

The Communist

20c.

FEBRUARY

1941

THE PEOPLE VS. THE 77th CONGRESS

JOHN WILLIAMSON



EDUCATION AND THE WAR

EARL BROWDER



"INTERVENTIONISTS" AND "APPEASERS"

EDITORIAL



IMPERIALISM AND THE SPLIT IN THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

V. I. LENIN



WAR ECONOMY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

G. D. CARPENTER



A REVIEW OF "OLIVER WISWELL"

BOOKS ON THE NEGRO IN AMERICAN HISTORY

THE CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES,

by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels **\$2.50**

A compilation of the writings of Marx and Engels dealing with the events and issues of the Civil War, including the correspondence with Abraham Lincoln.

RECONSTRUCTION: THE BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY,

by James S. Allen **1.25**

A study of the post-Civil War period and the progressive role of the Negro people in the struggle against the Southern Bourbons.

THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES,

by James S. Allen **1.25**

A full-length study of the national question in the United States.

Pamphlets

THE NEGRO IN THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT,

by Herbert Aptheker **.15**

THE NEGRO IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,

by Herbert Aptheker **.15**

NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS IN THE U.S.A. 1526-1860,

by Herbert Aptheker **.15**

THE NEGRO IN THE CIVIL WAR, by Herbert Aptheker **.15**

NEGRO LIBERATION, by James S. Allen **.05**



Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



CONTENTS

Editorials	99
Defeat Roosevelt's War-Powers Bill! Get Out and Stay Out of the War!	<i>National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A.</i> 115
The People Vs. the 77th Congress	<i>John Williamson</i> 120
Education and the War	<i>Earl Browder</i> 132
America's War Economy and the Un- employed	<i>G. D. Carpenter</i> 138
Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement	<i>V. I. Lenin</i> 151
Innovations and Business Cycles	<i>C. E. Wisden</i> 164
Book Reviews:	
<i>Oliver Wiswell</i> , by Kenneth Roberts	<i>Gordon Place and Donald M. Lester</i> 178
<i>Labor in Wartime</i> , by John Steuben	<i>C. T.</i> 186

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street.), New York. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

WAR AND THE PEOPLE, by K. Pollard \$.10

A factual study of the costs of the last World War to the people, in terms of human lives, and suffering, and the destruction of property and of cultural values.

NEW ASPECTS OF IMPERIALISM, by P. Wieden .10

A fundamental study based on Lenin's theory of imperialism as the root cause of wars for the redivision of the world, with new light thrown on certain problems of the present-day imperialism.

EPIC OF THE BLACK SEA REVOLT, by Andre Marty .10

A dramatic account of the events which took place in the Black Sea during the intervention against the Soviet Union in 1919, described by the leader of the mutiny in the French Black Sea Fleet.

THE WOMEN WANT A PEOPLE'S PEACE!,

by Dolores Ibarruri (La Pasionaria)10

The militant activities of women in every country in the struggle against the imperialist war, described by the outstanding leader of the Spanish people's war for liberation.

THE GROWTH OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE U.S.A.

by Roy Hudson03

An analytical study of the programs and policies of the A. F. of L. and of the C.I.O., with special attention to labor's tasks in relation to the war plans of Wall Street and the Roosevelt Administration.

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIALS

“INTERVENTIONISTS” AND “APPEASERS”

THE war between the German-Italian Axis and England is becoming a war between Germany, Italy and Japan, on the one hand, and the Anglo-American combination, on the other. And this is the orientation of American imperialism and its Government. It is this orientation that dictates the external and internal policies of the Roosevelt Administration. It is this orientation that guides the legislative plans of the dominating forces in the 77th Congress—the orientation towards closer military collaboration with England against the countries of the three-power pact abroad and towards sharper attacks upon the economic standards and civil rights of the masses at home.

What has happened to the Roosevelt policy of “steps short of war”? It's gone with the elections. And what has happened to the election promises of Roosevelt (and Willkie) to keep America out of war? These have gone the same way; or, rather, they are *going* the same way, for we are still moving towards wider and deeper military participation in the war.

In his message to Congress, the President spoke of his imperialist war policy as a “national” policy. He also undertook to justify this

war policy by reference to the “impressive expression of the public will” in the elections. But all this is highly misleading. Neither Roosevelt nor Willkie dared come to the mass of the electorate with an outspoken policy of war participation. While trying by all means to evade a discussion of this question with the mass of the people, both Roosevelt and Willkie were forced to take it up at the latter phase of the election campaign. They were forced to make definite commitments on the issue of peace and they made solemn promises to keep America out of war.

We knew that these promises were worthless, and we told the masses so. We told the masses that these promises would be violated as soon as the elections were over, for the simple reason that both major parties and their candidates are the political instruments of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the United States, and that this bourgeoisie is being driven inexorably, by its class position and by its fundamental interests in the present world situation, to a course of imperialist war abroad and intensified reaction at home. And life is quickly confirming the truth of our viewpoint.

But the wide masses of our people, unfortunately, took the promises of the imperialist candidates rather seriously, even though with misgivings and anxiety. The wide

masses did believe that, whatever the "personal" inclinations and views of the Presidential candidates on the question of war, they would take into account, when in office, the well-known opposition of the overwhelming majority of the American people to war participation and would be guided in their actions accordingly.

President Roosevelt knows that. He knows that the American people, excepting the ruling imperialist circles, expect him to subordinate his own war orientation to the anti-war position of the masses. In this expectation, the masses are gravely mistaken, for the President's "personal" attitudes on this momentous question originate in the class interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie which is in power in this country. The President is realizing in his policies the class interests of the exploiters and oppressors of the American people, not just a personal attitude. And this is what the broad masses must learn and are slowly learning. But the fact of today still is that the "public will" of the masses wants the President to be guided not by his "personal" desire for war participation but *by the people's opposition* to war participation. The masses still believe, though erroneously, that this is what the existing bourgeois "democracy" guarantees them.

And what is President Roosevelt's answer to these democratic and peace expectations of the masses—not in fine-sounding words but in deeds? His answer is: the almost complete abandonment of the "short-of-war" demagoguery, faster

movement to more complete military collaboration with England in the war against the powers of the tri-partite pact, more intensive persecution of all those who oppose the imperialist war and insist upon defending the interests of the people from the attacks of the war profiteers. In other words: total disregard of the democratic and peace expectations of the "public will" of the masses. And this, incidentally, is how bourgeois "democracy" works out in practice. The masses are given illusions while the imperialists and war-makers hold the power.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that the imperialist bourgeoisie and its spokesmen are now, after the elections, abandoning all pretense and demagoguery. Not at all. The imperialist game of confusing and befuddling the masses is proceeding even more intensely, with the devoted help of the Greens, Hillmans and Thomases. Precisely because the American imperialist bourgeoisie is accelerating the tempo of war involvement and is moving faster to a capitalist war dictatorship at home, the imperialists and warmongers are talking now about peace and democracy more than they ever did before. In fact, it is nothing else but for peace and democracy that they are dragging this country deeper into war, if you believe the speeches and writings of the imperialists and their reformist agents. But what is the truth? What is the real meaning of the present debate between the "interventionists" and "appeasers" in the imperialist camp?

President Roosevelt likes to lump

all the opponents of his policies into one pile of "appeasers" of, and sympathizers with, aggression, presenting himself as the champion of peace, democracy and national freedom. This is, of course, nothing else but a trick to confuse the people; and one of the ways to expose this fact is to show that the opponents of the government's war policies *cannot be lumped into one pile*; that there are opponents and "opponents"; that the anti-imperialist and peace opposition of growing masses of the people headed by labor is one thing while the "opposition" of the Hoover-Lindbergh kind is a different thing altogether. Take, first, the Hoover-Lindbergh "opposition," the one that seeks to create for itself a mass base through the leadership of such organizations as the "America First Committee" and the "No Foreign Wars Committee." What do these forces really oppose and what do they want?

To begin with, the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd does *not* oppose the expansionist plans of American imperialism. They are as strong for these plans as the Roosevelts, and perhaps stronger, if that is possible. Together with the Roosevelts, the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd seeks to exploit the present war to secure for the imperialists of the United States as much foreign territory, spheres of influence and strategic positions as is possible. They all seek a dominating position for American imperialism in the redivision of the world for which the war is fought. On these objectives they are all agreed, because these are the class objectives of the imperialist bour-

geoisie of the United States whose interests are represented by the Hoovers, Roosevelts and Lindberghs. On this *fundamental* question, imperialism versus anti-imperialism, the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd is no opponent of the Roosevelt crowd. They are in the same class, in the same camp, in the camp of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

If this is so, what is the meaning of the Hoover-Lindbergh peace agitation? What is it that these forces don't like in the Roosevelt policies? Why are they insisting upon keeping America out of war and looking for a negotiated peace? On matters of internal policy, the Hoover-Lindbergh forces are not fully satisfied that the Roosevelt Administration is moving fast enough with the curtailment and destruction of the people's rights and economic standards. They want more speed and more ruthlessness. And on matters of foreign policy, they seem to think that the best bet for American imperialist aggrandizement is to force peace negotiations in the immediate future, while "aiding" England within certain limits and keeping this country in the position of a non-belligerent.

This orientation of the Hoover-Lindbergh forces seems to rest on the assumption that England will have to sue for peace in the near future; and should this come about, it will be a peace *disadvantageous* to American imperialism. To forestall such an eventuality, the Hoover-Lindbergh forces favor an initiative by the United States to promote a move towards peace negotiations and looking towards a

settlement that would reduce England, restrain the ambitions of the powers of the tri-partite pact and perhaps divide them, and establish American imperialism in a dominant world position for *further expansion*. Without touching at this point on the realism of such an orientation, it is clear that its outlook is not for peace at all but for a temporary truce and breathing spell to enable American imperialism to prepare better for the eventual armed conflict with German and Japanese imperialism.

How does this compare with the estimate and orientation of the Roosevelt forces? These too seem to think that if American "aid" to England does not come forth with greater speed and decisiveness, England's ruling circles may choose to seek a peace which will seriously endanger the expansionist plans of American imperialism. But whereas the Hoover-Lindbergh forces conclude from this that the United States should therefore seek to "forestall" England in the matter of peace negotiations, the Roosevelt forces seek to bolster up Britain, and keep her going, with more material aid and greater military collaboration. The expectation is that this will exhaust the Axis powers still further; England certainly will be exhausted; and this will create a relation of forces enabling American imperialism to assume a decisive position in the peace-making.

Furthermore: the Hoover-Lindbergh forces still cling to the hope that it is possible, by a certain kind of compromise settlement between the big imperialist powers in the

near future, to "switch" the war over to a war against the Soviet Union. These forces also fear that a prolongation of the present war will give rise to serious revolutionary upheavals in the capitalist countries of Europe, including England, and in the colonies. They also have no great confidence in the ability of Social-Democratism to check successfully such developments. Hence, their great anxiety to attempt an imperialist settlement.

And what about the Roosevelt forces? These too continue to orientate on "switching" the war to an attack against the Soviet Union; only they don't seem to believe it possible in the immediate future and without keeping the present war going for some time yet. And as to the possibility of revolutionary upheavals, the Roosevelt forces fear that as much as the other imperialists; only they display more confidence in Social-Democratism as a check upon the masses.

From the foregoing it is clear that both the Roosevelt policies as well as those of the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd lead, in the final analysis, to the same thing. They lead to ever greater and fuller military participation of the United States in the war as an ally of England, to secure for American imperialism a decisive share in the redivision of the world; and—internally—to a war dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. And if the imperialist bourgeoisie remains in power, this means eventually a "peace" of violence and oppression which could be nothing else but the starting point for new and more devastating wars. The Roose-

velt policies lead in this direction in one way; the Hoover-Lindbergh policies might take the country, *at one stage or another*, through a somewhat different way; but their main direction and objectives are the same, and so must inevitably be the result.

The reason for this has already been indicated. Both belong to and speak for the imperialist bourgeoisie. Both fight for and seek to realize the fundamental objectives of this bourgeoisie in the present world situation. Both policies are, therefore, imperialist and reactionary. Roosevelt's claim to being different in this respect from the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd, the "appeasers," is sheer pretense designed to bind the masses to the imperialist war wagon by "democratic" and anti-fascist demagogy. Equally fraudulent are the claims of the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd to being different from the Roosevelt "interventionists" on the fundamental issue of imperialism and war or anti-imperialism and peace. *Imperialist "appeasers" turn "interventionist" by the force of events just as naturally as imperialist "interventionists" turn "appeasers."*

The transformations undergone by imperialist policy in England and France for the last several years are conclusive proof of this truth which is also demonstrated by the transformations of imperialist policy in the United States. The road seems to be: from "appeasement" to "intervention" and from "intervention" to "appeasement"; and when the fortunes of war turn unfavorable, the impe-

rialist bourgeoisie seeks to save itself by outright surrender to the foreign conquerors, by capitulation and national betrayal. These possibilities are *inherent* in the Roosevelt policies just as much as in those of Hoover and Lindbergh.

Only the working class, heading a united anti-imperialist peace front of the people, can save and protect the nation. Only the masses of the people, headed by a united working class, following an international anti-imperialist peace policy like the policy of the Soviet Union, can bring the war to an end, bring a true and just peace to the peoples, and make the recurrence of war forever impossible.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLES OF THE MASSES AND A NEGOTIATED PEACE

WHEN Senator Wheeler criticizes the war-making policies of the Roosevelt Administration, insisting that America be kept from further involvement in the war and supporting in a measure the mass demands for the protection of the economic standards and civil rights of the people, he is reflecting to a certain extent the desires and wishes of the masses of the American people. Altogether inadequately, and in many respects distortedly, he is nevertheless voicing in a measure the growing opposition of the masses to imperialist adventures, war and reaction. Considering furthermore that the membership of the Senate does not contain a single representative of the true anti-imperialist

peace forces in the country, the masses are naturally glad to hear even the inadequate expression of their desires as voiced by Senator Wheeler.

But when Senator Wheeler comes forward with a peace plan designed to be realized by the bourgeois imperialist governments of the United States and of the belligerent powers, the effect of this is a *mixed one*. To the extent that it aims to end the war as quickly as possible and to bring about peace, the peace plan reflects the dearest wishes of the masses of the people. But that is not the only thing it does. It also reflects *illusions*, petty-bourgeois illusions and false hopes that the imperialist bourgeoisie is either able or willing to bring about a just, lasting and democratic peace. Not only that, but it tends to cultivate and perpetuate such false hopes. And to this extent, Senator Wheeler's peace plan tends to paralyze the independent peace struggles of the masses themselves. It tends to weaken the very forces which alone can bring about a just and lasting peace. To this extent it works into the hands, not only of the Roosevelt "interventionists," but also of the Hoover-Lindbergh "appeasers," into the hands of the imperialist, war-making and reactionary bourgeoisie.

