climbs, the more he shows his arse.

Economics Determines Politics

Cordell Hull's memorandum, plus the withdrawal of the diplomatic representatives, created a delicate enough situation. The air was filled with uncertainty, the most varied comments and conjecture. The "democratic" element either did not know how or did not want to take advantage of the happy opportunity that came to them as rain from the sky. How could it be otherwise? The secret of the strength of fascism lies in the weakness of democracy. The Nazi elements, headed by the Argentine Nationalist group, ardently assisted by the German Nazi groups, the Italian fascists and the Spanish Falangists went out into the streets, taking charge of the defense of "national sovereignty." They rallied the people to a huge demonstration. Trucks with loudspeakers went through the city calling the citizens to come to the defense of "the endangered fatherland." A few days later the demonstration took place. Placards with incendiary slogans against "Yankee imperialism"; fluttering leaflets with varied slogans in dubious taste; imprecations and denunciations; all in all, there was a little of everything and something to please everyone. Finally to give color to the thing, they stoned and threw bombs at some of the democratic daily newspapers. The demonstration was strong enough numerically. Of course, there were those who saw among the attendants at the demonstration such a large number of municipal street-cleaners, mailmen, lamp-lighters and other employees of the government that they suspected the demonstration was not "so free, nor so spontaneous" and that it had been organized "from above." But, you understand, there are always suspicious people. A curious thing: among all the placards and all the cursing and insults, one could neither see nor hear one word in favor of the "restitutions of the Malvinas islands."

We do not know who said that history repeats itself, the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce. In a time when, to our shame, our country was ruled by Juan Manuel de Rosas, an idol of our native fascists, this fine gentleman also played the rôle of defender of the "national sovereignty" against the bloc of France and Spain. The truth was that Rosas, who was celebrated for the expeditious manner in which he freed himself from his opponents—his method consisted in passing a jagged knife across the throats of his enemies, thus separating the head from the body—was merely defending his own tyrannical system of government. Like these nationalists who declare frequently, and it must have been the same with Don Juan Manuel, that "the country is one and indivisible," Rosas never remembered to mention a word about the restitution of the Malvinas. Confronted with these coincidences, one ought to ask himself if there is not present in all these machinations, the fine hand of some emulator of Canning.

Be that as it may, it would be well to remember once again that *economics determines politics*. Argentina has, fortunately or unfortunately an economy that is similar but not complementary to that of North America. This is not our fault, nor do we believe it is the fault of Mr. Hull. But it is a fact.

On the other hand, it would be well if Mr. Hull and whoever succeeds to his office, were warned, in behalf of good government, that in this blessed country there exists a lively feeling of hatred toward imperialism, *all imperialism*. This hatred is based on sound democratic sentiment that the creole Nazis are now trying to channelize for the success of their own foul ends. It is a sentiment derived from a true recognition of the

exploitive character and aim of capitalist imperialism.

It would be well to add that in possibly no other American country as in the Argentine, are the writings of North American philosophers, writers, economists and teachers so widely translated, published and read. We have knowledge of the economic, political, cultural and social life of North America from a wide range of writers: Sinclair Lewis, John Dos Passos, Upton Sinclair, John Steinbeck, Pearl Buck, James T. Farrell, etc.; philosophers and pragmatists such as William James and Mark Baldwin; eminent teachers like John Dewey. We are aware of the existence of revolutionary and socialist currents such as are represented in that country by the Workers Party. We know of its admirable and inimitable firmness by the study of social and political questions such as those expounded in articles that appear in reviews such as *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, Politics, New Essays, The Fourth International* and many others. We know all this. But we also know many other things, such as the episode of the "martyrs of Chicago," of Sacco and Vanzetti, of Augusto Cesar Sandino, of the martyrdom of Puerto Rico, etc., etc. And we could add many etceteras, my friends. We know that in North America, as in every other country on earth, there are "two nations," that of the oppressors and that of the fighters for freedom. And we know of the international solidarity of the oppressors as we know of the solidarity of the oppressed and the fighters for freedom. We know all this and know it well. It is our hope that in the movement of really renewed spiritual and physical forces existing in North America, and in view of our weakness before the powerful monster of North American imperialism we will be remembered.

The beautiful phrases contained in the memorandum of Mr. Hull about "liberty, the rights of the peoples, democracy and human laws" sound hollow, not to say something worse, when we still recall the eager assistance which the same Mr. Hull rendered to the petty tyrants of Central and South America, where the slate was wiped clean of all liberty, peoples' rights, democracy and human laws. One cannot lose sight of the popular reaction to the Hull memorandum, which had some of the characteristics of a truly popular repudiation, although it was intertwined for circumstantial reasons with interests that were spurious and foreign to the true anti-imperialist feeling of this country. This feeling, you should understand, does not come from a chauvinistic sentiment but from love of democracy—without the quotation marks—and from fondness for freedom.

Effects of Hull's Denunciation

In spite of all this, it would appear that the Catilinian denunciation of Cordell Hull has had its effect in government spheres. For immediately the freedom of the press—not the workers' press—was reestablished. Some political prisoners—the great majority was still in the jails—were freed. The Chamber of Justice in *Lo Comercial* just dictated a policy against the expropriation of the Gas Company. The ex-Minister of the Interior, Culaciati, first in the trial "for the corruption of the political parties who sold out to imperialism"—a fact established in his own confessions—was just "absolved of guilt." By reason of all this, newer and greater frictions have been produced among some of the rulers and the native fascists. The latter accuse the government of "trying to place the country in a new electoral crisis." If this comes to pass, we shall find ourselves again in the unenviable situation where the pseudo-democratic parties, who were directly responsible for the *coup d'état*, will try to return us again to the starting

point. Those parties, and not alone in this country, have shown over and over to the point of boredom, their complete incapacity to solve the most urgent and vital problems of society. They have not even shown themselves capable of resolving the problems of their own democratic bourgeoisie. In which case it is not adventurous to predict that their incapacity will be grist for the fascist mills. There is a phrase not lacking in scientific content which Lenin used to repeat: "In the present era of imperialism, no solution or advance is possible without taking the road of socialism." But that is not the task—in fact it is quite the contrary—that the pseudo-democratic and pseudo-socialist parties undertake, especially when one considers the counter-revolutionary rôle played—and not in this country alone—by the Stalinists, who serve as the baggage car on the conservative train of these parties.

But here is another fact that has caused us much astonishment, although we had expected it for a long time. A good number of workers and students have almost spontaneously formed various groups to work for the ideas and program of the Fourth International. Without any organic connection among themselves for reasons of illegality, nevertheless these groups work, study and show signs of activity. One of them edits a mimeographed *Bulletin* which his own comrades would do well to imitate. (It is all but impossible in conditions of illegality to find printers for our propaganda.) Some of these comrades come from the ranks of the Socialist Party, where they were disgusted or nauseated by their leaders who, instead of resisting the order to dissolve the party, preferred the political hara-kiri of non-resistance, gave the order to dissolve to the affiliated sections of the party and—sold their books to the libraries! I repeat that this unexpected affluence of new comrades in the Fourth International was a surprise for us. It augurs well for the times ahead.

I notice now that this sketch has grown longer than I intended.