From an immediate practical standpoint, this latter phase of Senator Wheeler's peace plan—the phase that leaves it to the imperialist governments to make the "peace"—tends to create a *bridge to the masses* for the reactionary imperialist forces which are manipulating

the "America First Committee" and the "No Foreign War Committee." That is, it objectively tends to help the Hoover-Lindbergh crowd and not the peace movements of the masses. And that is not good. That is why we said that the effect of the Wheeler peace plan is mixed. The peace movements of the masses, building their independent strength on a consistent anti-imperialist peace program directed against the imperialist policies of both the Roosevelts and the Hoover-Lindberghs, should try to extract from the Wheeler position the good effects and combat the bad ones.

The question raised here is a fundamental one. Can the imperialist bourgeoisie and its spokesmen be depended on to work for and bring about a just and lasting peace? The representatives of American imperialism (the "interventionists" as well as the "appeasers") together with the reformist leaders (Hillman, Green, Thomas) say: yes. Facts and experience say emphatically: no. And that is our position.

And, again, let us differentiate criticism from "criticism." Senator Wheeler's peace plan was sharply attacked by the imperialist press; also by President Roosevelt and his supporters. But that is not our criticism. That is not the criticism of the anti-imperialist peace movements of the people. The imperialist press, notably *The New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*, attacked Wheeler's plan on the ground that Hitler cannot be trusted to abide by a just peace even if he could be brought to accept one. Both of these mouthpieces of interventionist im-

perialism argued from this basis against a "negotiated" peace at this time and in favor of a policy looking to the defeat of Germany by closer Anglo-American military collaboration.

The unspoken assumption in this criticism of Wheeler is that it is *only the German ruling circles* that cannot be trusted with making and keeping a just peace, while the ruling circles of America and England can. But the truth is that *neither* of them can. And this is our criticism of the Wheeler plan.

Let us not ignore experience, because we can ignore it only at our own peril. And that experience is that the imperialist bourgeoisie, whether its class dictatorship at home is veiled in "democratic" forms or is naked and terroristic, cannot make a just and lasting peace. Incidentally, the process in all capitalist countries today, including the United States, is to the establishment of a naked and terroristic dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

But to come back to the question of peace. The iniquitous "peace" of Versailles was made by the imperialist bourgeoisie, primarily by the "democratic" rulers of England, France and the United States. President Roosevelt tells us that the peace, which German imperialism is trying to establish, is even worse than the one made in Versailles. That is true; but it is also true—and this President Roosevelt didn't tell us—that a victorious Anglo-American imperialism will make a peace that will also be worse than the one of Versailles. Reason? The general crisis of capitalism has gone

much further and deeper; its contradictions have grown more acute and insoluble and so have the imperialist rivalries; and the anti-imperialist peace movements of the masses have grown stronger and more mature, moving to a perspective of greater chances for victory, propelled by infinitely sharpened contradictions between the working class and its allies, on the one hand, and the imperialist bourgeoisie, on the other. That is why a peace made by the imperialist bourgeoisie in this war, whether dominated by the Axis or by the Anglo-American bloc, or whatever the relation of forces in the imperialist camp may be, will be *worse* than the peace of Versailles, and also *less stable*.

The "stability" of the peace of Versailles is worth examining. The peace treaty was concluded in 1918. But beginning with 1919 and until the outbreak of the present war in 1939, *there took place twenty-two individual wars*. More than one war per year. That is the record (see *Sunday Worker*, January 5). In the face of this record of "peace-making" by the imperialist bourgeoisie for the last two decades—twenty-two wars culminating in a new, a second, imperialist war of world dimensions—what ground is there for assuming that this same imperialist bourgeoisie, having become more bankrupt, more decayed, more reactionary and operating in an infinitely more decayed system, torn by greatly more acute and sharpened contradictions and rivalries, facing a growing and powerful world of socialism—what grounds are there for assuming that this

bourgeoisie will now make a more stable peace? No grounds at all. On the contrary, there are all the grounds for assuming that, if the bourgeoisie remains in power, its "peace" will be as violent and oppressive as its war, incomparably worse than the peace of Versailles and incomparably less stable. At best, it will be a temporary truce, a breathing spell, to prepare for greater and more devastating wars. At worst, it will be no peace at all, though it will be called so, but a continuation of military conflicts in various parts of the world, without end and without relief. That is, if the peace-making is left in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Only the peoples, headed by the international working class, and in defiance of the imperialist bourgeoisie, can make a just and lasting peace. For this the masses must fight. But this they are doing and will continue to do only to the extent that they abandon all trust in the peace-making abilities or wishes of the imperialist bourgeoisie ("interventionists" and "appeasers"), only to the extent that they gain greater and ever greater confidence *in their own ability* to defy successfully the imperialists and lead the world to peace and happiness. Consequently, anything that tends to keep the masses in false hopes regarding the bourgeoisie as a "peace-maker" and anything that tends to weaken the confidence of the masses in their own mission and ability, anything of this sort is harmful to the struggle for peace. And this is *our* criticism of Senator Wheeler's peace plan: that phase of it which

presupposes the ability and willingness of the imperialist bourgeoisie to make a just and lasting peace hurts the struggle of the masses for peace and helps the imperialists and war-makers.

Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the Roosevelt Administration were pressed into accepting Senator Wheeler's peace plan. How would it work out? It would be found out very soon that none of the belligerents (neither the British imperialists nor the imperialists of the tri-power pact) are ready for the kind of a "peace" that would satisfy the American imperialists. Why? Because German imperialism is out for world domination and is unable to retreat from that objective without envisaging disastrous consequences for itself. British imperialism is equally determined to save its empire and world power and correctly sees in a "negotiated" peace at this time loss of a good deal of empire and abdication of world power. Japanese imperialism continues to be driven inexorably to domination in East Asia. Italian imperialism needs victory even more than the others. And American imperialism, whose fundamental interests would be *decisive* in the "peace" efforts of the American Government, whether it be guided by "interventionism" or "appeasement," is equally driven by its entire position, internal and external, to expand its domination in various parts of the world.

How can there be a "negotiated" peace between them at this stage of the war and with the present relation of forces? They simply couldn't

achieve it. For the truth is, as formulated by Georgi Dimitroff some time ago, that having gotten into this war for the redivision of the world (and these are the stakes), the imperialists cannot and will not get out of it willingly, except by intensifying the war, sharpening it and spreading it. And that is what is happening. That is what American imperialism is doing. That is in part the reason why the end of the war is still not in sight: the people's peace movements have not yet become strong enough to end the war in their own way.

To continue then with this imaginary effort of an American imperialist government to bring about a "negotiated" peace at this time:

Having discovered that none of the belligerents is willing to accept a "peace" satisfactory to American imperialism, what would the American Government do next? It would exploit this very peace "failure" for dragging this country *faster* to a military alliance with England and to full-fledged participation in the war, and eventually to a "peace" of violence and oppression as a prelude to new wars.

In practice, therefore, the Wheeler peace plan would work out very much like the plan of Senator Vandenberg, which is: to ask the Axis for their peace terms and, if they prove unsatisfactory, to join England in the war. But is this what Senator Wheeler wants?

This is not to say that a negotiated peace by the imperialist governments is impossible. No, it is possible under certain conditions which, however, do not yet exist.

An attempt by the imperialists at a negotiated peace is most likely *as a by-product* of the independent struggles of the masses against the imperialist war and for a people's peace. As the people's peace movements, such as is now advancing in England, make serious headway and become powerful, the imperialist bourgeoisie may conceivably try to patch up a "peace" to forestall a true people's peace by the masses themselves. Then a negotiated peace by the imperialist bourgeoisie would become a "realistic" proposition. But in such an eventuality, a new *opening* would arise, for the peoples themselves to press more aggressively forward, to end the war in their own way, to establish a just and lasting peace, to make war altogether impossible.

Here also, therefore, we come back to the central point in the discussion. We come back to the point that only the masses of the people, headed by labor, fighting consistently the imperialist policies of the bourgeoisie, can bring *in sight* the end of the war.

Is peace possible now? The answer is: yes. But only the masses themselves and their daily struggle against the imperialist war and internal reaction can bring peace in sight; and only the masses, headed by labor, and in defiance of the imperialist bourgeoisie, can establish a just and lasting peace. They can and will do so by building the class unity of labor, by developing the anti-imperialist people's peace front, by collaborating with the colonial peoples, by supporting actively the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

The struggle for peace requires labor's unity of action on a world scale. It requires the pursuit of an international proletarian peace policy, inspired by the principles of working class internationalism. The imperialist bourgeoisie—the enemy of peace—fears such a policy and seeks by all means to impede its growth among the masses. That is why Congress passed the Voorhis Act virtually outlawing affiliation for international collaboration in the interests of peace, progress and liberation from capitalist exploitation. And that's why the progressive movements of labor and its allies must fight for the repeal of this Act, striving with all their might to rally the masses around the banner of working class internationalism in the struggle for true people's peace.

PRESIDENT MURRAY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

IN discussing President Murray's plan "To Strengthen National Defense," it has to be said plainly that its principles and underlying assumptions are unsound from a working class point of view. At the same time, we are fully conscious of the fact that the plan reflects in a way the profound dissatisfaction of the workers with Big Business domination of the "national defense" machinery, their distrust and opposition to the Hillmans as "labor" representatives, their demand for real and effective protection of labor's interests against the rapacities of the war profiteers. In fact, some of the formulated "objectives"

of the plan are obviously designed to meet certain of these grievances and demands of the workers. The question is: Will the *plan*, with its main principles and underlying assumptions, help labor achieve these desirable objectives?

The principle of President Murray's proposals is "collaboration" between labor and capital in each basic industry, on the basis of "equal" representation, with the Government as a sort of "impartial" arbiter, to organize and promote production for "national defense." The underlying assumptions of the plan are that we are dealing here with a program for the defense of the nation instead of a drive for imperialist aggrandizement and war; that equal representation on the industrial councils for capital and labor will mean real equality instead of actual subordination of labor to capital; and that Government representatives will be impartial arbiters instead of instruments of power to compel labor's subordination to the war profiteers. A whole string of basically false assumptions which, if strictly adhered to in practical policy, would paralyze altogether labor's efforts to protect its standards and rights and to promote the struggle for a people's peace.

Look at France and England, and ask yourself the question: How much good did the reformist leaders of the French trade unions do for labor and the French people in general by accepting the imperialist war in September, 1939, and by collaborating with Daladier and Reynaud in the prosecution of the

war? To be sure, the reformist leaders in France spoke very loudly about "protecting" labor's rights and standards in the "defense" efforts; and many French workers actually believed that the way to protect these rights was to "collaborate" with the bourgeoisie and its government in the "national defense." But what was the result? Its main outlines are well known. Labor was subordinated, and every genuine effort to protect its interests was crushed—and crushed precisely by the "collaborative" machinery of capital, "labor" and government, with the loyal assistance of the police and military forces of that government. Or, rather: this "collaborative" machinery was doing the "softening" and demoralizing of labor, making it easier for the police and military to do the actual crushing.

And what was the net result for the French *nation*? Collapse, catastrophe and betrayal. That's what the French reformist leaders (Jouhaux, Blum, etc.) accomplished with their policy of collaborating with the imperialist bourgeoisie in "national defense."

Look at England, which seems to be the "model" for certain reformist leaders in the United States. There you have a good deal of "collaboration" and almost (if not quite) complete "equality" of representation. Bevin, Morrison and Greenwood—"Labor" leaders—are in the government; and Bevin has been made practical "dictator" over production. A regular reformist paradise—is it not? And what is all this doing for British labor or the British

nation? Robbing the masses to feed the war machine of the British lords and capitalists, and to enrich further the war profiteers; curtailing the rights of the people; helping the British imperialists to drag the British nation to disaster and catastrophe. Why, these reformist collaborators of Churchill, these great "powers" in the government, would not even provide safe air-raid shelters for the people, as proposed by the Communist Party!

True enough, British labor has not been crushed. Many of its rights are still being respected. And at this very time, a wide mass movement of labor and the common people is gathering forces around the People's Convention to resist more effectively the offensive of the imperialists. But that is not *because of* Bevin's collaboration with the imperialists, but *in spite of* it. This People's Convention movement, headed by labor, is directed just as much against the Bevins as against the Churchills, and primarily against Bevin's policy of "collaboration" with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Just think of it. After more than a year of "labor's" collaboration with the bourgeoisie in "national defense," the British workers find themselves compelled to initiate a movement, without the "collaborators" and against them, for such elementary demands as: "Defense of the people's living standards. Defense of the people's democratic and trade union rights. Adequate air raid precautions, deep bomb-proof shelters, rehousing and relief of victims." This is what British

labor has to fight for today, after all the "collaboration" of the Bevins with the Churchills. No wonder, then, that this same People's Convention movement, learning from the experiences of over a year of reformist collaboration policy, also raises such demands as: "A People's Government, truly representative of the whole people and able to inspire the confidence of the working people of the world. Friendship with the Soviet Union. A People's Peace that gets rid of the causes of war."

Here are the first significant fruits of the experience of a great working class movement with the reformist policy of class collaboration in the present imperialist war. And what is the message? It is that labor cannot "collaborate" with the imperialist bourgeoisie without being subordinated to it, robbed and exploited for the glory and power of the war profiteers. It is that the "national defense" of this bourgeoisie is a fraud to cover up its struggle for power over other nations and peoples and to secure its power over its own nation. It is that "collaboration" with the imperialist bourgeoisie sacrifices the masses to the war profiteers and leads the nation to ruin and catastrophe. It is, finally, that labor—in sheer self-defense—must lead the people in struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie and its reformist collaborators, for a People's Government and a People's Peace, in friendship with the Soviet Union.

Does American labor have to go through all the bitter experiences and disappointments of its British

brothers (or of the French) before reaching these conclusions of opposition to class collaboration? Wouldn't it be better to *learn* from these experiences and thus save our class and people a great deal of trouble and difficulty?

We are fully aware of the fact that the Murray plan did not meet with much favor (if any) either among Big Business or in the Roosevelt Administration. Big Business does not trust the C.I.O. and is afraid of its progressive and militant organizations. Therefore, any proposal coming from the C.I.O., and containing the slightest possibility of promoting the prestige of that organization, is met with suspicion and antagonism by Big Business. Similar feelings motivate the Roosevelt Administration in its cool attitude towards the Murray plan, and also a desire to retain for Hillman and his clique a sort of monopoly of trade union representation in the industrial war machinery. This desire is part of the general Roosevelt policy of seeking to place the trade union movement under the domination of the Hillmans and Greens and such others from the C.I.O. as will "collaborate." All that is true. And for these reasons many a worker will feel tempted to give the Murray plan a favorable reception, even though uncertain or critical of its main principles of class collaboration.

But that would be taking a short-sighted view. Supposing the plan is accepted by the Government in its entirety, what will happen? For the moment the prestige of the C.I.O. would register a rise, and that

might prove helpful for the achievement of certain gains here and there. But only for a brief moment. Subsequently, and as the months go by, the C.I.O. organizations and those of the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods would be steadily pressed into becoming mere cogs in the industrial war machine, forced to abandon to the war profiteers one labor position after another, producing a layer of reformist trade union bureaucrats working hand in glove with Big Business and its governmental servants, and placing the trade union movement under the virtual domination of this reformist bureaucracy reinforced with semi-governmental authority. How much good does such a perspective bode for the workers and the common people generally? Little good and much evil.

All this is on the assumption that the Murray plan is accepted by the Government and honestly put into effect. But will it? The chances are that the Government will continue to ignore the plan officially, but will realize in practice Murray's main principles of class collaboration, while eliminating from the plan all those objectives which aim to protect labor's economic standards and civil rights. In fact, this is what the Government is already doing. With Hillman's help it has established what looks like an industrial council of the Murray type for the shipbuilding industry—the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee—and is planning a similar committee for the aviation industry. It may try the same thing also in other industries, but without Murray (so far)

and without his expressed objectives of protecting labor's rights and standards.

And why is it relatively so easy for the Government to follow such a course with respect to the Murray plan? Because the plan grants to the Government and the imperialist bourgeoisie *the main things* that they want from labor, namely, "collaboration" for the prosecution of the war and war preparations. Having gotten from Murray this main commitment of support for its war preparation program, the Government feels at greater liberty to ignore what it considers "details" of the plan, such as adequate and more democratic representation of the unions in the defense organization, protection of labor's standards and rights, provision for an adequate supply of consumer goods, etc., etc.

It is, of course, quite possible that under the pressure of labor's independent struggles for the protection of its interests, the Government may begin to display a more favorable attitude to some of these "details" of the Murray plan, but this will happen not because labor followed the plan's policy of class collaboration. No. It will happen because labor followed the policy of class struggle, the policy of rallying the mass of the common people in struggle against the offensive of the imperialists, against the imperialist war and for a people's peace. It will happen in the measure in which labor follows a policy of class independence, industrially, politically and in all other respects.

To give effect to the decisions of

the last national convention of the C.I.O., President Murray has urged its organization to a number of highly important and progressive actions. To mention only a few: actions dealing with the organization of the unorganized, with the struggle against the projected "model" anti-labor bills and against all anti-strike proposals, for the protection and improvement of existing progressive labor legislation and similar measures. This will be a crucial field of struggle in the coming months between the anti-imperialist peace camp of the people and the camp of the imperialists and war-makers. This will include the fight for the repeal of such laws as the Conscription Act, the Alien Registration Act, and the Voorhis Act which outlaws international labor affiliations. It will include the struggle for the adoption of the American Youth Act, sponsored in Congress by Representative Marcantonio, and the Lee-Geyer Bill outlawing the poll tax in the Southern states. All of them are important and vital struggles for labor and its allies.

The C.I.O. continues in the front ranks of these struggles of the people. Its initiative will draw together for common action all sections of the labor movement (the unions of the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods), promoting the alliance of all common people into a united and independent force for peace, freedom and security. But the essential condition for success is firm adherence to an anti-imperialist peace policy and consistent opposition to reformist class collaboration.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN CHILE. LUIS CARLOS PRESTES

THE announced project of Vice-President Henry A. Wallace "to visit each of the Latin American countries" in the near future directs attention once more to the *increasing* concentration of American imperialism upon the economic, political and military subjugation of Latin America. And as this imperialist drive continues to unfold, its predatory and profoundly reactionary character becomes ever more visible to the peoples of Latin America as well as to wide masses in the United States.

We are dealing here, clearly, with a "total" program, an integral part of which is to secure for American imperialism such governments in the Latin American countries as will willingly carry out the commands of the imperialist master in the United States. It is a fact that American imperialism is actively interfering in the internal political affairs of the Latin American countries. It is manipulating the internal political conduct of certain ruling circles in Mexico, and it is trying its hand in Cuba and Chile.

Wall Street and the Roosevelt Administration want puppet governments in Latin America, and for this purpose they are trying to bring about "political realignments" within the various countries to the south of us. That's what it is called by Mr. McCulloch in the current bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association (December 27, 1940).

Taking note of the refusal of the

Popular Front Executive in Chile to break with the Communists, he paints the following perspective:

"So far, the Radicals have shown themselves loath to drop the Communist connection and the Executive Committee of the Popular Front as a whole has refused to take action. In the light of the clearly expressed Socialist attitude, however, this situation can scarcely continue. Should the Popular Front revise its attitude, as the result of an agreement between Socialists and Radicals to throw the Communists overboard, it might then be possible to secure a realignment of political parties in Chile, based on a broad alliance between moderate Leftists and moderate Rightists."

This is what American imperialism is seeking to bring about in Chile, with the aid of such "Socialists" as Schnake & Co. But what is this projected alliance of "moderate" Leftists and Rightists? It is a nice-sounding word for a puppet government, a government based upon such groups and individuals as will take orders from Wall Street and Washington, as will be selling out their country wholesale and retail to the imperialists of the United States. Naturally, no Communist will support such a government, nor will honest democrats and other true friends of their country. That's why American imperialism seeks the break-up of the Popular Front in Chile. It seeks a "realignment" there that will be based upon the reactionary and corrupt groups among the wealthy landlords, bankers, capitalists, combined with the reactionary forces of the church and with such "So-

cialists" as Schnake & Co.

The pretext for such brazen intervention in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries is that the United States cannot feel secure with governments in those countries which are sympathetic to the governments of the tri-power pact—Germany, Italy and Japan. But the truth of the matter is that the basic class forces of the Popular Front in Chile are the most dependable and consistent opponents of these imperialist powers; and if that was really what the Roosevelt Administration wanted in Chile, it couldn't wish for a better political alignment for the national security of the United States. So, what is the matter with the Popular Front? The matter is that it is equally opposed to the imperialism of Wall Street and of the Roosevelt Administration; the matter is that its basic class forces are truly national and are seeking to protect the independence and freedom of their nation, and the well-being of their people, *from all imperialisms* and their native agents, including that of the United States. And that is its crime in the eyes of Wall Street and of the Roosevelt Administration. That is why it has to be "realigned." Wall Street and the Roosevelt Government want puppets there, puppets of American imperialism.

The anti-imperialist forces in the United States have a serious duty in the situation. It is the duty, first of all, of *exposing* these reactionary machinations before the American people. It is also the duty of rendering active support to the struggle of the Latin American peo-

ples for their national independence, freedom and prosperity. To help them is to help ourselves, our own struggle here for peace, freedom and security.

Luis Carlos Prestes, now in a Vargas dungeon in Brazil, is the most beautiful symbol and representative of the national liberation forces in Latin America. Brazil's Knight of Hope, the masses call him. All anti-imperialist and progressive forces in the Americas are now rallying around the struggle for his

liberation, for his ideals and visions. For these are the ideals of the masses of every country in the Americas—the ideals of national freedom, peace and well being of the peoples.

The anti-imperialist and peace movements in the United States can do themselves no greater honor or service than to raise high the banner of Luis Carlos Prestes and fight for his cause—our cause—and for his liberty.

DEFEAT ROOSEVELT'S WAR-POWERS BILL! GET OUT AND STAY OUT OF THE WAR!

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., JANUARY 23, 1941.

FELLOW Americans! Working Men and Women! Youth!

Barely three months have passed since President Roosevelt promised the American people that "We will not participate in foreign wars."

What has happened to that solemn pledge?

This country is already involved in the war and being plunged deeper and deeper into its fiery hell with every passing day.

Now the warmongers and interventionists are going further—they are making America into a full-fledged military belligerent.

This is the sinister meaning of the War-Powers Bill (H.R. 1776) which they are trying to stampede through Congress at this very moment.

Make no mistake. *Our liberties—our very lives—are in imminent peril!*

The War-Powers-Dictatorship Bill would give the Roosevelt Administration a free hand in the waging of its undeclared war. It would lead to a war dictatorship in this country akin to fascism.

Here are the facts:

This Bill would give the President the power to lend or lease unlimited billions of dollars' worth of

armaments and to send naval convoys. But more than that. It would give him the power to "lend" or "lease" the lives of America's youth!

This Bill would put the stamp of Congressional approval on Washington's military alliance with the British Empire. It would give the President *unlimited* authority to enter into other foreign entanglements and secret alliances.

This Bill would cancel the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. It would delegate increased dictatorial powers to the White House. It would nullify and circumvent what is left of the Neutrality and the Johnson Acts.

This Bill would saddle an unbearable burden of new taxes on the backs of America's workers, farmers, professionals and small business people. It would mortgage the future of our youth in the interests of Wall Street and British imperialism.

The War-Powers-Dictatorship Bill is therefore a huge conspiracy to drag America all the way into the war—*through the back door!*

These are the facts!

People of America! Now is the

time to make your voices heard! Now is the time to call a halt to the criminal plot conceived by the crafty minds of the House of Morgan and directed against you and your sons! Now is the time to demand that Congress break up its alliance with the British Empire, the terms of which are a profound secret to the American people! Now is the time to demand that America *get out and stay out* of this second imperialist war!

How is it possible that the War-Powers-Dictatorship Bill may be enacted by Congress? Have not the people of this country time and time again expressed their will for peace? Have they not time and time again repeated: *The Yanks are not coming?* How is it possible?

It is possible, men and women of America, because Roosevelt, like Wilson before him, has deceived and betrayed you.

It is possible because Wall Street and its spokesmen Roosevelt and Willkie have perpetrated a cruel hoax; have deceived millions into believing that this country could take sides in this war and yet keep out of it.

It is possible because these same gentlemen lie to you when they say this is a war for democracy. It is a war for profits, markets, empire!

It is possible because the Hillmans and Greens, the Dubinskys and Thomases, like their Social-Democratic brothers in Europe—the Bevins and Blums—are employing anti-fascist demagogy to conceal their despicable treason to labor.

It is possible because the apostles

of appeasement, the Hoovers and Vandenberg, the Lindberghs and Fords, are confusing the people, are playing Wall Street's game by supporting the Administration's so-called defense program and the whole policy of imperialist expansion and incitements against the Soviet Union.

It is possible because the Wheelers, the Nyes, and the LaFollettes, the spokesmen of isolation, are compromising and weakening the struggle to keep America out of the war by their support of imperialist expansion policies camouflaged as so-called hemisphere and national defense, by their agreement with giving aid to the British imperialists "short of war," and by their attempts to lump communism and fascism together.

It is further possible because the ruling class and its government strives to create war hysteria and war panic; brands all genuine fighters for peace as Fifth Columnists, and resorts to increasing intimidation and coercion in order to outlaw the Communist Party and to crush the labor and anti-war movement.

It is possible, workers and farmers, for still one more reason: because you who *desire* peace so ardently are not united, are not organized into one great people's movement which could command peace.

This is the bitter truth. It must burn itself into the consciousness of every working man and woman. It must arouse the masses to unity and action. *Only the people can save the people!*

The proponents of the monstrous War-Powers-Dictatorship Bill says that unprecedented dictatorial powers must be given the President, that "all out" aid must be given the British Empire as a means of "preserving world democracy."

What brazen gall these gentlemen have! They dare speak of democracy while calling for dictatorship!

Working people, do not be deceived again! This is no more a war for democracy than was the first World War.

Everyone knows and there is no need to repeat the crimes that are Hitler's. We Communists and the American people are against him first, last and all the time. Hitler and German imperialism are waging a war for profits, empire and world domination.

But what about British imperialism? It too fights for profits, empire and world domination. Can anyone honestly claim that British imperialism, which enslaves four hundred and fifty million colonial subjects, is fighting for democracy and in behalf of weaker and small nations? Of course not!

The European conflict is a war between two gangs of thieves; a war in which one gang is muscling in on the territory of the other. In such a war all honest men can but hope and strive for the mutual destruction of both thieving outfits to the mutual benefit of their former victims—the people. For when thieves fall out, honest men get their due.

Nor is this truth unknown to our "own" bandit gang in Wall Street and its "mouthpieces" in Washing-

ton. They favor a policy of "all out" aid to the British Empire in order to prolong the war, to pile up fabulous profits, to defeat their German imperialist rival, and to make of their British ally a junior partner in the Anglo-American imperialist alliance.

The only real difference between the position of the Wall Street interventionists and that of the Wall Street appeasers relates to how best to crush the rival German imperialism while fleecing the rival British imperialism. Such is the honor between thieves. Such are the sordid aims camouflaged with phrases about "saving democracy."

To put one's trust in British or American imperialism is like setting a thief to catch a thief.

Fellow Americans! All of us sympathize with the brave British people who are passing through a living inferno. Do not be misled into believing that aid to British imperialism means aid to the British people. It does not!

The way to aid the British people, and the German people, and all the oppressed and exploited peoples, is by *refusing* to give any aid to either side in this imperialist war. Fascism can only be defeated by defeating imperialism from which it springs as does a boil from a poisoned blood stream. Everything that encourages the people of Britain and Germany to take their fate in their own hands is a blow against the ruling classes responsible for the war and thus a blow for peace.

Let us tell the heroic British people: We sympathize with you in this hour of horror. Your ruling class,

your government, is as responsible as the German ruling class and government for the present war. It enslaves millions. It knifed Spain, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia. It is responsible for Munich, for trying to turn the Nazi beast against the Soviet Union. Get rid of this class and its government! Establish a people's government which will give freedom to your "own" colonies and which can propose and make a just and lasting peace by inspiring the German people to do the same!

But the counterpart of such good advice is practicing what we preach. Our most menacing enemy is not in Europe; it is the war-mad imperialism right here at home.

Look about you, workers and farmers. Look at the travesties being committed in the name of so-called national unity and national defense. Look how the munitions makers and economic royalists are reaping fabulous profits in the name of patriotism. Look how billions upon billions are being spent for war by the same reactionary Congressmen who shouted "bankruptcy" when the unemployed, the aged, the farmers and the youth asked for a little assistance.