Just now the radio announced the fall of Paris to the French insurgents. They say that enormous crowds throng the streets in a demonstration—this time free and spontaneous, indeed. I close here to join them.

The Parisian workers, like their forebears during the heroic days of the Commune of 1870, intoned with a profound and moving sacredness emanating from the great liberating forces of humanity, the martial strophes of *La Marseillaise*.

With sure vision and profound conviction in the final triumph, we work, brothers of America and the world, whatever might happen, for that not distant day when, over every sea and frontier will wave proud and supreme, one single flag, the red banner of socialist freedom; when man will be, and deem himself, the brother of mankind. When this day comes—and never doubt for a moment that it will come—we shall all be able to sing from the depths of our hearts: "*Le jour de gloire est arrivé!*"

PETER SMILES.

Buenos Aires, August 23, 1944.

A COST-PLUS WAGE

An Answer to the Wage-Freeze

By MAX SHACHTMAN

PRICE: 5 CENTS

IN BUNDLES: 3 CENTS

Karl Marx on Herr Vogt--II

Russian Intrigue in XIXth Century Europe

(Concluded from August issue)

The endeavor to herald Russia as the protecting lord of liberalism and national aspirations is not new. Catherine II was celebrated as the banner-bearer of progress by a whole host of French and German Enlighteners. The "noble" Alexander I (*Le Grec du Bas Empire*, as Napoleon ignobly called him) in his time played the hero of liberalism throughout Europe. Did he not bless Finland with the benedictions of Russian civilization? Did he not, in his generosity give France, in addition to a Constitution, a Russian Prime Minister, the Duke of Richelieu? Was he not the secret head of the "hetæria," while at the same time he pushed Louis XVIII, at the Congress of Verona, through suborned Chateaubriand, into the campaign against the Spanish rebels? Did he not egg on Ferdinand VII, through his father confessor, to an expedition against the insurgent Spanish-American colonies, while at the same time promising the President of the United States of North America his support against any intervention of European powers on the American continent? Did he not dispatch Ypsilanti to Wallachia as the "leader of the holy host of Hellenes" and betray the host through the same Ypsilanti, and have Wladimiresco the Wallachian rebel leader, assassinated?

Nicholas too was greeted before 1830, in every language, whether it made sense or not, as the nationalities-emancipating hero. When he undertook the war against Mahmud II in 1828-29 for the liberation of the Greeks, after Mahmud had refused to let a Russian army march in for the purpose of suppressing the Greek rebellion, Palmerston explained to the English Parliament that the foes of liberating Russia are necessarily the "friends" of the greatest world-monsters, Don Miguel's, Austria's, and the Sultan's. Did not Nicholas, out of paternal solicitude, give the Greeks a Russian general, Count Capo d'Istria, for their President? Only, the Greeks were not Frenchmen and they murdered the noble Capo d'Istria.

Although Nicholas played his rôle mainly as patron of legitimacy following the outbreak of the revolution of July, 1830, he nevertheless did not neglect for a single moment to work for the "liberation of the nationalities." A few examples suffice. The constitutional revolution of Greece in September, 1843, was led by Katakasi, the Russian minister to Athens, former responsible senior inspector over Admiral Heyden during the catastrophe of Navarino. The center of the Bulgarian rebellion of 1842 was the Russian consulate at Bucharest. There, in the spring of 1842, the Russian general, Duhamel, received a Bulgarian deputation to which he presented the plan for a general insurrection. Serbia was to serve as the reserve of the insurrection, and the Hospodariat of Wallachia was to be transmitted to the Russian general, Kisselev. During the Serbian insurrection (1843), Russia, through the Embassy at Constantinople, pushed Turkey to violent measures against the Serbs, in order, on this pretext, to appeal thereupon to the sympathy and fanaticism of Europe against the Turks. Not even Italy was excluded from the emancipating plans of Czar Nicholas: *La Jeune Italie*, for a time the Paris organ of the Mazzini party, reported in an issue of November, 1843:

"The recent disturbances in the Romagna and the movements in Greece were more or less connected. . . . The Italian movement failed because the genuine Democratic Party refused to join in it. The *Republicans did not want to support* a movement set afoot by *Russia*. Everything was to begin in Naples, where it was expected that a part of the army would place itself at its head or would immediately make common cause with the patriots. After the outbreak of this revolution, Lombardy, Piedmont and the Romagna were to rise; and an *Italian Realm* was to be founded under the Duke of Leuchtenberg, son of Eugene Beauharnais and son-in-law of the Czar. *'Young Italy' thwarted the plan.*" The *Times* of November 20, 1843, observed about this communication of *Jeune Italie*: "If this great goal—founding of an Italian realm with a Russian Prince at its head, could be achieved, so much the better; but another, more immediate, even if not so important, advantage was to be achieved by any outbreak in Italy—to cause Austria alarm and divert its attention from the fearful plans of Russia on the Danube."

Czarist Intrigues in Italy

After Nicholas had turned to "Young Italy" without success in 1843, he sent M. von Butenyev to Rome in March, 1844. Butenyev notified the Pope in the name of the Czar that Russian-Poland was to be ceded to Austria in exchange for Lombardy, which was to constitute a North Italian kingdom under Leuchtenberg. The *Tablet* of April, 1844, then the English organ of the Roman See, observed about this proposal: "The enticement for the Roman Court in this fine plan lay in Poland coming into Catholic hands, while Lombardy remained as before under a Catholic dynasty. But the diplomatic veterans of Rome perceived that while Austria can hardly hold its own possessions and in all human probability must sooner or later surrender its Slavic provinces, a transfer of Poland to Austria, even if this part of the proposal was seriously intended, would only be a loan to be repaid later; whereas North Italy would fall in actual fact under Russian protection with the Duke of Leuchtenberg, and before long would unfailingly fall under the Russian scepter. As a result the warmly recommended plan was for the time being set aside."

So much from the *Tablet* of 1844.

The only circumstance that justified the state existence of Austria since the middle of the eighteenth century, its resistance to the advances of Russia in Eastern Europe—a helpless, inconsistent, cowardly but obdurate resistance—induces Vogt to the discovery that "Austria is the prop of every schism in the East" (*l.c.*, page 56). With "a certain simplicity," so well suited to his greasy manner, he explains Russia's alliance with France against Austria, apart from the liberating tendencies of the "benevolent Czar," by the ingratitude of Austria for services rendered by Nicholas during the Hungarian revolution. "In the Crimean War itself Austria went on to the ultimate limits of armed, hostile neutrality. It is self-evident that this behavior which, in addition, bore the stamp of *deceit and perfidy*, necessarily embittered the Russian government against Austria to an enormous degree and therewith also pushed it toward France." (*L.c.*, pages 10, 11.) Russia, accord-

ing to Vogt, pursues a sentimental policy. The thanks that Austria offered the Czar at Germany's expense during the Warsaw Congress of 1850 and by means of the expedition of Schleswig-Holstein, is not yet enough to satisfy the grateful Vogt.

The Russian diplomat, Pozzo di Borgo, in his famous dispatch from Paris, December, 1825, says, after having enumerated Austria's machinations against Russia's intervention plans in the East: "Our policy therefore bids us to show this state [Austria] in a terrible light, and to convince it by our preparations that if it dares to undertake a movement against us, the fiercest storm it has ever experienced will explode over its head." After Pozzo has threatened war from without and revolution from within, characterized Austria's grabbing of the "promised provinces" of Turkey as a possible peaceful solution, but depicted Prussia simply as a subordinated ally of Russia, he continues: "Had the Vienna Court yielded to our good purposes and intentions, the plan of the Imperial Cabinet would long ago have been realized—a plan that extends not only to the seizure of the Danubian principalities and Constantinople, but even to driving the Turks out of Europe." In 1830, as is known, a secret treaty was concluded between Nicholas and Charles X. It was stipulated therein: France allows Russia to seize Constantinople and receives as compensation the Rhine provinces and Belgium; Prussia is compensated by Hanover and Saxony; Austria receives a part of the Turkish provinces on the Danube. Under Louis Philippe, the same plan was once more presented to the Petersburg Cabinet by Mole, at Russia's suggestion. Immediately thereupon, Brunnov traveled with the document to London where it was communicated to the English government as proof of France's treachery and was used for the formation of the anti-French coalition of 1840.

Let us now see how Russia was supposed to exploit the Italian War in agreement with France, as it exists in the mind of the Vogt inspired by his Parisian original sources. The "national" composition of Russia, and especially the "Polish nationality," might seem to hold some difficulties for a man whose "guiding star is the principle of nationality," but while "the principle of nationality is dear to us, the principle of free self-determination is even dearer" (page 12, *l.c.*)

The Russians in Poland

When Russia, through the treaties of 1815, annexed the by far largest part of Poland proper, it obtained a position projected so far to the West, it drove such a wedge not only between Austria and Prussia but between East Prussia and Silesia, that Prussian officers (Gneisenau, for example) already then called attention to the unbearable nature of such frontier relations with a superior neighbor. But when the crushing of Poland in 1831 subjected this territory to the complete discretion of the Russians, the real significance of this wedge first unfolded itself. The suppression of Poland served only as a pretext for the large-scale fortifications established at Warsaw, Modlin, Ivangorod. Their real purpose was the complete strategical domination of the Vistula region, the establishment of a basis for the attack upon the North, South and West. Even Haxthausen, who is smitten with the orthodox Czar and everything Russian, sees here a quite decisive danger and threat to Germany. The fortified position of the Russians on the Vistula threatens Germany more than all the French fortresses taken together, particularly from the moment when Poland's national resistance should cease and Russia should dispose of Poland's military power as its own aggressive power. Vogt therefore reassures Germany that Po-

land is Russian out of free self-determination.

"Undoubtedly," says he, "undoubtedly, as a result of the efforts exerted by the Russian People's Party, the gulf that yawns between Poland and Russia has decreased appreciably and it requires perhaps only a slight impulse to fill it up entirely." (*L.c.*, page 12.) This slight impulse was supposed to be offered by the Italian War. (Alexander II convinced himself during this war, however, that Poland did not yet stand on Vogt's level.) Poland, absorbed into Russia by "free self-determination," would be the central body attracting to itself by virtue of the law of gravity the members of the whilom Polish Empire languishing and amputated under foreign rule. So that this process of attraction should proceed more easily, Vogt counsels Prussia to seize the moment to rid itself of the "Slavic appendage" (page 17, *l.c.*), namely Posen (page 97, *l.c.*) and probably West Prussia too, since only East Prussia is recognized as "genuinely German land." The members separated from Germany would naturally revert immediately to the central body absorbed by Russia and the "genuinely German land" of East Prussia would be converted into a Russian enclave. On the other side, so far as Galicia is concerned, which is also incorporated into Russia in the map "*L'Europe en 1860*," its separation from Austria was one of the direct aims of the war, to liberate Germany from the un-Germanic possessions of Austria. Vogt recalls that "before 1848, the image of the Russian Czar was to be found more frequently than that of the Austrian Kaiser" (page 12, *l.c.*) and "given the unusual skill which Russia possesses in threading such intrigues, Austria would have substantial grounds here for apprehension." (*L.c.*)

It is, however, perfectly obvious that to rid itself of the "enemy at home," Germany must calmly permit the Russians "to shift troops to the border" (page 13) who support these intrigues. While Prussia itself parts with its Polish provinces, Russia was to separate Galicia from Austria by utilizing the Italian war, just as Alexander I back in 1809 was paid with a piece of Galicia for his purely theatrical support of Napoleon I. It is known that Russia successfully asked, in part from Napoleon I and in part from the Vienna Congress, for the return of those portions of Poland that had fallen originally to Austria and Prussia. In 1859, according to Vogt, the moment had arrived for uniting all of Poland with Russia. Instead of the emancipation of the Polish nationality from Russians, Austrians and Prussians, Vogt demands the dissolution and extinction of the whole former Polish realm into Russia. *Finitis Polonia!* This "Russian" idea of the "restoration of Poland," which spread throughout Europe right after the death of Czar Nicholas, can already be found in March, 1855, in the pamphlet: *The New Hope of Poland*, denounced by David Urquhart.

But Vogt has still not done enough for Russia.

"The extraordinary civility," says this amiable companion, "you might almost say the brotherliness, with which the Russians treated the Hungarian revolutionists, contrasted too greatly with the conduct of the Austrians for it not to exercise its full effect. Although it put down the party [*Nota bene*: According to Vogt, it was not Hungary that Russia put down but the party], but treated it with mercy and courtesy, Russia laid the basis for a way of viewing things which can perhaps be expressed in the need of choosing the lesser of two evils, and that in the given case, Russia is not the greater evil" (pages 12, 13, *l.c.*)

Russia and Austria in Hungary

With what "extraordinary civility, mercy, courtesy," you

might almost say "brotherliness," does Plon-Plon's Falstaff lead the Russians to Hungary and make himself the "canal" of the illusion on which the Hungary revolution of 1849 shattered. It was Görgei's party which then disseminated the belief in a Russian Prince as the future King of Hungary and through this belief broke the power of resistance of the Hungarian revolution.*

Without having any fixed position toward any race the Habsburgs naturally based their rule over Hungary before 1848 upon the prevailing nationality—the *Magyars*. In general, be it said in passing, Metternich was the greatest preserver of the nationalities. He misused them against each other, or else he used them in order to abuse them. Therefore he preserved them. Compare Posen and Galicia. After the revolution of 1848-49, the Habsburg dynasty, which had beaten the Germans and Magyars through the Slavs, endeavored, in imitation of Joseph II, to bring the German element forcibly to power in Hungary. Out of fear of Russia, the Habsburgs did not dare to sink into the arms of their saviors, the Slavs. Their entire state reaction in Hungary was even more directed against their saviors, the Slavs, than against their vanquished, the Magyars. In combat with their own saviors, the Austrian reaction, as Szemere showed in his pamphlet: *Hungary, 1848-1860*. London, 1860, therefore drove the Slavs back under the banner of Magyarism. Austrian rule over Hungary and the rule of the Magyars in Hungary therefore coincided before and after 1848. It is quite different with Russia whether it rules in Hungary directly or indirectly. Counting together the racially and religiously kindred elements, Russia disposes of the *non-Magyar majority* of the population right off. The Magyar race succumbs instantly to the racially kindred Slavs and the religiously kindred Wallachians. Russian rule in Hungary is therefore equivalent to the destruction of the *Hungarian nationality*, i.e., of the Hungary which is historically linked with the rule of the Magyars.**

Vogt, who has the *Poles* dissolve into *Russia* through "free self-determination," has the *Hungarians* perish in *Slavdom* through Russian rule.†

But Vogt has still not done enough for Russia.