But what have you to show, workers and farmers? Higher prices! The loss of export markets for the farmers! Increased discrimination against the Negro people! Regimentation of the youth! Fingerprinting and hounding of the foreign born! Threats to outlaw strikes! A growth of intolerance and vigilanteism! And soon—death to your sons!

This is the balance sheet.

No! It must not be! The workers and farmers, the people of America, have nothing to gain from war. Only the Morgans, the Rockefellers and du Ponts—only the imperialist scavengers—feast on the blood of imperialist war.

"But," shout the warmongers, "the world has shrunk, our very shores are threatened." Once again they lie. Geography is not the cause of war—but imperialism is! This is the lesson that must be learned. If the Soviet Union can remain neutral and at peace when surrounded by two major wars, then certainly the United States which is surrounded by two oceans can do likewise. But only one thing is lacking for this—an anti-imperialist, an anti-war government and policy. Such a government would cooperate with the greatest force for peace in the world—the Soviet Union. For hostility against the Soviet Union is but one side of hostility to peace.

Towards such a government, towards such a policy, the American people must march.

Americans all! Native and foreign born! Negro and white! Christian and Jew!

You and you alone have the power to paralyze the hands of the war-makers!

You and you alone can defeat the war plot of the economic royalists!

Speak up now! Let your voices thunder forth condemnation of the betrayers of the people!

Defeat the War-Powers Bill! Send telegrams and letters of protest to your Senator and Congressman! Raise this question in your trade

union and club! Bury Washington in an avalanche of protest!

Only by action now, only by united organized opposition, can you hinder and ultimately stop the war-makers, can you win peace and security for yourselves and your children.

Get out and stay out of the imperialist war!

Break up Washington's alliance with British imperialism.

Unite against every step to further involve us in this criminal blood-bath!

Friendship with the Soviet Union!

Full aid to the Chinese people!

For a true good neighbor policy to Latin America! Independence for Puerto Rico and the Philippines!

Stop war profiteering! Make the rich pay the armaments burden!

Raise wages and lower the cost of living! Increase aid to the farmers, unemployed, aged and youth!

Protect labor's right to organize and strike!

Defend the rights of the Communist Party! No blackout of the Bill of Rights!

End discrimination, Jim-Crowism and anti-Semitism!

Defeat the War-Powers Bill!

THE PEOPLE vs. THE 77TH CONGRESS

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

AS THE 77th Congress opens, the demagogic declarations of "keeping the country at peace" and of pursuing a policy "short of war" have been further exposed by a series of events, following fast one upon the other. Foremost among these is the War Powers Bill (H.R. 1776) which is a virtual declaration of war and turns over to the President war-time dictatorial powers. Equally important is the unprecedented establishment of a three-ocean navy which Secretary of Navy Knox declares "is just a rearrangement which really fits the fact." What facts? Mr. Virgil Jordan, President of the National Industrial Conference Board, supplied the facts, when he declared in an address before the Investment Bankers Association:

"America has embarked upon a career of imperialism, both in world affairs and in every other aspect of her life. . . . Southward in our hemisphere and westward in the Pacific the path of empire takes its way."

Equally indicative was the President's budget proposal to Congress. Roosevelt's budget of \$17,500,000,-000 derives from the main features

of his message to Congress and exposes the hypocrisy of that message. Although almost as large as that of 1919, the President's budget promises to be enlarged by a supplementary budget of unknown proportions to finance the "all aid" policy to British imperialism. In the present budget, 62 per cent is openly allocated to war purposes. Every other item which has any connection with the war program is increased, as, for instance, the F.B.I., the Immigration Service charged with hounding non-citizens, and the interest to the bankers on the public debt. The only cuts are those affecting the workers and farmers. That which in the past caused the economic royalists to hate Roosevelt is now being systematically eliminated. The W.P.A. is cut by \$400,000,000; the deficiency appropriation for the W.P.A. for the current year is slashed by \$100,000,000 below what is needed to maintain the present level of employment; the P.W.A. is reduced by \$43,000,000, and the Federal Works Agency by \$30,000,000; the farmers suffer a cut of \$187,000,000 as compared to last year, including a reduction of \$25,000,000 in the fund available for rehabilitation loans to farmers.

The farmers and unemployed suffer jointly in a cut of \$35,000,000 in the food stamp plan which met such an enthusiastic reception in many cities. This budget is an example of the Roosevelt program of "sacrifice." Sacrifice for the workers and farmers; fabulous profits for the banks and corporations.

But the thirst of the capitalists is never slaked. They demand greater slashes in these social services. They no longer worry about the increase in the national debt, so long as it is poured into the corporations through war orders or into the banks in the form of interest. *The New York Times* expresses this point of view when it declares:

"We can be certain that Congress will not withhold a single dollar necessary for defense. The assurance we really need lie elsewhere."

In what direction does the "elsewhere" of the *Times* lie? We are quickly told in the same editorial that: "if we are to discard the notion of business as usual, we must also discard the notion of non-defense spending as usual. Though the need for a sharp reversal of the trend of Federal fiscal policy in recent years stands out . . . the President has proposed economies which are wholly unimpressive." Clearly, monopoly capital, under the fake slogan of "national defense," demands that *now* is the time to intensify the war against the toiling people and their organizations.

The Scripps-Howard staff writer, John W. Love, pictures the mad rush towards a Hitlerite war economy in the United States, writing

that: "Guns are moving in ahead of butter so swiftly that the change may be watched, from one day to another."

The repeated warnings of the Communist Party have again been substantiated.

*The People's Will No Concern
for Congress*

Will the 77th Congress be remembered by tens of millions of Americans as the Congress of war and reaction? That question looms large as this session, captained by the warmongering Roosevelt, convenes. If this is to be the record of the session, it will be indelibly written in the minds of those who will suffer the agonies of imperialist war, who will find themselves prisoners in concentration camps and factories, who will be compelled to accept lower wages, longer hours, and the scrapping of all social legislation. These experiences and the struggle connected with them will teach the masses of the people the connection between war and capitalism, so that, under working class leadership, they will increasingly turn to a socialist solution of their problems. Today in Europe, millions understand that only by following the example of the workers in the Soviet Union, only through socialism, can a true people's peace be brought about.

These developments arouse the fury of the American bourgeoisie. But this ruling class and its government in Washington, as Earl Browder declared: "Make their plans without sufficient consideration of the American working class,

the American people. The American masses have different aspirations and ideas, not represented by Sidney Hillman. They [the capitalists] have taken the nation on the 'path of Empire' only by the most brazen and cynical deception. As they awaken to the truth the American masses will brush those plans aside. Let 1941 be the year of the great awakening!"

The composition of the present Congress is proof that the will of the American people will not be its chief concern. In its great majority it is composed of corporation lawyers, reactionary agents of the Southern landlords and various other flunkeys of capitalism. Most of the key positions in it are in the hands of poll-tax "statesmen," such as Senator Harrison of Mississippi; Senator George of Georgia; Representative Sumners of Texas, aided by Representatives Dies of Texas, Smith of Virginia, and Hobbs of Alabama. While there will be a few new faces, the present Congress will continue the pro-war and anti-labor policies of the last Congress. Thus, Arthur Krock stated in *The New York Times* of January 5:

"Since Congress last heard from Mr. Roosevelt—that was the 76th Congress, which is substantially the foundation of this one—world events have moved the country much closer to the brink of war."

The New York Times' news review of the same date declared:

"The 76th Congress, which last week came quietly to an end, wrote the legislation that was the basis for an armament effort unparal-

leled since World War days. The continuance of that work promised to be the principal task before the new Congress."

The keynote of a united reactionary bourgeoisie was sounded by the President himself in his message to Congress:

"We must all prepare to make the sacrifices that the emergency—as serious as war itself—demands. Whatever stands in the way of speed and efficiency in defense preparations must give way to the national need. . . . To change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements of peace to a basis of war-time production of implements of war is no small task. . . ."

Conveniently forgetting the promises of "peace" and "no war" which both candidates proffered lavishly during the election campaign, Roosevelt now admits:

"In the recent national election, there was no substantial difference between the two great parties in respect to the national policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate."

While it is true that there are no "substantial differences" between the two old parties of capitalism on the burning issues of the day—war, imperialist expansion, and attacks on labor and democratic rights—neither party presented its true program to the people. Even today in the course of this most war-like of his utterances to date—a virtual call to arms—Roosevelt still talks of "that high concept," of a new "moral order."

He even talks glibly of "revolution" and a new "world order," and still refers hypocritically to old-age pensions, unemployment insurance and adequate medical care, all of which he has stabbed in the back.

This 77th Congress, with but a few honorable exceptions in its midst, will be responsive to the demands of Wall Street and its Roosevelt government. This does not mean that the people can disregard this Congress or adopt a fatalistic attitude towards it. On the contrary, it means that labor must undertake a more intensive mobilization of the people's strength, outside of Congress, for a program of peace, security and democratic rights. This will make its might felt inside of Congress; but irrespective of the outcome there, labor must keep its forces intact and persist in mobilizing the progressive forces to intensify the struggle for this program.

Wall Street and Roosevelt Have Anti-People's Program

Before this Congress convened, monopoly capital, through its various spokesmen, had already outlined its program. Whatever differences exist involve only sectional interests of the bourgeoisie, or the degree of speed and intensity in fulfilling the general program of war and reaction. To sell this program to Congress is the job of the President in his message and his budget recommendations. To carry through these recommendations is the job of the leaders of both major parties in Congress. To sell the program to the workers and tie the

labor organizations to the imperialist program of Wall Street is the primary job of the labor bureaucrats and Social-Democrats of all hues—the Greens, Hillmans, Freys, Van Bittners, Reuthers, etc. Each has his role in the general division of labor. As against all of these, it is necessary to mobilize the majority of the people and especially labor, the farmers, the Negro people, the unemployed and the youth, around the slogans of peace, security, democratic rights and defense of labor organizations; it is essential that a many-sided struggle be waged in their defense. This is the job of every progressive force, primarily the Communists.

Let us examine briefly the program which monopoly capital wants to set before Congress and the extent to which it is being carried out. We must always remember that the foundations of the present program of war, imperialist expansion and attacks on democratic rights and labor organizations were already laid during the past year.

The central objective of monopoly capital is to place the country on a war footing, ready to participate in the present imperialist war. Thus, Wall Street's trade and expansionist interests will be furthered and huge war profits will be reaped. When the capitalists talk among themselves and not for public consumption, they drop all pretenses of defending democracy or of struggling for a new "moral order." Three examples shows this clearly:

1. *The Army and Navy Journal* declared on August 24, 1940:

"The inevitable conclusion to be

drawn from these developments is that the U.S.A. has moved to the point where it is committed to assist the British Empire. . . . Only the blind can fail to see that the U.S. is rapidly moving toward participation in the world struggle . . . [for] an empire greater than any which history has ever known."

2. The *United States News* stated on December 27:

"Roosevelt . . . is pointing the national policy toward a world leadership, towards a merger of British and American interests. What Roosevelt sees: England, even if saved, will be unable to maintain an immense fleet and a large army; will be unable to hold together the British Empire. The U.S. will be in a position to inherit much of the British power, will then become the senior partner in empire, with Britain, the junior partner."

3. Mr. Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board stated on December 10:

"Whatever the facts about this war may have been or are now, it must be unmistakably clear to any intelligent person that we are engaged in it. . . . Even the job of winning the war, with England or alone, is only part of the task to which America has committed herself for the future. Whatever the outcome of the war, America has embarked upon a career of imperialism, both in world affairs and in every other aspect of life. . . . Even though by our aid, England should emerge from this struggle without defeat, she will be so impoverished economically and crippled in prestige that it is improbable she will be able to resume or maintain the

dominant position in world affairs which she has long occupied. At best, England will become a junior partner in a new Anglo-Saxon imperialism, in which the economic resources and the military and naval strength of the U.S. will be the center of gravity. . . . We have no alternative, in truth, than to move along the road we have been traveling in the past quarter century, in the direction which we took with the conquest of Cuba and the Philippines and our participation in the last World War. . . . All this is what lies beneath the phrase 'national defense'—some of it deeply hidden, some of it near the surface and soon to emerge to challenge us."

In line with these very frank objectives, the 76th Congress went into action and adopted peace-time conscription against the wishes of the nation. President Roosevelt, without even asking Congress, negotiated the destroyer-naval base deal, the American-Canadian agreement, the shipment of tanks to Canada and bombers to Britain. The line of action as the 77th Congress meets was traced in the Roosevelt message to Congress:

"The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily—almost exclusively to meeting this foreign peril [to American markets and imperialist expansion]. For all our domestic problems are now a part of the great emergency."

Much franker was the editorial declaration of *Business Week* on January 4: "To be blunt about it, the United States has become a military state."

Unless the organized might of the American people puts a halt to it, the War Powers Bill will actually revise the Johnson Act prohibiting loans to foreign countries in default on their debts, give full power to the President to carry out every measure of war, short of the actual declaration. This bill itself is an indirect declaration of war; for it gives the President dictatorial powers to:

“(1) . . . manufacture in arsenals, factories and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. (2) To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend or otherwise dispose of to any such government any defense article. (3) To test, inspect, repair, outfit, recondition or otherwise to place in good working order any defense article for any such government.”

The cost of this is expected to run from five to ten billion additional dollars for 1941 alone. Efforts will be made to get approval for having these armaments convoyed to Britain with American naval vessels. Military training at home will be speeded up and a new proposal will come before Congress to make conscription permanent.

The War Powers Bill dramatizes the fact that as far as the ruling class is concerned, the country is already in the war. The dictatorial war powers of the President will extend to putting the “workers in uniform,” prohibiting strikes and practically adopting a system of forced labor in the factories. The

struggle to get the country out of the war and stay at peace can be effectively organized by the broadest mass mobilization for the defeat of this War Powers Bill. This issue lends itself to arouse the majority of the people led by labor, who actually stand for peace, in demonstrative actions far exceeding even the mass movement which developed against the proposed conscription bill. The speed with which the ruling class and their Roosevelt Administration is plunging the country into war brooks no delay. The actions of the people and labor must take on an emergency character.

The War Program Demands Attack on Labor Conditions and Democratic Rights

An integral part of the program of monopoly capital is to give every aid to the war-makers while attacking the living conditions and the organizations of labor and the people. Here also a beginning was made in the 76th Congress, although the militant fight of labor, primarily the C.I.O., defeated a number of pending bills. On this score the capitalists have grown more careful in their utterances, since it is harder to cover up these attacks by demagogy and deceit. Nevertheless, their proposals and their actions make clear their intentions.