Among the "outer-German provinces" of Austria for which the German Confederation was *not* to "resort to the sword" against France and Russia, which "stands entirely on the side of France," were to be found not only Galicia, Hungary, Italy, but particularly also *Bohemia and Moravia*. "Russia," says Vogt "offers the firm axis around which the Slavic nationalities strive increasingly to group themselves." (*L.c.* page 91.) Bohemia and Moravia belong to the "Slavic nationalities." As Muscovy expanded to Russia, so must Russia to Pan-Slavo-

nia. "With the Czechs at our back, we shall *succumb* to every foe." We, that is, Germany, must seek to unload the Czechs, that is, Bohemia and Moravia. "No guarantee for outer-German possessions of the ruler." (Page 133, *l.c.*) "No outer-German provinces in the Confederation any more" (*l.c.*) but only German provinces in France! It is therefore necessary not only "to let alone the present French Empire so long as it does not violate the territory of the German Confederation" (page 9, Introduction), but also to "let alone" *Russia* so long as it violates only "outer-German provinces in the Confederation." Russia will aid Germany in the development of its "unity" and "nationality" by shifting troops to the "Slavic appendages" of Austria which are subjected to its intrigues. While Austria is being kept busy in Italy by Louis Bonaparte, and Prussia forces the sword of the German Confederation back to its scabbard, the "benevolent Czar" will understand how "to support secretly, with money, arms and munitions, revolutions in Moravia and Bohemia" (page 11, *l.c.*).

And "with the Czechs at our back we shall succumb to every foe!"

How generous, then, of the "benevolent Czar" to free of us Bohemia and Moravia and their Czechs, who must naturally "group themselves as Slavic nationalities around Russia."

Russia and Germany's Eastern Frontier

Let us see how our Reichs-Vogt protects the German eastern frontier with his incorporation of Bohemia and Moravia into Russia. Bohemia Russian! But Bohemia lies in the midst of Germany, separated from Silesia by Russian-Poland, and from Vogt-Russiafied Moravia by Vogt-Russiafied Galicia and Hungary. Thus Russia obtains a piece of German Confederation territory of fifty German miles long and twenty-five-thirty-five miles wide. It pushes its western frontier a good sixty-five German miles westward. Since there are only forty-five German miles from Eger to Lauterburg in Alsace, on a straight line, Northern Germany would be separated completely from Southern Germany by the French wedge on the one side, and even still more from the Russian on the other side, and the *partition of Germany would be finished*. The direct road from Vienna to Berlin would pass through *Russia*, yes, even the direct road from Munich to Berlin. Dresden, Nuernberg, Regensburg and Linz would be our border cities against Russia; our position with regard to the Slavs would be at least the same in the South as before Charlemagne (while Vogt does not permit us to go back in the West to Louis XV) and we could just as well strike a thousand years out of our history.

What Poland served for, Bohemia can serve for still better. Prague converted into a fortified camp and auxiliary fortifications at the confluence of the Moldau and the Eger into the

*It was, says the Polish colonel Lapinski, who fought in the Hungarian revolutionary army until the surrender of Komorn and later against the Russians in Circassia, "it was the misfortune of the Hungarians that they did not know the Russians." (Theophil Lapinski: *Feldzug der ungarischen Hauptarmee in Jahr 1849—Campaign of the Main Hungarian Army in 1849—Hamburg, 1859, page 216.* "The Vienna cabinet was completely in the hands of the Russians... It was upon their advice that the leaders were murdered... While the Russians gained sympathy in every conceivable way, Austria was ordered by them to make itself even more hated than it had ever been before." (*L.c.*, pages 188-189.

**General Moriz Perczel, renowned from the Hungarian revolutionary war, withdrew right in the midst of the Italian campaign from the Hungarian officers assembled around Kossuth in Turin, and set forth the reasons for his withdrawal in an open declaration—on one side, serving Kossuth only as a Bonapartist scarecrow, on the other, the perspective of Hungary's Russian future. In a reply (dated St. Héller, April 19, 1860 to a letter in which I asked for more detailed information about his declaration, he says, among other things: "Never shall I be a tool helping Hungary to be rescued from the talons of the Double Eagle only to turn it over to the deadly caress of the Northern Bear."

†Mr. Kossuth never deceived himself on the correctness of the view developed in the text. He knew that Austria can mistreat Hungary but not destroy it. "Kaiser Joseph II," he writes to the Grand Vizier Reschid Pasha under date of Kutayah, February 15, 1851, "the only man of genius that the family of the Habsburgs has produced, exhausted all the extraordinary resources of his rare mind, as well as the then still popular notions about the power of his House, in the endeavor to Germanize Hungary, and to make it pass over into the united state, but Hungary emerged from the struggle with renewed vigor... In the last revolution, Austria raised itself from the dust merely in order to fall at the feet of the Czar, the Czar of his master, who never gives his aid but always sells it. And Austria had to pay dearly for this aid." (*Correspondence of Kossuth, page 33.* On the other hand, he says in the same letter, only Hungary and Turkey united can shatter the Pan-Slavist intrigues of Russia. He writes to David Urquhart under date of Kutayah, January 17, 1851: "We must crush Russia, my dear Sir! and, headed by you, we will! I have not only the resolution of will, but also that of hope! and this is no vain word, my dear Sir, no sanguine fascination; it is the word of a man, who is wont duly to calculate every chance: of a man though very weak in faculties, not to be shaken in perseverance and resolution, etc." (*L.c.*, p. 39.

Elbe—and the Russian army in Bohemia can calmly await the arrival of the German army, divided in advance, from Bavaria, from Austria, from Brandenburg, allowing the stronger to storm the fortresses and defeating the weaker piece by piece.

Look at the language map of Central Europe—let us take, for example, a Slavic authority, the *Slovansky Zeměvid* of Schafarik. Here the border of the Slavic tongue runs from the Pomeranian coast at Stolp over Zastrow south of Chodziehen on the Netz and then moves westward to Meseritz. From this point onward, however, it suddenly bends to the southwest. Here the massive German wedge of Silesia drives deep between Poland and Bohemia. In Moravia and Bohemia, the Slavic tongue again leaps far to the west—hemmed-in, to be sure, on all sides by the advancing German element and studied with German cities and language-islands, just as in the North the whole Lower Vistula and the best part of East and West Prussia are German and are pushed forward uncomfortably against Poland. Between the westernmost point of the Polish and the northernmost point of the Bohemian languages lies the Lausitz-Wendish language-island in the midst of the German language territory, but in such a manner as almost to cut off Silesia.

For the Russian Pan-Slavist Vogt, who has Bohemia at his disposal, there can be no question here as to where the natural frontier of the Slavic realm lies. It runs from Meseritz straight to Lieberose and Luebbe, from there south from the gap of the Elbe through the Bohemian mountain frontier and follows further along the western and southern frontiers of Bohemia and Moravia. What is farther east is Slavic; the few German enclaves and other interlopers on Slavic territory can no longer stand in the way of the development of the great Slavic entity; they have no rights where they are anyhow. This "Pan-Slavist status" once established, it turns out naturally that a similar rectification of the frontiers is needed in the south. Here a German wedge has likewise intruded itself between northern and southern Slavs, and occupied the valley of the Danube and the Styrian Alps. Vogt cannot tolerate this wedge and therefore he consistently annexes Austria, Salzburg, Styria and the German sections of Carinthia to Russia. That this establishment of the Slavic-Russian Empire according to the most tested principles of the "nationality principle" also has the few Magyars and Rumanians, as well as various Turks, fall to Russia (the "benevolent Czar" is also working on the "nationality principle" in the subjugation of Circassia and the extirpation of the Crimean Tartars!) in punishment for intruding between the Northern and Southern Slavs, has already been developed by Vogt in defiance of Austria.

The Partition of Germany

We Germans lose through this operation—nothing more

than East and West Prussia, Silesia, parts of Brandenburg and Saxony, all of Bohemia, Moravia and the rest of Austria outside of the Tyrol (of which a part falls to the Italian "nationality principle") and our national existence into the bargain!

But let us stick to the first step, according to which Galicia, Bohemia and Moravia become *Russian!*

Under such circumstances, German-Austria, Southwest Germany and North Germany could never act together, unless it be—and it would come to this inevitably—under *Russian leadership.*

"Vive Alexandre,
"Vive le roi des rois,
"Sans rien prétendre,
"Il nous donne des lois."*

Vogt's "nationality principle," which he sought to realize in 1859 through the union between the "white angel of the North" and the "white angel of the South," was therefore to prove itself in the first place, according to *his own views*, in the dissolution of the Polish nationality, the extinction of the Magyar nationality, the passing of the German nationality into—*Russiandom.*

I have not mentioned his [Dentu's] original pamphlet this time, because I kept in reserve one *single* striking quotation to prove that in everything that he half hints at and half babbles out here, he is obedient to one of the watchwords put forth by the Tuileries. In the May 2-16, 1858, number of *Pensiero ed Azione*, in which Mazzini foretells events that later occurred, he notes among other things that in the alliance concluded between Alexander II and Louis Bonaparte, the first condition read: *abbandono assoluto della Polonia*" (absolute abandonment of Poland by France, which Vogt translates as the "complete filling up of the yawning gulf between Poland and Russia"). "*Che la guerra siprolunghi e assuma... proporzioni europee, l'insurrezione delle provincie oggi turche preparata di lunga mano e equelle dell' Ungheria, daranno campo all'Alleanza di rivelarsi... Principi russi governerebbero le provincie che surgerebbero sulle rovine dell' Impero Turco e dell' Austria... Constantino di Russia è già proposto ai malcontenti ungheresi.*" (See *Pensiero et Azione*, May 2-16, 1859.) ("But should the war be prolonged and assume European proportions, the long-ago prepared insurrections of the present Turkish provinces and of Hungary will afford the Alliance the opportunity to expose themselves. . . . Russian princes will govern the states that will arise upon the ruins of Turkey and Austria. . . . Constantine of Russia has already been proposed to the Hungarian malcontents.")

KARL MARX.

*"Long live (Czar) Alexander, long live the King of Kings, without laying claim to anything, he gives us our laws."—Trans.

From the Bureaucratic Jungle

The Discussion in the S. W. P.

The Socialist Workers Party has just held its national convention. It was preceded by a "discussion." This discussion is worth while dwelling upon here if only because it has no equal in the annals of the Trotskyist movement. For us to expose it is a revolutionary duty.

The war has lasted more than five years. In that time, we have seen the most spectacular changes in the working class,

in the labor movement, in capitalist society itself. We have seen the remarkable phenomenon of Stalinist Russia in the war, and seen it as it was never predicted. We have seen the fall of Fascist régimes. We have seen the rise of the powerful and unprecedented "underground national revolutionary" movements all over Europe. All these things and many others have thrown up problems by the score, including old ones in

new form, and some of first-rate importance. To give old answers to some of these problems is like talking Aramaic to an Icelander.

Throughout all this turbulence, the SWP—we refer primarily to its leadership—has sat serenely in its groove and repeated antiphonically, “Unconditional defense of the Soviet Union,” “Socialist United States of Europe,” “Our program is complete and confirmed.” While every radical organization in the world was avidly examining and debating the situation and the problems, the SWP went without a single discussion of importance in its ranks, perhaps with the exception of an abortive and not very enlightening dispute over dialectics! What five years of events! For the SWP, what five years of sterility, utter, unrelieved sterility! And this in a movement which, whatever else the world might think of it, had a teacher who was characterized by fertile, audacious, alert revolutionary thought. The death of this teacher left the SWP leadership with nothing more to do than to repeat in season and out, what he had already said, and to cover up this theoretical and political impotence with heroic posturings, like “We stick by our fundamental principles! We have no cause to abandon our principles! *Everything* we said has been confirmed by events! Nothing need be added, nothing subtracted!”

The only “new” activity engaged in by the leadership in this period, which began, let us note, with the expulsion of the present Workers Party, was a systematic consolidation of the positions of a bureaucratic clique and an artificial “building-up” of a sacrosanct Leader, from whose prudent silence on all political questions of the day all party wisdom emanates.

An Opposition Develops

Such a situation could not endure forever, especially not under the rule of such a pitiable bureaucracy. Opposition to the policy of the party—or lack of policy—developed in some of the most important sections of the Fourth International. Opposition developed also in the party itself and in its leadership. Within the party, this opposition was voiced by such prominent leaders as Morrison and Morrow. Reference has already been made in these pages to the document in which Morrow, a year ago, proposed a rectification in the SWP’s position on the European revolution (with reference to the importance of the struggle for democratic rights), and in its blind semi-Stalinist position on “unconditional defense” of the counterrevolutionary Russian state. Morrow’s document was suppressed and the membership was not even allowed to know that it ever existed—it was we who had to call it to its attention.

Toward the end of the current year, the leadership discovered that the party constitution provides that a national convention be held right away. A dozen times before in the history of the American Trotskyist movement conventions have been postponed, sometimes for good reasons and sometimes not. How did the provisions of the constitution suddenly become so sacred and rigidly-to-be-maintained that the convention had to be held on the very day written in the bond and not a very few months later? Simply. Neither of the two opposition spokesmen is physically in a position to attend a convention held in November, 1944. Hence, hold it in November, 1944. Both of them, however, could very easily participate personally in a convention held, say, a few months later. Hence, by all means, hold it in November, 1944! In the absence of qualified spokesmen, the opposition was cut to bits in the most disloyal manner ever seen outside the Stalinist movement. Morrison and Morrow were compelled to con-

fine their interventions to bits of writing from afar with necessarily restricted effect. Suppose *anything like this* had taken place in a Stalinist party. Can you imagine the streams of indignant ink the editors would pour all over *The Militant*?