The Brookings Institute, in a recent report submitted to the U.S. War Department, calls for control of wages “if rising wage rates are not to bring higher costs, with inflationary results.” It further asks that “all restrictions on production

and hours, such as those administered . . . under the Walsh-Healey Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, should be suspended for the duration of the war."

The *United States News* recently called on Congress to lengthen the working week to fifty hours or more. *Business Week* of November 9 declares:

" . . . no matter how the defense program is financed, the end result is that ultimately people may have to work harder without compensating increase in consumption goods. That situation calls for delicate handling from the White House."

Thus, the *New York Sun*, on January 11, declared editorially:

" . . . more work is our imminent and overwhelming need . . . anything that prevents more work is an evil. . . . We may be compelled to give up part of the butter we want in order to get all the guns we must have."

This is a brazen declaration that defense of the present working conditions, standards of living and labor legislation by the trade unions will be "an evil" that must be uprooted.

Mr. Virgil Jordan is much bolder when he declares (in the cited speech):

"Recent studies by the Conference Board indicate that, even if we were to be spending or investing as much as fifteen billion a year on armaments, as we did during a full years of the last World War, we could squeeze that much or more out of the consumption and savings of the community at the current national income level. . . . However it

is made, everyone in the community must consciously or unconsciously participate in this investment . . . even the unemployed, whether they know it or not."

A good start in achieving this program was made during the life of the 76th Congress either by action of Congress or administrative decree of the President. It is enough to recall the cut in relief and W.P.A. appropriations, the rescinding of the law limiting profits in war contracts, the disregarding of the existing labor laws in awarding war contracts, the appointment of William Leiserson and Dr. Harry A. Millis to the National Labor Relations Board, the appointment of Hillman and his "Labor" Advisory Board, the suspension of the eight-hour-day law in all work on the newly acquired naval bases in the Caribbean.

The unfinished business on this slate will be resumed in the 77th Congress. The Roosevelt message to Congress sounds the keynote:

"We must all prepare to make the sacrifices that the emergency—as serious as war itself—demands. Whatever stands in the way of speed and efficiency in defense preparations must give way to the national need. . . . A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my budget message I recommend that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today."

The proposed budget with its slashes of all social services is an appropriate sequel to this message.

Indicative of what will come be-

fore the 77th Congress are the bills proposing prohibition of strikes, life imprisonment for strike leaders, compulsory arbitration, revision of the Wagner Act and the Wages-and-Hours Act, broadening the base of the tax structure and the projected bills for a national sales tax for defense purposes, the issuance of defense bonds to which everyone will be compelled to subscribe, and the Federal Reserve Board proposal that the savings now on deposit be drawn on to float loans to finance the so-called defense program.

Not to be forgotten in the program of monopoly capital is its determination further to curtail democratic rights and civil liberties, and especially to intensify its attacks against the progressive labor leaders and the Communist Party. The 76th Congress in this, as in other respects, started the ball rolling. The Voorhis Act, the Alien Registration Act, the activity of the Dies Committee and the persecution of leading Communists, particularly Earl Browder, were all indicative of the course of Wall Street and its Washington government. The President in his Congressional message gives a lead on this question by branding every proponent of peace and every defender of the rights of labor and civil liberties as a "slacker and trouble-maker":

"The best way of dealing with the few slackers or trouble-makers in our midst is, first, to shame them by patriotic example, and, if that fails, to use the sovereignty of government to save government."

This is a polite way of threaten-

ing the majority of the American people with concentration camps, the F.B.I. and the vigilante mob, if they do not "fall in line" with the policies of Wall Street and Roosevelt.

Already before Congress are bills for concentration camps for alien "agitators," for indeterminate sentences in "criminal" cases, for outlawing the Communist Party, for continuing the Dies Committee, and a host of others.

The Role of American Social-Democratism

This is the picture of the 77th Congress facing the American people. Both old parties are firmly in the grip of Wall Street, and the people can no more look to this Congress than they can to the Roosevelt government to represent their will. From the very outset of these present developments, the Communist Party has made the only consistent and clear analysis and exposure of the war policy, as it is now revealed, of monopoly capital and its Roosevelt government. Every warning given has been justified a hundred times over. The present trend of the American capitalist class, unless checked by a tremendous upsurge from below of the American people, is leading towards an American form of the very fascist regime of Hitler which they hypocritically claim to oppose. The Congress will become more and more a mere rubber stamp for approving accomplished deeds by a dictatorial President or his appointed commissions, such as the Office of Production Management

(O.P.M.), headed by Knudsen and Hillman.

The "guns-not-butter" type of economy of Hitler and Goering is translated in American terms to read "everything in our national life must be subordinated to the necessity of defense," as Roosevelt's message to Congress put it. Two days later this was followed by a blunt warning from the O.P.M. that "labor avoid any attempt to make improper use of its position in the present worldwide emergency."

We see here the lengths to which Hillmanism—the crassest American form of Social-Democratism—extends. In Germany, a Hindenburg-Braun combination paved the road for Hitler. In France, a Daladier-Blum-Jouhaux combination paved the road to the Petain-Laval brand of fascism. In Great Britain, a Chamberlain-Citrine combination approved Munich and paved the road to the present imperialist war policy, conducted by a Churchill-Bevin combination. So history repeats itself in the U.S. with Hillman, Green and Co. as active organizers of imperialist war and attacks against the labor movement. We may soon expect a return visit of a Hillman or a Green to England in exchange for the help of "the labor knight" Sir Walter Citrine, with his message to the American workers of longer hours and intensified speed-up. The leaders of the Building and Metal Trades Union of the A. F. of L. have already gone Samuel Gompers, of World War I fame, one better. While Gompers waited till the country was already at war before making his treacherous no-strike prom-

ises, his 1941 prototypes have given "guarantees" ahead of time. Of the same pattern is the action of the Socialist-led C.I.O. shipyard workers' and Aluminum Workers' Unions with their anti-Communist resolutions, which can only result in weakening these unions in their struggle against the war-profiteering corporations. It is to the credit of the C.I.O. Executive Board that, at its recent meeting, it refused to be blackjacked into similar no-strike pledges. American labor and the entire American people, remembering the lessons of Social-Democracy in Germany, France, Great Britain, and Czechoslovakia, must wage a merciless struggle against its American brand.

The People Must Be Rallied Behind Their Own Program

The welfare of the American people demands a different type of program from that placed before this Congress by President Roosevelt and supported by both the Republican and Democratic parties. The most complete formulation of this People's Program was presented in the 1940 election platform of the Communist Party. In a more limited and unclear way it is finding expression in the legislative proposals of the C.I.O., of the national Labor's Non-Partisan League and of John L. Lewis, in the resolutions of local trade unions, of old-age pension groups, and in the American Youth Congress.

What are the main outlines of such an immediate People's Program to fit the conditions of today?

1. Defeat the Wall Street war

program of "all out" aid to Britain, whether in the form of the Roosevelt-Willkie "lease-lend" program or the Taft-Landon form of a billion dollar loan to Britain; defeat the military dictatorship War Powers Bill; declare American must remain at peace. Give active aid to China, and bring about the establishment of friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

2. Stop Wall Street interference in the affairs of the peoples of Central and South America.

3. Repeal the Conscription Act and pending that make adequate provisions for the families of the conscripts; guarantee return employment and protection of the social security rights of every conscript.

4. Prohibit war profiteering; enact a real excess profits tax, no new consumers' taxes, and no broadening of the base of the present income tax.

5. Protect the freedom and independence of the trade unions and their right to strikes; strengthen and extend the present labor laws instead of revising them.

6. Expand the purchasing power of the people by extending the Social Security program, specifically increasing aid to the unemployed, the aged, the poor farmers and the youth.

7. Guarantee and defend in struggle all democratic rights; stop the drive against the Communists, militant labor leaders, and all anti-war forces; refuse new appropriations for the Dies Committee; abolish the F.B.I.

8. Adopt the anti-poll tax bills

and wipe out poll tax representation in Congress; pass the Anti-Lynching Bill.

9. Curb the monopolies through limitation of prices and increased taxation, and thus lower the rising cost of living.

10. Increase wages, shorten working hours, and slow down the speed-up in the factories through a vigorous drive of all workers and their unions.

The mobilization of support for such a program in every locality is a central task today. Only to the extent that it takes on mass proportions can it be effective in intervening in the affairs of the 77th Congress and in upsetting the Wall Street-Roosevelt plans. Such movements should not base themselves exclusively on an approach to Congress. Wherever possible, they must direct themselves toward the newly-convened state legislatures, which have all received recommendations from Attorney General Jackson to adopt anti-strike and so-called Home Guard legislation, plus the crop of anti-labor legislation which will be included in the messages of the various governors.

The forms of this activity cannot follow any one pattern. They will range from actions by local unions, through delegations from various districts to Congressmen and state legislators and should include meetings of Congressmen and state legislators convened by labor. In their higher stages they may well assume the form of state and national legislative conferences of all labor, anti-war and people's organizations.

Above all, it must not be left to individual protests or committee action. The mass of the American workers and the people must be involved. It must be a people's action led by labor.

Economic Struggle Lay Foundations for Broader Political Struggles

The developing mood of economic struggle among the workers in various parts of the country lays the foundations for broader political struggles. It is not yet an even development in all sections or industries of the country; and it is hampered by the confusion still existing as to the imperialist character of the war preparations and obstructed by the misleadership of Roosevelt's labor lieutenants. But it is definitely an upward trend. That most of the workers participating in these struggles were found voting in the Roosevelt column on November 5 simply means that, although misled on election day, they are now willing and ready to fight for their demands and rights. Of further significance in this development is the growing number of department strikes and stoppages occurring in the steel mills, automobile, rubber and electrical plants, which are never recorded either in the papers or in the union publicity.

With proper union leadership this mood of struggle can develop into such a wave of unionization and activity that it will help tear away the mask from Roosevelt and his Social-Democratic assistants and show them in their true role as

agents of Wall Street and its war program. The opposition of the employers, Government and labor leaders of the Hillman-Green-Frey-Van Bittner-Reuther type to these demands of the workers; the threat of state and national legislation against strikes, for lengthening the work-week, etc.; the no-strike pledge of the twenty-five A. F. of L. International Union Executives; and the general hue and cry of "labor must sacrifice" while the employers are piling up exorbitant profits, may well lead the workers to an understanding of the real imperialist character of the war, the fraudulent "defense" character of the war program of Wall Street. That is why these present moods of struggle among the workers are so important. They can become the key to a deeper class consciousness on the broad class issues of the day. Those labor leaders who come to the defense, directly or indirectly, of the employers and the war-mongering Administration will be exposed, while the workers and local labor leaders who were in a minority before election day when they opposed endorsement of Roosevelt will be supported by the workers in ever larger numbers.

To make this year of the 77th Congress "the year of the great awakening" (Browder) it is necessary:

1. To analyze and understand the main trends at work and not be misled by superficial tendencies or demagoguery;

2. To unmask Roosevelt and his Social-Democratic aids in the labor movement, without which no sub-

stantial progress in the struggle against war and capitalism can be made;

3. To stimulate and guide the developing moods of struggle and unionization among the workers; to use these experiences for deepening their class understanding and directing their wrath and struggle against American finance capital and its program of war, imperialist expansion and attacks on labor and democratic rights;

4. To popularize the Land of Socialism and its achievements and explain how it is a great potential ally for peace for the American people; to make the American workers conscious of their responsibility in defending the interests of the peoples of Latin America and

in fighting for the complete independence of these people from the iron heel of Wall Street.

5. To spread the message and teachings of the Communist Party to new millions; to strengthen the organizational ties of the Party with the masses, especially in the basic industries and shops, and to hold high the banner of peace, social security, civil liberties and socialism, always confident of the understanding and continuous development of our class.

6. To understand, as Earl Browder says, that "the key to every problem of our Party lies in the working masses of the people, in our correct scientific program, and the organic union between the two."

EDUCATION AND THE WAR

BY EARL BROWDER

THE war program has finally caught up with the schools. In the higher schools it has already made considerable headway. According to a recent issue of *School and Society*, "when measures for national defense were initiated in the late summer and early fall, universities and colleges throughout the United States promptly undertook their share." The professional journals have lost no time in examining "The Role of the Educator in the Present War Crisis," and determining the exact function of the teacher in the "defense" program. They have even coined their own special slogan: "Educational preparedness is a vital part of national preparedness." Indeed, one college president discovered that the war has given "new meaning and deepened dignity to our profession," and prayed that the educators would "not be found wanting!" (*School and Society*, December 21, 1940, p. 645.) To avoid such a possibility, he proposed that the educator assume the role of popularizing the "positive" aspects of democracy and reviving the gospel of sacrifice.

Here we have the immediate significance of the shameful spectacle now disgracing our educational sys-

tem. Under the pretext of combating subversive activities, the rulers of America are seeking to harness the schools to the war machine, a task which cannot be accomplished without the suppression of all that is progressive in the realm of education. In this respect, the events in the educational field are only a replica of what is happening in every sector of American life. If they appear to be more shocking, it is only because of the high regard Americans have for education and the general misconception that our schools are exempt from the vulgar influences of the more material realms of life.

Nevertheless, the simple fact remains that our schools are under assault both from within and without, an assault more sweeping and broader in the objectives than appears on the surface. Although it has already assumed serious proportions, it is only in its beginnings and promises to merge the separate and at present independent attacks into a nationwide and centrally directed drive against the whole educational system. The Rapp-Coudert "investigation" of the New York schools, allegedly for subversive activities, is only a sample of what

awaits the school system of the entire country.

If our educational system, which has never recovered from the effects of the 1929 crash, has displayed any hopeful, positive features during the past decade, it has been in the growth of teacher unionization, the vigor of the progressive student movement and the extension of progressive educational principles. But it is these very elements of vitality and growth that are the target of the present drive. Summarized more fully, the objectives of this drive may be stated as follows: (1) To destroy the teachers' unions which bring teachers within the orbit of the labor movement; (2) To remove the schools as centers of progressive, democratic education, preventing their participation in the people's movements; (3) To transform them into bulwarks of reaction and instruments of Wall Street's war program; (4) To beat down resistance to the plan to scrap higher education for the masses; (5) To abolish academic freedom and students' progressive movements; (6) To "coordinate" all textbooks in full harmony with the reactionary outlook of the National Association of Manufacturers.

As a matter of fact, the N.A.M. is assuming the leadership of this drive through its project to control all social science textbooks. Like the Rapp-Coudert Committee, and for the same reasons, it is anxious to purge the schools of even the mildest criticism of capital and its disastrous stewardship of American economy. Of course, to mask this effort to subvert the truth and enslave the mind, it pretends to be

combating subversive activities in the well-known style of the burglar who shouts, "Stop thief!"