The atmosphere for the convention discussion was properly charged from the very beginning. A feeling of shame for the good name of Trotskyism must be overcome just to write about it. Suddenly, for the first time in many, many months, a general meeting of the New York membership of the SWP was called. To it, the Political Committee brought four heinous culprits, one old party member and three very young girl comrades. They had all been arraigned, indicted, cross-examined and found guilty by no less a body than . . . the Control Commission. Crime? They had visited at the house of a Workers Party member where—shudder, Reader!—“the discussion . . . revolved primarily around the Russian question.” These black-hearted rogues then came to “the general understanding that there would be more discussion meetings held,” a subversive offense not at all mitigated by the fact that (we still are quoting from the verdict of the Control Commission) “the four members of the SWP subsequent to the first meeting decided that they would no longer participate in further discussions.” This penitential decision undoubtedly saved them from execution. But not from a solemn censure. And not from a mass trial before the New York membership, carried out in the authentic Moscow style. It is the opinion of the Control Commission that the four comrades involved are guilty of a violation of party discipline and party procedure in participating in a political meeting [!] with members of an opponent organization [!!], without the permission [!!!] of the official party committees and without informing the party committees [!!!!] of this fact. For this they most emphatically should be censured. In the case of X, who is a member of the City Committee and an old party member, and who is familiar with party procedure, his conduct was particularly reprehensible.” And more and more of the same, all translated from *Pravda*.

Protests Against an Abomination

This infamous decision, the New York membership, whipped up by the two-by-four bureaucrats parading around in oversized boots, endorsed by a big majority. But not the entire party. There are enough left in it to revolt against such abominations. Among them were Lydia Bennett and M. Morrison.

I happen in my political experience to have had on several occasions to stand up before a mass assembly of my own comrades to explain a rejected political policy [wrote the former]; I was in the process of being expelled from the Communist Party for Trotskyism. I can only say that no one who has not had to go through such an experience can know the horror of having to stand all alone before an antagonistic body and argue for a cause already hopelessly lost. . . . To call the entire membership together, to force a young comrade to stand before all those who constitute the real social content of her life and defend herself against them as they are whipped into a fever of denunciation by the party leadership—I cannot accept this as a constructive way of eradicating error in the party.

In another letter, by Morrison, which also appeared in the discussion bulletin of the SWP, we read:

It is difficult for me to convey the feeling of sadness and frustration that came over me as I contemplated the significance of this incident. . . . This year marks the end of a quarter of a century since I came into the revolutionary movement, and during all this time I have never heard nor read of any case where responsible Bolsheviks have even discussed such a question as was raised at the New York membership meeting. I have always felt free to attend any meeting of any opponent organization or to arrange a dis-

cussion with any members of an opponent organization. I still feel free to do the same thing. If it was important enough I informed some member of a higher body; if it wasn't of sufficient importance I did not mention it.

And elsewhere in the same letter:

You who are young in the movement and have not had a chance to study the history of Bolshevism, do not take for granted that whatever someone in authority claims to be Bolshevik practice, is actually such. Nor should you be overly impressed if that someone takes pains to emphasize and stress and repeat the word "Bolshevism."

Acquire the habit of asking everyone who presumes to tell you what Bolshevik procedure is, to show you where a particular procedure has been followed in the history of the Bolshevik movement. Acquire the habit of asking that every strange procedure claimed to be Bolshevik, be justified by reason and common sense. Above all, study the history of the Bolshevik movement and see if you will not agree with me when I say that it has a proud and liberating spirit, in addition to requiring discipline in action.

I know how dangerous it is to follow a general rule, but I think you will be quite safe to abide by the following general rule: whenever any organizational procedure has a resemblance to Stalinist procedure, hesitate a thousand times before accepting it as Bolshevik procedure.

... For the sake of the party and the great principles it stand for, I fervently hope that the New York membership meeting is but a passing incident. Let not one single Stalinist germ penetrate into our ranks.

But as Morrison is aware, and has been aware for a long time, it is much to late to speak of not allowing "one single Stalinist germ" to penetrate the SWP. Those germs have been there for a long time. They have multiplied and become more virulent. That such an infamy as was perpetrated upon the four comrades might occur to the mind of one leader, is possible, even though that would already be a bad sign. That it was planned, endorsed and executed by the entire leadership, unanimously, shows that real Stalinist rot has set in. One of the comrades, eighteen hardened years old, very young in the movement (she is the one referred to in Bennett's letter), who went through this little Roman festival, soon thereafter quit the movement entirely, bitter, disillusioned, depressed, convinced that the Trotskyist movement is no different than the Stalinist, with which she had already had gloomy experiences. These young comrades—undoubtedly filled with high idealism as well as an eager interest in the problems of the movement—were compelled to run a gauntlet that could have been organized only by *bureaucratic louts*, not by Trotskyists, by revolutionary socialists

The "Episode" of the Hansen Article

A companion piece to this "episode" was the discussion of the notorious article by Hansen in the SWP press on "How the Trotskyists Went to Jail." The article has been a muted scandal in the *international* Trotskyist movement—and outside of it, too, since it first appeared. We, for our part, refrained with the greatest effort from making any comment on it, and we think the reader will understand why. But since the appearance of the article, the question has not only become an open issue inside the SWP but has been made a public question.

The article aroused, it is well to note, considerable protest from the ranks of the party. The Chicago branch even adopted an official motion against it. Such loyal friends of the movement as James T. Farrell reacted similarly, as may be seen elsewhere in this issue. Dwight Macdonald, in his magazine, was afforded the opportunity to make appropriate derisive comment on it and to draw inappropriate conclusions about the "organizational methods" of Bolshevism. The reaction of the leadership was interesting and characteristic. Hansen is a

member of the top clique, so the indefensible had to be defended. The article was not only published in *The Militant* and in the party's theoretical magazine [1] but reprinted in a special party pamphlet, as if to make damned sure that every possible reader would see this disgrace to the movement.

The reaction of Morrison to Hansen's prose was the same as ours. Instead of a public justification of Hansen, he proposed a public repudiation which would at the same time facilitate a refutation of such political conclusions about "Bolshevism's principles" as are drawn by critics like Macdonald. He even wrote a draft of such an article for the party press. The Political Committee rejected it. Whereupon Morrison wrote another letter which appears in the party bulletin. It is distinctly worth quoting from:

Morrison on Hansen

As the matter stands, Hansen wrote an article containing statements which, in my opinion, are not only foolish but a discredit to the Trotskyist movement. (I am informed that our British comrades refused to reprint the article in their press. If that is so, they showed good taste and the finest type of Trotskyism.) This article appeared in the party press and Macdonald utilized it in an attempt to discredit the Bolshevik movement. An answer to Macdonald is called for. Some will say that Macdonald is not important enough to answer. Utter nonsense! Even if Macdonald's magazine had one-fifth of the circulation he claims to have, his attack on Bolshevism, based on Hansen's article, demands a reply. It is the kind of an attack which, by a failure to answer, acquires considerable effectiveness, because there is a tendency for that type of an attack to circulate widely by means of conversation. On the other hand, an effective reply strengthens our movement in the eyes of many whose faith would be shaken by Macdonald's criticism. In fact, a copy of the letter which Morrison wrote for our press should have been forwarded immediately to Macdonald's magazine. If any attack may possibly do some harm, do not leave it unanswered, is a good rule to follow.

To defend Bolshevism against Macdonald, Morrison finds it necessary to make, what is in fact, a mild criticism of Hansen's article. In reality the article is every bit as nauseating as Macdonald claims it is. But, says the Political Committee, no criticism of Hansen is permitted in the open press. His article can be criticized only in an internal bulletin. (By the way, I am given to understand that the PC requested someone, who wrote an article for the internal bulletin, criticizing Hansen's article, to withdraw it—an indication to me that the PC was very touchy on the subject.)

What does this attitude of the PC really mean? Actually it has this terrible significance: that every party member is bound, as far as the public is concerned, not only by policies adopted by official bodies of the party, but by all possible nonsense that a party member may write and an editorial board publish! And regardless of whether the foolishness has anything to do with party policy or not. Carry it a step further and it means that when asked, in conversation with some non-party member, what I think of Hansen's article, I must defend it. I can only say that this is not Bolshevism; it is a travesty on Bolshevism. I can only say that if any non-party persons asks me, in any conversation, what I think about Hansen's article, I shall not hesitate to give him my real opinion. I advise every other party member to do the same—unless the highest body of the party specifically forbids any party member from doing so. And woe to our party if such a monstrous decision is ever made.

All that Bolshevik practice demands is not to oppose, in public, a policy adopted by the party or not to defend, in public, a policy rejected by the party. To broaden this sound principle to a point where it includes a prohibition to disagree publicly with what another member writes in the press on a matter not pertaining to party policy is characteristic not of Bolshevism but of its antithesis, Stalinism.

The answer of the small-time bureaucrats to this blistering but perfectly just criticism only added validation to Morrison's conclusion: *they are infested with Stalinist characteristics*. Hansen wrote a reply to Morrison and it is most regrettable that it cannot be reproduced in full. If the reader were to lay it side by side with, say, one of Stalin's 1924 attacks on

Trotsky, he would be startled to see the almost verbatim similarity, in tone, style *and* content. Yes, even the style!

Stalin's Style

Stalin's style is familiar, and it runs something like this: "Comrade Trotsky accuses the Party and its Central Committee of being afflicted with the germs of a social-democratic degeneration. But our Party and its Central Committee are Bolshevik-Leninist. Does Comrade Trotsky mean that there is no difference between Bolshevism and social-democratism? But this would be a monstrous insinuation. Our Bolshevik-Leninist Party does not prefer monstrous insinuations. Lenin taught us all to oppose monstrous insinuations. If therefore Comrade Trotsky denounces our Bolshevik-Leninist Party and its Central Committee as being social-democratically degenerated, what has happened to the whole history of our struggle against social-democratic deviations? It would appear that there was no such history. [Laughter.] But the Bolshevik-Leninist Party believes there was such history. Therefore Comrade Trotsky is in grievous error. [Applause.] In addition, is not Comrade Trotsky making an assault not only upon our Bolshevik-Leninist Central Committee and Comrade Stalin, who is only an humble and disciplined member of it, but also upon Comrade Lenin, inasmuch as we are only his faithful disciples? Yes, Comrade Trotsky is making such an attack. Therefore, the Bolshevik-Leninist Party must protect itself from such an attack. In addition, is it not Comrade Trotsky who is furnishing juicy tidbits to the scribblers of the miserable Mensheviks and White Guard press abroad? And is not this press the enemy of the workers and peasants? Yes, it is the enemy of the workers and peasants. It is also the enemy of our Bolshevik-Leninist Party, which stands at the head of the workers and peasants. Therefore, Comrade Trotsky is doing the workers and peasants an ill-service. It is not seemly for an authoritative leader of our Bolshevik-Leninist Party to do an ill-service. Therefore, the Party must point out to Comrade Trotsky that he must not do an ill-service. Comrade Lenin taught us to be firm. Therefore the Party must be firm. Unfortunately, Comrade Trotsky is not firm." Etc., etc., till your stomach turns like a pinwheel.

Now let us take a deep breath and read Hansen:

Still more important, aren't new recruits going to wonder why certain leaders like Morrison are so concerned about the appearance of *anything* resembling *Stalinism* in our party? Is Stalinism perhaps inherent in Bolshevism?

... we must conclude, despite the monstrous character of the insinuation, that Morrison has thought this question through. He is a party leader who advocates choosing words carefully, not only with an eye to "style," but also with due regard for their scientific meaning. We are justified, therefore, in my opinion, to conclude from these excerpts that after long and thorough pondering, Morrison believes that Stalinist methods—none other but Stalinist methods—are indeed growing in our party and that the main task of the coming period is to fight to eliminate them...

Macdonald refers to *Cannon* not Hansen and ultimately not Cannon but *Trotsky*. Does Morrison then agree or disagree with the declarations of Cannon and Dunne which were taken down, some of them in shorthand, some recorded from memory the same day they were uttered? As Farrell and Macdonald specify, it is a certain orientation, certain *ideas* which are decisive and not Hansen's good or bad manner of writing of the trip to prison...

And this precious passage:

There is only one other premise that I have ever heard advanced and that is the explanation offered by Shachtman in 1939-40. True it is not exactly "Stalinist" procedure that Shachtman referred to, and if we presume that Morrison believes Shachtman was correct, then Morrison used the word "Stalinist" not in a scientific sense, but in an inexcusably lax manner that could only disorient the membership.

A few sentences from "The War and Bureaucratic Conservatism," which was signed by Abern, Bern, Burnham and Shachtman, will give the gist of this position: "When we call the Cannon faction 'bureaucratic conservative' we are giving a *political* characterization. But this particular political tendency manifests itself at one and the same time as *conservative* in its politics and *bureaucratic* in its régime—these are the two sides of the same coin... the Cannon group is in a state of development. Its bureaucratic conservatism is not the product of a day or a year. It has become crystallized, become a *system*, only gradually, over a long period... The Cannon faction is a bureaucratic conservative clique, not a group built on a commonly accepted political platform. But what, then, holds it together, if not a political platform? It, like all such groupings, if it is to endure, has only one resort: to group itself around an *individual*, a *leader*. The 'platform' of the grouping becomes—the leader. It could not be otherwise."

Rank and file members of Morrison's tendency who whisper among themselves that the petty bourgeois opposition of 1939-40 was right on the organizational question have probably been advised by their leader not to state openly their views about the source of infection but to confine themselves simply to stamping out Stalinist germs whenever they become manifest. They are supposed to fight typhoid by boiling their drinking water rather than hunting down the carriers and the source of contamination. We ask Morrison directly, since you do not agree with Macdonald's explanation of how Stalinist procedure can appear in Trotsky's party, do you then agree with the explanation advanced by Abern, Bern, Burnham and Shachtman? *Isn't it Bolshevik procedure to say what is?*

Why not bring out in the open the premise which forces you and your followers and sympathizers to accuse Trotsky's party of fostering a "fawning" attitude to leaders and sponsoring a "leader-worship complex"; of turning the "membership of the party... into a prosecuting body whipped up to a frenzy"; or organizing "literary apache work"; of utilizing the party educational system to culture the "germ of Stalinist degeneration." You call on the party to follow an "intangible" *spirit*. Isn't an explanation in order?

Our party is in no mood today to hear monstrous accusations that its leadership employs the methods of Stalinism. We reached a conclusion on that subject some time ago.