The bigoted and benighted forces and vested interests that have rallied for this job, the sinister purposes behind it, the arbitrary, star-chamber procedure and the yellow-dog demands for union membership lists testify to the reactionary character of this drive. But even more than this, they testify to the reactionary character of the whole "defense" program which releases and multiplies, not democratic, creative energies, but reactionary persecution of all the vital, progressive forces and trends in our educational system. They only provide additional evidence, in the important field of education, of the enormous duplicity that characterizes the gap between the words and deeds of our ruling circles infected with the fever of "manifest destiny" and blind to everything but the conquest of world empire.

* * *

Capitalism in its decline is especially hostile to popular, democratic culture; the only perspective it holds out for it is one of decay and death. The war program, which is itself only an expression of the mortal crisis of capitalism, has merely brought the matter to a head and accelerated the drive against popular education. This mood and temper of our ruling circles is best expressed by the New York Chamber of Commerce in its shameless declaration not so long ago that there are too many schools in America. The ruling class does not regard education as a development of the

intellectual powers of man, the enrichment of human personality. It measures the value of education purely by what it contributes to the maintenance of its rule, the extent to which it promotes its profits and policies; anything beyond that is evil, wasteful, useless, and dangerous, especially if it really educates the masses to the truth.

The great State of New York, the richest in the country, provides the most striking example of the combined effect of the all-devouring war program and the general decline of capitalism on the school system. Instead of extending the educational opportunities and facilities, the New York school system will drop two hundred and twenty-five classes starting with the spring term on February 3. The announcement of Dr. Campbell, Superintendent of Schools, which revealed this cultural retrogression, estimated that \$500,000 a year would thus be saved. He admitted that the outlook for prospective teachers in the New York school system was bleak and he expected that the time might come in the near future when even regular teachers would have to be placed on preference lists, something unprecedented in the history of the New York schools.

Dr. Campbell attempted to justify this reduction on the ground that for a decade the elementary schools have been losing an average of 20,000 pupils a year and that the decrease has now begun also in the academic high schools. The strong suggestion of a threat against the teachers in his statistics does not alter the basic significance of the consolidation of classes and reduc-

tion of teaching staff. Not only do his figures indicate an underlying process of social decline, but they are directly related to the war economy and are characteristic of its slashing of social expenditures. With schools overcrowded and with at least a third of them unfit for occupation, the war-economy gentlemen see no need for new classes and new teachers. Their slogan is "Save on schools and spend it for war." Youth that is being prepared for imperialist cannon-fodder obviously needs no culture!

Facts like these, of course, take the starch out of the exalted phrases and "noble sentiments" about preserving the freedom of the human spirit which are offered as the moral justification for support to Wall Street's war program. They expose the essential demagogy of a book-writing Vice President who only recently introduced a chapter in his volume on *The American Choice* with a sentence from Thomas Jefferson which reads: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Above all, these facts show the real purpose behind the investigation of alleged subversive activities by Communists in the schools.

* * *

It is necessary to note that, in order to conceal this purpose, these "investigators" do not hesitate to misrepresent the position of the Communists in relation to the public schools. This misrepresentation is not due to the failure of the Communist Party to make its views

known. As far back as January, 1935, I expressed the official position of our Party in an article written for *The Social Frontier*. That article represented the basic position of our Party then and it represents our basic and official position today. In substance it declared: The educational system is involved in the general crisis of capitalism. Progressive educators must join in the fight against fascism and cultural reaction. In this way, by tying up with the labor movement and appealing to the masses, they can further their struggle for progressive teaching and combat reaction inside the schools which is part of the general social struggle. But the school is not the place where fundamental political questions will be answered and it certainly is not the place where the basic issues of the class struggle will be resolved. The Communist Party merely asks the educators to join in the fight against cultural reaction, but as far as its fundamental revolutionary outlook is concerned, "the Communist Party has its own educational work, its own educational institutions, to conduct this specific task of indoctrination, and does not look toward any other body to do it."

What does this position show? To anyone not merely looking for pretexts for persecution but interested in establishing the truth, it shows that the Communist Party does not have a conspiratorial attitude toward the schools. It merely establishes the well-known fact that the school is part of society and its social struggles and that progress must be defended in the educational field as in every field. It shows fur-

ther that Communists maintain that the social issues will be decided in life, in the economic and political arenas, that is, outside the classroom. It starts from the premise that the proletariat is the social class that will lead the struggle for socialism, and that the main task of Communists as the most advanced section of the proletariat is to play a leading role in uniting the working class in defense of its economic and political interests and in the struggle to abolish exploitation and oppression. On this basis, it draws the general conclusion that the working class will be educated and will come to understand the correctness of the Communist program and the need for socialism only in the course of its practical struggle in defense of its daily needs. Finally, it establishes the principle that the Communists who owe their advanced position to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism can master these teachings only with the help of their own Marxist-Leninist educational institutions.

The significant thing about this whole position, which can be found outlined again and again in all the basic writings of Marxism-Leninism, is that it stakes its acceptance on publicly verifiable facts; it trusts its fate to the living experience of millions of people, submitting to the most inexorable of all tests, the final judgment of the masses based on the bitter experience of life. The Communists derive their strength from objective truth, and this truth is public, wide open, reproduced a million times over in the life of every toiler, every human being. It is grounded in the material, objec-

tive conditions of society, and it is these conditions, in the last analysis, that assert themselves with all the overriding force of a law of nature.

Marxism simply says that the people can get along better without capitalists, landlords and exploiters; that all their troubles flow from the system of capitalist private property and production for profit; and that if they want a peaceful, happy and prosperous life, they will have to change the system. Indeed, all the material and social prerequisites for such a change have long been at hand, and this change can no more be prevented, once the majority of people are ready to make it, than darkness can be kept from being dispelled by the sun.

The Rapp-Coudert Committee may never know it, but the conditions produced by the capitalist "way of life" are the worst offenders against the best laid plans of the capitalist ruling class. If Marxist ideas take hold of the people, it is because these conditions confirm the correctness of the Marxist analysis and the necessity of the Communist program. The whole Rapp-Coudert falsification of the Communist position is based on a contempt for the people and for the truth and the very possibility of objective knowledge. It rests on the cynical assumption that the masses can be indoctrinated with any kind of notions regardless of their merit or objective truth. Such an assumption is appalling in its implications. Indeed, only a ruling class which knows that the ideas it seeks to indoctrinate have nothing to do with the truth can pretend that the people will keep on absorbing any ideas

regardless of whether they stand the test of thought and experience.

Anyone who is really serious about freedom of the human mind must permit the truth to prevail whether he likes it or not. He must follow the truth wherever its conclusions may lead, regardless of vested interests. That is the spirit of objective science; and that is the theoretical and practical substance of any position that professes to adhere to Jefferson's oath of "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." In that case, however, such a person must either disprove the Communist position on its merits or cease posing before the world as a champion of the liberty of the human spirit.

Needless to say, this is the last thing the reactionary "investigators" of alleged Communist activity in the schools are willing to do. Their task is of a different order, and they operate on a different plane than that of inquiring into the merit or truth of Marxism-Leninism.

They are so little concerned with the merits of anyone's position that they regard everyone as a Communist, regardless of his adherence to Marxism-Leninism, as long as he displays even the shadow of a progressive idea. The attack against social science textbooks, for example, an attack which has continued since the middle of 1939, is not a drive against Communist textbooks. There are no Communist textbooks in the public school system, regrettably; let us not forget that. The texts that have been under fire are written by people, some of whom have themselves been out-Red-baiting the Red-baiters. Despite this, they have

not been able to save themselves from the onslaught of reaction, and by their own Red-baiting have only helped to feed the attack against the underlying principle of progressive thought which is the object of the drive. This basic principle was summarized quite clearly, even if not exhaustively, in an editorial in the railroad workers' paper, *Labor*, in its issue of September 10, 1940. It said:

"To put it bluntly, children must not be permitted to discover that our own national income is so distributed that millions starve while a few indulge in profligate spending, and that one reason labor unions are formed is to assist in righting this lamentable condition. To give the boys and girls these facts 'might warp their minds. . . .'"

This campaign against even mildly liberal textbooks was originally launched by Blanton, Martin Dies' colleague from Texas, in 1934, when, as a member of the House Committee on District of Columbia

Affairs, he waged a fight against a book by Professor George Counts. He made life so miserable for Counts that the latter began a steady retreat, and ended up virtually an intellectual prisoner of Dies, capitulating completely and making his peace with the powers that be. That is far from an edifying spectacle, but it demonstrates how reaction works, breaking down character and step by step driving people into the swamp.

There can be no doubt that the drive of reaction against the educational system has its own logic and those that lend themselves to it, even in the slightest way, will find out only too soon they have themselves become its victims. Wall Street's war program is the inexorable foe of everything progressive in the educational field. Only the united resistance of labor and all true friends of democracy can save the educational heritage which the American people fought so long to build up.

AMERICA'S WAR ECONOMY AND THE UNEMPLOYED

By G. D. CARPENTER

A KEY point in President Roosevelt's plans to "sell" the imperialist war to the American working class is the propagation and cultivation of the illusion that a war economy will abolish unemployment. This he deems important because he knows that labor rightly considers unemployment the gravest problem facing it. In the eleven years of the present chronic economic crisis of capitalism, there is hardly a working class family which has not at one time or another suffered from the ravages of unemployment. Nor is there a family, even today, which is not in constant fear of the loss of jobs.

At the present time the national economy is still unable to reabsorb at least nine million jobless workers. In the course of a year, some fifteen to twenty million workers go in and out of the ranks of the unemployed to make up this standing army of surplus workers.

This surplus population is not likely to be taken in by talk of "sacrifice" or the demagogic promises of defense of "everyone in the nation against want and privation." They have lived through many

years of "want and privation," against which little was done to defend them. They are desperately seeking a solution to their problems. They demand an end to unemployment!

Therefore, Roosevelt is forced to adopt special measures to mollify and intimidate the unemployed and link them to the capitalist war machine. Chief among these is the promise that the vast expenditures of the United States for armaments and the huge war orders from the British imperialist government will end unemployment.

But American finance capital cannot be expected to attempt solution of the problem of unemployment, except in a capitalist way. But the problem of unemployment cannot be solved without abolishing capitalism and its exploitation of labor, since unemployment is an immutable condition of the system, which brings about an ever-widening gap between the productive forces and consumption capacity.

Deeper and deeper has this shadow of unemployment fallen over the working class. It has been an uninterrupted process of capital-

ism, whereby, as Marx pointed out, "the laboring population . . . produces, along with the accumulation of capital produced by it, the means by which . . . [it] is turned into a relative surplus population." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 645, International Publishers, New York.)

Whatever gestures the capitalist class has made in the past to solve this problem have ended in abject failure. Its "solutions" are always at the expense of the unemployed and the working class as a whole, since it does not want the "solution" to interfere with the continuance of its profits.

When the great economic crisis of capitalism struck the United States in 1929, Wall Street tried to palm off on the working class such spurious palliatives of mass unemployment as "block aid," "share the work," "self-help," and street-corner apple-selling, all of which laid the cost on the workers themselves.

But because these palliatives only divided what little income there was left in the working class, they did little to reduce the piles of commodities which had been produced during the peak period of the "boom" preceding the economic crisis, an essential pre-condition before the capitalist industrial machine could be set into motion again.

Even the makeshift stopgaps against the ravages of unemployment put into operation by Roosevelt and various local and state governments, under the pressure of the unemployed, such as C.W.A.,

W.P.A., the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the direct relief and unemployment insurance, providing purchasing power sufficient only for a bare minimum of food, clothing and housing, could not give the necessary impetus to the system.

Therefore, in the years since 1929, the capitalist economy of the United States could make only a partial recovery, on a lower level, which, along with the tremendous gains made in technology and factory efficiency (speed-up), brought about the absorption of only a part of the unemployed, and these only for short periods of time.

Whereas following previous crises, the majority of the unemployed would be reabsorbed by the labor market at a peak period of production, the present chronic economic crisis of capitalism created a *chronic mass unemployment* which has developed into two classes: (1) the permanently unemployed, who, either because of the debasement of their skills through long disuse, or speed-up system, or the reduction in factory staffs due to increased efficiency and improved technology, could never hope to find work again; (2) the part-time or periodically unemployed, who, because of the increased production now possible and the reduced demand resulting from the huge mass unemployment, were employed only for short periods during the year.

An examination of the statistics accumulated by the National Unemployment Census conducted in November, 1937, provides some

interesting figures concerning the development of these two classes of the unemployed during the present economic crisis. This census, which was carried out through the mails, divided the unemployed into three classifications: the totally unemployed, emergency workers (those employed on W.P.A., etc.), and the part-time unemployed.

When the figures of this census are adjusted to their percentage effectiveness,* they show that there were 10,537,329 part-time unemployed workers and 6,006,774 either totally unemployed or working on W.P.A. and other Government projects.

The development of this huge army of part-time unemployed has had a disastrous effect on the living standard of the American working class in the last few years. In this same unemployment census of 1937, the jobless were asked to report any earnings in the week prior to the census; 3,252,236 reported some earnings. Of these, 1,893,745 reported earnings of only \$1 to \$9 for the week, and 922,131 reported earnings of only \$10 to \$19 for the same period. With the vast majority of these part-time unemployed earning only \$1 to \$9 a week, *when they do work*, it is easy enough to see how Big Business has been using part-time unemployment to lower even further the living standards of American workers for the purpose of increasing its own wealth.

The Shift to War Economy Has Not Eliminated Unemployment

What is the situation today? American finance capital has failed, in peace-time economy, to eliminate unemployment, because it has been unable to bridge the gap between production capacity and the limited consumption. Therefore, it seeks in a war economy a way to postpone a fundamental solution. In a war economy production is not dependent on consumer-market; there is no necessity for increasing purchasing power of the masses to provide customers for its products. American finance capital has geared itself to the profitable production of armaments. An artificially stimulated customer has been found in the United States Government, which will pay through the nose and later collect from the masses in the form of taxes. To provide the profits for American finance capital in its shift to a war economy, Roosevelt and Congress have already appropriated \$17,000,000,000 for so-called "national defense." (In the five years of W.P.A., Roosevelt and Congress appropriated only half of that amount for relief of the unemployed!)