Good Advice

Enough. Enough. Perhaps it should only be added that it would be a lot easier to carry out the last point if conventions and discussions were organized in such a way as to permit the "hardened" and the "factional" to be *present* so that he may really "develop his full views in the eyes of the membership," and be able to give the honorable Plagiarists-from-*Pravda* the kind of reply they merit. Failing that, the membership may content itself with this part of another letter from Morrison which, because it is so completely in the spirit of all Trotsky stood for, is a refreshing change from what Hansen and his bosses stand for:

Let us foster both the knowledge of Marxism and an independent critical spirit. Let us destroy every germ of degeneration that enters our ranks. The spirit of the article on "How the Trotskyists Went to Jail" is a germ of degeneration. Let us destroy it. The spirit of those who insisted on publishing this article in a pamphlet after a substantial minority objected to the article is a germ of degeneration. Let us destroy it. The spirit of those who organized the New York membership meeting to make our members feel that they cannot discuss political questions with Workers Party members is, consciously or unconsciously, one that constitutes a germ of Stalinist degeneration. Let us destroy it.

We for our part feel no jubilation at seeing how completely our first main criticism, five years ago, of the SWP régime has been confirmed again—and confirmed with a vengeance. The obvious reason suffices. We shall see in the conclusion of this article why there is another reason besides.

MAX SHACHTMAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

Letters from J. T. Farrell

This letter should be self-explanatory. As the date on it will indicate, it was written last summer and mailed to the editors of *The Fourth International*. They refused to print it. As a consequence of protests made within the Socialist Workers Party, I then withheld it from publication. It was published, in deference to such protest, in *The Internal Bulletin* which that party distributes to its membership. I consented to this publication in order that my protest might be read by the membership of this party in an atmosphere that might not be heated with factionalism. But in consenting, I stressed that I should not be satisfied unless the letter were publicly printed. Its contents reveal that it was written as a public, not a private, protest. I have heard—although not what is called “officially”—that *The Fourth International* still will not print this letter. A large percentage of the leadership—and also an apparently large majority of the membership—of the Socialist Workers Party endorses the methods and attitudes embodied in the articles I criticized. I continue to consider them to be reprehensible.

JAMES T. FARRELL.

New York City, Nov. 28, 1944.

The Editors
The Fourth International
116 University Place
New York City

Dear Friends and Comrades:

For some time, I have been disturbed by two articles which have appeared in your pages, “How the Trotskyists Went to Jail,” by Joseph Hansen (February, 1944) and “A Defamer of Marxism,” by Harry Frankel (May, 1944). I have decided to send you this public protest against them.

What is most lamentable in Joseph Hansen’s article is the gross emotional reaction to events which it reveals. Such an attitude must be condemned. There are fine models of Marxist writing; there are other fine models of writing, such as the letters of Vanzetti. Instead of learning from these, it seems as if Hansen imitated the very

worst of bourgeois journalism, the sob sisters. I cannot escape the conclusion that Hansen used the Marxist conception of history and the Marxist conception of morality as a means of mere sentimental personalization. If such is not the adulation of leadership, I do not know what it is. I admire the fine example which the eighteen showed during the trial: I admire them for the way in which they have preserved their morale while in jail. But this does not mean that I should adulate them, no more than that I should hope for them or anyone else to adulate me for any reason whatsoever. I also wish strongly to object to the assertion that only the Trotskyists are moral. When party leaders and leading party journalists make such assertions in public, the time has come for such a party to turn a sharp lens of criticism on itself. Hansen’s attitude can only create distorted images of reality. I consider it dangerous. The other criticism of Hansen’s article—his bad taste, his sloppiness, his bathos—which one can make—these are secondary to its dangerous orientation. I deem it absolutely necessary to criticize that—the emotional reaction to events, and with it, the emotional concept of history.

I reject the theory of bureaucratic collectivism. But I consider that Harry Frankel’s review of Max Shachtman can well be described as literary apache work. It was not principled in its arguments. It substituted vituperation for argument and analysis. In consequence, it destroyed the effect of the good points which it made. For instance, Frankel indicated that during the Finnish War, Max Shachtman used the low morale of the Red Army as one argument substantiating his position. Thereby, he established morale as a criterion of argument. In consequence, it should be obligatory for him to explain the high morale of the Red Army in repulsing the Nazi invasion. But the fact that I agree with some of the points made by Frankel does not mean that I should defend his unfairness, his uncouth efforts to strip his adversary of all dignity, all honor, all sincerity. I consider it highly objectionable to polemicize with shabby arguments. And that is precisely what Frankel did in this article. For instance, he wrote that Shachtman had issued a “new edition” of Trotsky’s *The New Course*. Here is an innuendo which helps Frankel discredit Shachtman, to call him, in the manner of a fishwife, a black market charlatan. Now, where is the old edition of *The New Course*? Who sells it? When has it been advertised in your press? When I read this book, I immediately regretted that it had not been available sooner; I regretted in particular that it was not available during the period of the struggle against the Moscow Trials. Among other things, this book contains a brilliant description of the methods of Leninism, one which I hope will be widely read. I hope

Harry Frankel will read it again. For I am convinced that he has much to learn from it. Also: Harry Frankel asked an empty question as a means of discrediting his opponent. Issuing a challenge, he asked why Max Shachtman did not republish *The Revolution Betrayed*. First of all, there is easy access to this book for all who want to read it. Second, it is a known fact that the publication rights to this book are owned by Doubleday, Doran & Co. If Max Shachtman published it, he would, undoubtedly, be faced with a lawsuit. And if that happened, I am rather sure that Frankel, or one of his comrades who is equally rigid in attitude, would then write of this lawsuit in order to prove the low morals of Max Shachtman. When one indulges in such cheap argument, what moral right has one to call anybody a black market merchant in tripe? Why ask empty questions as a means of destroying the character of an adversary? Also, Harry Frankel would have us believe that in the United States, Max Shachtman has abandoned the Marxist conception of a trade union: in other words that he is a scab and a strikebreaker. I wonder who will believe that? And while he indulges in such miserable means of refutation, Frankel is, at the same time, guilty of one serious omission. Trotsky conceded that it might happen that history will prove Bruno to have been correct, and that if this turns out to be the case, then Marxists will have to reorientate themselves totally. But, Trotsky, added, he was not convinced that events had, as yet, justified Bruno, and that therefore, it was wrong for Marxists to abandon their program. This concession was a very important one. Frankel should have discussed it. It would have been more important to have it discussed than to have wasted space in the cheapest of abuse. The fact that I reject Max Shachtman’s acceptance of the theory of bureaucratic collectivism does not, in my eyes, justify me in approving of unfair, unprincipled, utterly unjust attacks upon him and his character. I consider such methods to be unworthy of Marxism.

I am, as is well known, not a member of your party. But I have collaborated with you on defense cases. I have expressed sympathy with you. On more than one occasion, I have made it clear to Max Shachtman and his collaborators that I did not agree with the theory of bureaucratic collectivism. The fact that I have done this causes me to feel all the more imperatively that it is my duty to send you this protest. Also: I admire the organized will which your party has shown. I admire your spirit of optimism and confidence. I admire the many examples of dedication to ideals and sacrifice for superpersonal loyalties which your party has displayed. But none of these virtues can, in any way, excuse the Frankel attack.

I am fearful that if articles such as these two continue to appear, their only effect will be that of working harm, not good. Gross sentimentality, unbending rigidity, unfair attacks on opponents—these are all dangerous. I hold them to be indefensible.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES T. FARRELL.

July 30, 1944.