But this shift to a war economy still leaves the nation with nine million unemployed man-years and with fifteen to twenty million workers that move in and out of the ranks of the jobless to make up this nine million or more throughout the year. These unemployed workers and their families will still demand jobs and security. How American finance capital expects to solve the

* A test enumerative census carried out after the mail census on 1,455 postal routes showed the mail census to be 72 per cent effective for the totally unemployed and 57 per cent effective for the part-time unemployed.

problem of unemployment for these millions of suffering workers can be evinced from the measures already taken by President Roosevelt, and those contemplated.

First of all, in order to stifle the resistance of the unemployed, he cooperated with David Lasser, a renegade leader of the jobless, in his unsuccessful efforts to split and destroy the only organization of the unemployed, the Workers Alliance, because of its militant struggles against unemployment and in the interest of the jobless. This followed years of effort by the reactionaries in Congress—Dies, Woodrum, *et al.*—to do the same thing from the outside.

Following upon his reduced appropriations for W.P.A. and relief of last year, which left one million unemployed workers who were certified for W.P.A. jobs without any chance of getting them, Roosevelt is proposing this year to cut to the bone all social expenditures—W.P.A., housing, relief, etc. His budget message to Congress called for a reduction in W.P.A. funds necessitating the cutting of W.P.A. rolls by one-third—500,000 to 800,000.

He maneuvered the passage of the peace-time Conscription Act through Congress, which, by its very nature, will take in many thousands of the unemployed in its yearly quota of 800,000 and thereby immobilize them for struggle against unemployment.

Through the propagandizing of Mrs. Roosevelt among the youth groups, he has been trying to lay the basis for setting up compulsory

work camps for all the non-conscripted youth.

To sugarcoat this reactionary program for driving the jobless into line for his war-and-hunger program, Roosevelt is busy coralling a menagerie of "experts" to propagate the illusion of re-employment among the jobless. Leading the pack among these "experts" is his Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, upper middle-class social worker turned labor "economist," who blandly declares that the rise in "defense" production will re-employ at least six million of the presently unemployed by the fall of 1941. However, the accuracy of her prediction can be discounted. It was the same Madam Perkins, who, by devious mathematics, "proved" that there were only 4,500,000 unemployed in 1934, at a time when the estimate of such a reactionary manufacturers' group as the National Industrial Conference Board showed nearly twelve million jobless, and the American Federation of Labor estimated the unemployed at 13,382,000.

But even some people in Roosevelt's own Administration from time to time make significant admissions. With at least nine million still jobless at this stage of armament production, Corrington Gill, Assistant W.P.A. Commissioner, speaking at Atlantic City, in November, 1940, declared:

"We must recognize that this stage of our defense preparations is apt to be a period of maximum employment. Naturally, more jobs are opened when new plants are being constructed and new equipment

prepared. Later, when the productive machine is in complete readiness and the emphasis has come to be on maintenance rather than exclusively on new production, the need for labor may be somewhat reduced."

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, which has usually been quite accurate in its forecasts in the past, points out in its November, 1940, monthly bulletin, *The Agricultural Situation*:

"Industrial output has reached such a high level that further gains will be much more difficult of attainment. Steel output already is near capacity, and some other important industries are operating around the highest levels in their history. For some of these industrial capacity is being increased, but this is a relatively slow process. Industrial activity, therefore, may be expected to fluctuate for some time about present levels."

If this forecast holds true, all the hullabaloo about a great upturn in re-employment will be "much ado about nothing." While it is undoubtedly true that in certain centers of armament industry there will be an appreciable increase in re-employment, this will not hold true for the whole country.

How re-employment in "defense" industries is affecting unemployment may be seen in the recent statement of Howard Hunter, Acting W.P.A. Commissioner, who asserted that 80 per cent of "national defense" contracts awarded so far were in areas where there were

only 20 per cent of those on W.P.A. rolls.

It is interesting to note that in November, 1940, when the "defense" orders were already flowing at a rapid rate, the total increase in factory re-employment amounted to only 51,000.

Factors Hindering Re-employment

What are the factors which will retard absorption of the unemployed in industry? Foremost among them is the drive of Big Business to lengthen the work-week to six and seven days, with longer hours, without payment of overtime, as proposed by William Knudsen, Roosevelt's National Defense Commissioner; Alfred P. Sloan, President of General Motors; and many other leaders of industry.

In a war economy, such as the United States has now embarked on, the drive for increased profits by finance capital accelerates at a terrific rate. There are two ways in which this surplus value can be increased. One is by stepping up productivity through the speed-up, greater efficiency and improved technology. This process, which moves swiftly at all times, increases at a much more rapid pace in a war economy. The other method, which Big Business finds more difficult to utilize in a peace economy, because of the resistance of the organized labor movement, is that of lengthening the working day and working week.

Pleading a "national emergency," Big Business is now trying to foist that method of increasing its profits on the American working class.

They were given the lead in this by President Roosevelt himself during 1940, when he increased the working week in the War and Navy Departments from forty to forty-eight hours, on the grounds that there was a shortage of skilled workers, despite the fact that his own Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, in a letter to *The New York Times*, admitted that:

"... the Public Employment Service is still able to fill virtually every demand which is made on it by either the navy yards or the arsenals. Definite labor shortages are confined to an extremely small number of specialized occupations."

In line with this, Big Business is now wailing about bottlenecks and lack of adequate production to meet the needs of "national defense," due to the fact that there are not enough skilled workers. Therefore, they need to increase the hours worked by the present employees.

Prominent among the wailers are certain leaders of the machine tool and die industry. Proclaiming a shortage of skilled mechanics in the industry, which makes it impossible for it to go on a 24-hour, three-shift day, these leaders demand that the workers agree to a ten-hour day and seven-day week.

But a recent report by the United Automobile Workers, C.I.O., gives the lie to these manufacturers' unconscionable arguments. In the automobile industry alone, this report shows, there are 25,000 tool and die workers, most of whom are part-time unemployed. At the pres-

ent time, there are approximately 7,500 tool and die makers who are either unemployed or have transferred to other types of jobs because of the scarcity of work in the industry. Besides these, there are 100,000 automobile workers either on relief or W.P.A., all skilled or semi-skilled mechanics, capable of being trained.

This drive for the longer work-day and work-week may be expected to increase in intensity as the greed of Big Business for more profits rises. This lengthening of the work period can have an adverse effect on re-employment in two ways: First, it can bring about layoffs in a number of industries. Second, since present factory capacity can take care of much greater production with an increased work-day and work-week, it is possible that a diminution of construction of new factory capacity may result, with layoffs in the construction and other durable products industries.

A second important factor which will retard the absorption of the unemployed is the increased rationalization of American industry. America's labor force today is producing more in forty hours, with nine million unemployed, than it did in 1929 in a forty-eight hour week, with only two and one-half million unemployed.

A good example of this is the steel industry, which is the key group in the manufacture of armaments. In October, 1940, it turned out 5 per cent more steel ingots than in any previous month in its history. But total employment, including salaried employees, was

thirty-five thousand below the all-time high set in 1929.

Its present capacity, according to leaders of the industry, will be sufficient to provide all the steel needed for all purposes. Charles Hook, president of the American Rolling Mills Company, reported to the recent meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"The United States has a capacity to produce 83,000,000 tons of steel annually. Demands of domestic armament in 1942, the peak year under present plans, will not exceed 6,000,000 tons. Demands of Great Britain and Canada will not exceed 10,000,000 tons, and other export demands 2,500,000 tons. This makes 18,500,000 tons for all armaments and export, leaving 64,500,000 tons for peacetime industries at home, or 4,000,000 tons more than was used in the boom year of 1929."

How much re-employment can be expected from the steel industry based on such estimates?

Most of the other basic industries involved in armament manufacture have the same characteristics of increased rationalization and improved technology, with the result that they have increased capacity while reducing employment.

It is estimated by capitalist economists that, at the present rate of productivity, which due to rationalization has doubled since 1918, it would be necessary for production to be increased at least 20 per cent next year to absorb all the jobless.

Another important factor which will prevent the re-employment of the jobless is an expected contrac-

tion in the production of consumers' goods. In November, 1940, there was already a decline of 1 per cent in employment in the industries producing non-durable commodities.

This reduction in production of consumers' commodities will occur for a number of reasons:

1. The shift by many factories from production of consumers' commodities to armaments, because of the bigger profits therein. The report of Frieda S. Miller, New York State Industrial Commissioner, shows some interesting examples of this:

"A chintz and lace manufacturer is making gas masks. The Nylon which was developed to relieve milady's hose headaches is being made into parachutes instead."

2. Shortage of materials for consumers' commodities, as they are diverted into "defense" industry. For example, the electrical appliance manufacturers are already reporting, according to *The New York Times*, that they are facing "threatened shortages in raw materials, with suppliers guaranteeing no more than 50 per cent of a year's normal supplies."

3. Increase in the cost of living, making it impossible for the American worker to purchase as many commodities as before.

In addition to these factors, it must be understood that much of the re-employment which has already occurred has been of a part-time character. Of the 1,150,000 gain in re-employment between October, 1939, and October, 1940, as reported by the U. S. Department

of Labor, only 500,000 were in the manufacturing industries, with the rest in categories that may be classified as part-time unemployed.

Even those re-employed in the manufacturing industries could be so classified. The National Industrial Conference Board reports that, of the 4,000,000 it expects to have been re-employed by private industry before June, 1941, under "defense" contracts already awarded, and with present operating conditions, at least 2,500,000 will be discharged during the last half of 1941, unless other production is started.

Thus, from the evidence presented by the agents of finance capital themselves, it can be seen clearly that the increases in re-employment in the United States due to the shift to a war economy will not reach a very high figure. The vast majority of the 9,000,000 now unemployed, along with their families, will still be condemned to the misery and squalor of abject poverty. Moreover, to these 9,000,000 will be added the 600,000 young men and women leaving school every year and thrown onto the labor market without any possibility of jobs.

Struggle Against Unemployment Must Continue

These conditions make it imperative for the trade unions and the Workers Alliance to intensify their struggles against unemployment. Grave danger for the entire American working class lurks in this illusion of the end of unemployment and a return to "prosperity" which

American finance capital and its man Roosevelt are weaving around the war economy they have foisted on the American people.

To resist the drive of American finance capital to push the United States into this war, unity between the employed and unemployed workers is essential. Because, in the economic battles ahead to keep Big Business from extorting more and more profits from the American working class and driving it deeper into poverty, it will become all too easy for Big Business to use the unemployed against the employed, unless this unity is achieved.

If this unity between the employed and the unemployed to struggle against the war-and-hunger program of Wall Street is to be brought about, it will be because the trade union movement takes the lead in forging lasting bonds with the jobless through an intensified war against unemployment.

For the last eleven years, the main brunt of the fight against unemployment has been carried, first, by the Unemployed Councils, and, later, by its successor, the Workers Alliance of America. At the beginning of the economic crisis this duty fell to the lot of independent organizations of the unemployed, because of the weakened condition of the organized labor movement, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, and the inability of the rank and file of the trade unions to express themselves under the heavy-handed bureaucratic leadership of the A. F. of L.

The same narrow, craft trade

union interest which made the A. F. of L. leadership ignore organization of the low-paid and unskilled workers kept that leadership from organizing and fighting for the unemployed. This leadership, corrupt and servile to finance capital, was interested only in protecting the rights and privileges of the comparatively small labor aristocracy, from whom it could collect heavy dues and assessments, and not in organizing the broad sections of the working class and fighting the battles of the class of which the skilled workers were only a part. It had systematically avoided organizing the low-paid workers because organization of these workers would bring about militant struggles, with the urge for trade union democracy, and would, therefore, challenge the reactionary leadership. When the unparalleled economic crisis hit the United States in 1929, bringing with it the new phenomenon of chronic mass unemployment, the A. F. of L. bureaucracy refused to organize the unemployed, for the same reasons. The capitalist class sought to dump the unemployed and isolate them; the A. F. of L. bureaucracy followed suit.

Many of the lower bodies of the A. F. of L., however, do have an honorable history in the struggle against unemployment. In the early years of the present crisis, despite the opposition of the A. F. of L. leadership, many trade union locals and central trades bodies lent a helping hand to the Unemployed Councils. The A. F. of L. Trade Union Committee for Unemploy-

ment Insurance and Relief, composed of hundreds of trade union locals, was one of the main factors—along with the Unemployed Councils—in forcing the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, which has given at least a minimum of protection to a section of the working class against unemployment.

In 1935, a large section of the A. F. of L., expressing the will and the class aspirations of millions of workers in the basic industries, broke the craft-union, class-collaborative fetters of the A. F. of L. leadership, and formed the Committee for Industrial Organization, which later became the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The C.I.O. set out to organize the low-paid, the unskilled, the most exploited sections of the working class into industrial unions, which it did with phenomenal success.

The C.I.O., responding to the needs of the majority of the workers, who suffer at one time or another from unemployment, sought to do something about this problem. Taking seriously the statement of its leader, John L. Lewis, that "unemployment is the No. 1 problem of the nation," it fought on the legislative front for larger appropriations for W.P.A. and other measures to alleviate the suffering of the jobless. But the C.I.O. did not organize the unemployed. While the C.I.O. itself and many of its constituent unions cooperated in a number of instances with the Workers Alliance, it left the job of organizing the unemployed to the independent union of the jobless, the Workers Alliance. In some

cases, this was due to the fact that the progressive leaders of a number of C.I.O. unions felt that they might perhaps encroach on the jurisdiction of the Alliance.

Protection of the Unemployed, a Vital Task of the Trade Unions

Today, however, conditions have changed. An independent organization of the unemployed cannot function *alone* in this period, isolated from the main stream of the organized labor movement and unprotected against the vicious anti-labor drive of American finance capital. Today the most decisive section of the unemployed belong to unions. These unemployed can see no reason why they should join another organization during periods of unemployment. They rightly expect their unions to represent them and lead their fight. It is, therefore, in the interest of the trade union movement, to take over the responsibility for organizing and servicing the unemployed and forging unity of all the workers in the struggle against war and unemployment.

Of course, the best method of achieving this unity would be for some national trade union center, such as the C.I.O., to set up an apparatus on a national scale to do the job. The revamping and strengthening of the Committee on Unemployment at the recent meeting of the C.I.O. Executive Board in Washington may suggest a step in this direction. But even if it is not possible at the present time to set up such a national apparatus, there are a number of things the local, city and state trade union

bodies can do about the problem. Basic among these is the setting up of special bodies or committees to fight against the ravages of unemployment as it affects their own membership, and to organize the unorganized unemployed.

Among the forms these bodies could take would be:

1. Unemployment, relief or welfare committees in the various trade union locals. These would serve the unemployed of the respective locals.

2. Unemployment committees in the central bodies of the trade unions, both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. These citywide unemployment committees could coordinate the unemployment and relief activities of the various locals and provide centers for legislative, servicing and organizing activity among the unemployed.

3. Statewide trade union unemployment committees. These would coordinate the activities of the city unemployment committees and direct efforts to promote necessary state legislation.

In some instances, it may be better for such activity to be carried on in the beginning by groups independent of the local trade union bodies, but which will later serve, on the basis of their experience, as centers through which the trade unions can coordinate their unemployment activities. Variant forms of organization may have to be worked out on the basis of actual conditions in each community.

In any struggle against unemployment which the trade union movement may undertake, the

Workers Alliance can play a very important role. First of all, its many years of experience in fighting for the interests of the unemployed have brought forward a corps of trained leaders who can be of inestimable value. Secondly, there is still a great need for an organization which will organize and mobilize the millions of unemployed who are as yet not a part of the trade union movement and whom the trade unions are not yet ready to organize.

The core of the program of the trade unions and the Workers Alliance in the struggle against unemployment could be the fight for jobs, the right to work. American finance capital and Roosevelt are busy now proclaiming the existence of jobs for all. The American working class should demand that the capitalist class produce these jobs, either in private industry or on useful public works at regular trade union wages under trade union conditions.

This fight for the right to work can take the form of job hunts in the various factories; demonstrations at the public employment service centers, which have become veritable labor exchanges; legislation on state and national scale for useful public works; demands for a thirty-hour week, without reduction in pay.

Every action in the fight for jobs, every demand for the right to work is a blow struck against the efforts of Big Business to exploit further the workers now employed by lengthening their working day, under the excuse of a labor shortage.

Two other points must be in any inclusive program of struggle against unemployment. The first is the fight for adequate unemployment insurance for *all* the unemployed. Under the present unemployment insurance setup, millions of workers are not included at all. And those who are included suffer from low benefits, short benefit periods and long waiting periods.

This fight for unemployment insurance can be carried on along three fronts: (1) locally, around the grievances of applicants for unemployment insurance; (2) on a statewide scale, for improvement of the state legislation governing the present form of unemployment insurance; (3) on a nationwide scale, for improvement of the Social Security Act.

A great forward step in the fight for adequate unemployment insurance was taken by the C.I.O. recently, when John Brophy, National C.I.O. Director of Local Industrial Unions, submitted a program of action on unemployment insurance to the various affiliates of the C.I.O.

There are any number of local grievances of claimants for unemployment insurance which require the assistance of an organized and informed group. Most claimants are ignorant of the unemployment compensation law and do not know their rights under it. They suffer from understaffing of the administration of the law. Their employers violate the law, making it difficult for them to establish their rights. They have to wait long periods before getting their benefits, longer periods than are required by law.

They need some form of relief while they are waiting. They may not get the full amount due them. All these require adjustment which can best be carried out through an organized trade union unemployment center.

Since the Federal Social Security Act is so drawn up as to permit each state to set up its own unemployment insurance system within a wide latitude of discretion, it becomes possible for the trade unions in each state to fight for improvement of their own unemployment insurance system, through amendments to the state act governing it.

Among the points such a program of state legislation could contain would be:

1. Increase of benefits to unemployment compensation recipients. With benefits in most cases being at the outrageously low minimum of \$6 a week, with a maximum of \$15 a week, it is obvious that the benefits cannot even maintain a single man at bare subsistence level.

2. Allotment of substantial supplementary benefits to recipients with dependents. In most cases, ridiculously low supplementary benefits are allotted.

3. Increase in the number of weeks benefits are paid. With the majority of the part-time unemployed working less than twenty-six weeks a year, it is absurd to have maximum benefit periods of thirteen weeks or so. What are these workers supposed to do the rest of the time they are unemployed?

4. Cutting the waiting period be-

fore the claimant can secure benefits.

5. Stopping the penalizing of workers because of inability to report due to temporary illness.

6. Continuance of payment of unemployment benefits to unemployed workers who are drafted into the army.

On a national scale, the fight must be for improvement in the Federal Social Security Act:

1. To make eligible for unemployment insurance *all* the unemployed, including those workers not now covered, such as agricultural, marine and domestic, and also all those who have been totally unemployed for so long that no contributions have been paid for them into the unemployment insurance funds.

2. To pay unemployment benefits to jobless workers as long as they are unemployed.

In addition to the fight for jobs and more adequate unemployment insurance, the struggle around the immediate needs of the unemployed, such as jobs on W.P.A. and direct local relief, and the grievances around these points must not be lost sight of. Until every worker in the United States has a decent job, or is covered by an adequate unemployment insurance system, it will be necessary to maintain and improve the various forms of relief to provide for the immediate needs of the jobless.

Especially is it essential at this time to fight for prevailing or union rates of pay on W.P.A. Instead of being an instrument for providing

relief for the needy unemployed, W.P.A. has now become a section of the "defense" industries, with W.P.A. workers doing the same work as those employed in private industry—in many cases working side by side with these men employed by private contractors—but getting only the bare-subsistence wage of a W.P.A. worker, thus making it possible for the contractors to undermine union standards.

Since June, 1940, more than \$150,000,000, or one-sixth of the W.P.A. appropriation for the fiscal year, has been expended on "defense" projects, and the tendency will be to put the emphasis on more such projects in the future. At the present time 430,000 W.P.A. workers are on such projects. On all these projects, W.P.A. workers get at the most one-half the pay of a worker in private industry doing the same work. To prevent undermining of wage standards and as-

sure the W.P.A. worker a proper return in wages for his work, a fight for the prevailing wage on W.P.A. must be carried on.

Philip Murray, the new C.I.O. president, recently issued a statement, in which he declared:

"Every day has become a sad day for nine million of our workers and their families. They used to have work. How much longer can we afford to have them idle because private industry cannot provide them with jobs? Can we not stop this idleness, this complete unproductiveness from Monday morning of one week to Monday morning of the next week?"

The American working class can and will answer that question. It is the only social group which has the answer. And it will give its answer for all America to know, through its struggle against unemployment, for the right to work, which it will raise to ever higher levels.

IMPERIALISM AND THE SPLIT IN THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

BY V. I. LENIN

[*The following article will appear in Volume XIX of the Collected Works of Lenin, to be published shortly by International Publishers. Volume XIX covers the period from the beginning of 1916 to March, 1917. It deals with the whole problem of the imperialist war, the development of the split in the international Socialist movement, the situation in Russia and the attitude of the Socialist parties in the warring and neutral countries on the eve of the February Revolution, as well as aspects of the question of self-determination of nationalities.—The Editor.*]

IS THERE any connection between imperialism and that monstrously disgusting victory which opportunism (in the form of social-chauvinism) has gained over the labor movement in Europe?

This is the fundamental question of modern socialism. Having fully established in our Party literature, (1) the imperialist character of the present epoch and the present war, and (2) the inseparable historical connection between social-chauvinism and opportunism, and also the

similarity of their ideological and political content, we can and must proceed to analyze this fundamental question.

We must begin with the most precise and fullest possible definition of imperialism. Imperialism is a special historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: Imperialism is (1) monopolistic capitalism; (2) parasitic, or decaying, capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism. The substitution of monopoly for free competition is the fundamental economic feature, the quintessence of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in five main forms: (1) cartels, syndicates and trusts; the concentration of production has reached the stage which engenders these monopolistic combinations of capitalists; (2) the monopolistic position of big banks; three to five gigantic banks manipulate the whole economic life of America, France, Germany; (3) the seizure of the sources of raw material by the trusts and the financial oligarchy (finance capital is monopolistic industrial capital merged with bank capital); (4) the division of the world (economically) among

the international cartels has *commenced*.

The international cartels which dominate the *whole* world market, dividing it "amicably" among themselves—until war brings about a redivision—already numbers over *one hundred!* The export of capital, a particularly characteristic phenomenon as distinct from the export of commodities under non-monopolistic capitalism, is closely bound up with the economic and political-territorial division of the world; (5) the territorial division of the world (colonies) is *finished*.

Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism in America, Europe and in Asia, assumed full shape in the period 1898-1914. The Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1900-02), the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 are the principal historical landmarks in the new epoch of world history.

The fact that imperialism is parasitic or decaying capitalism manifests itself first of all in the tendency to decay, which is a distinguishing feature of *all* monopoly under the private ownership of the means of production. The difference between the republican-democratic and the monarchist-reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie is obliterated precisely because both are rotting alive (which by no means prevents the astonishingly rapid development of capitalism in individual branches of industry, individual countries, individual periods). Secondly, the decay of capitalism manifests itself in the creation of a huge stratum

of rentiers, capitalists who live by "clipping coupons." In each of the four advanced imperialist countries, Great Britain, United States, France and Germany, capital invested in securities amounts to 100 to 150 *billion* francs, from which each country derives an annual income of no less than five to eight billions. Thirdly, the export of capital is parasitism raised to the second power. Fourthly, "finance capital tends towards domination, not towards freedom." Political reaction *all along the line* is the attribute of imperialism: corruption, bribery on a gigantic scale. Panama scandals of all kinds. Fifthly, the exploitation of oppressed nations, which is inseparably connected with annexations, especially the exploitation of colonies by a handful of "Great" Powers, transforms the "civilized" world more and more into a parasite on the body of hundreds of millions of uncivilized people. The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society. Modern society lives at the expense of the modern proletariat. Marx particularly emphasized this profound observation of Sismondi. Imperialism changes the situation somewhat. A privileged upper stratum of the proletariat in the imperialistic states lives partly at the expense of the hundreds of million of uncivilized people.

It is clear, therefore, why imperialism is moribund capitalism, the *transition* to socialism: monopoly growing out of capitalism is *already* the dying of capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism. The *socialization* of labor on a huge

scale by imperialism (what the apologists, the bourgeois economists, call "interlocking") signifies the same thing.

In advancing this definition of imperialism, we definitely come into conflict with Karl Kautsky, who refuses to regard imperialism as a "phase of capitalism," and who defines imperialism as a *policy* which is "preferred" by finance capital, as the striving of "industrial" countries to annex "agrarian" countries.* This definition of Kautsky's is thoroughly false theoretically. The distinguished feature of imperialism is the domination, *not* of industrial capital, but of finance capital, the striving to annex, *not only* agrarian countries, but *all kinds* of countries. Kautsky separates imperialist politics from imperialist economics, he separates monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics, in order to pave the way for his vulgar, bourgeois reformism in the shape of "disarmament," "ultra-imperialism" and similar piffle. The meaning and object of this theoretical falsehood is to gloss over the *most profound* contradictions of imperialism and thus justify the theory of "unity" with the apologists of imperialism, the frank social-chauvinists and opportunists.

We have dealt sufficiently with Kautsky's rupture with Marxism in the *Sotsial-Demokrat* and in the *Communist*. Our Russian Kaut-

skyans, the O.C.-ists* headed by Axelrod and Spectator, not forgetting Martov and, to a considerable degree, Trotsky, have preferred silently to ignore the question of Kautskyism as a trend. They did not dare to defend what Kautsky wrote during the war; they evaded the issue either by simply praising Kautsky (Axelrod in his German pamphlet, which the O.C. has *promised* to publish in Russian) or by quoting Kautsky's private letters (Spectator) in which he asserts that he belongs to the opposition, and thus tried, Jesuit-fashion, to nullify his chauvinist declarations.

We will note that Kautsky's "conception" of imperialism—which is tantamount to embellishing it—marks a retrogression, not only compared with Hilferding's *Finance Capital* (no matter how assiduously Hilferding may now defend Kautsky and "unity" with social chauvinism!), but also compared with the *social-liberal*, J. A. Hobson. This English economist, who does not in the least claim to be a Marxist, in his work of 1902,** defines imperialism and reveals its contradictions much more profoundly. This is what that writer (in whose works can be found nearly all of Kautsky's pacifist and "arbitration" banalities) had to say on the particularly important ques-

* "Imperialism is the product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its control and to annex more and more *agrarian* regions irrespective of what nations inhabit those regions." (Kautsky in *Neue Zeit*, September 11, 1914.)

* The Organization Committee (O.C.) of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party was the leading body of the August Bloc formed in August, 1912, by Trotsky, the Mensheviks and all other anti-Bolshevik groups and trends directed against Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. For a fuller account of the August Bloc and the groupings it represented see *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp. 136-138. International Publishers, New York, 1939.—Ed.

** J. A. Hobson, *Imperialism*, London, 1902.

tion of the parasitic nature of imperialism.

Two factors, according to Hobson, have primarily contributed to weaken the power of the old empires: (1) "economic parasitism"; (2) formation of armies out of dependent peoples. The first factor is "the habit of economic parasitism, by which the ruling state has used its provinces, colonies, and dependencies in order to enrich its ruling class and to bribe its lower classes into acquiescence." Concerning the second factor, Hobson writes:

"One of the strangest symptoms of the blindness of imperialism [this song about the "blindness" of imperialism comes more appropriately from the social-liberal Hobson than from the "Marxian" Kautsky] is the reckless indifference with which Great Britain, France, and other imperialist nations are embarking on this perilous dependence. Great Britain has gone farthest. Most of the fighting by which we have won our Indian Empire has been done by natives; in India, as more recently in Egypt, great standing armies are placed under British commanders; almost all the fighting associated with our African Dominions, except in the Southern part, has been done for us by natives."

The prospect of the partition of China elicited from Hobson the following economic estimation:

"The greater part of Western Europe might then assume the appearance and character already exhibited by tracts of country in the South of England, in the Riviera, and the tourist-ridden or residential parts of Italy and Switzerland, little clusters of wealthy

aristocrats drawing dividends and pensions from the Far East, with a somewhat larger group of professional retainers and tradesmen and a large body of personal servants and workers in the transport trade and in the final stages of production of the more perishable goods; all the main arterial industries would have disappeared, the staple goods and manufactures flowing in as tribute from Asia and Africa. . . .

"We have foreshadowed the possibility of even a larger alliance of Western States, a European federation of Great Powers which, so far from forwarding the cause of world civilization, might introduce the gigantic peril of a Western parasitism, a group of advanced industrial nations, whose upper classes drew vast tribute from Asia and Africa, with which they supported great tame masses of retainers, no longer engaged in the staple industries of agriculture and manufacture, but kept in the performance of personal or minor industrial services under the control of a new financial aristocracy. Let those who would scout such theory [he should have said: prospect] as undeserving of consideration examine the economic and social condition of districts in Southern England today which are already reduced to this condition, and reflect upon the vast extension of such a system which might be rendered feasible by the subjection of China to the economic control of similar groups of financiers, investors [rentiers] and political and business officials, draining the greatest potential reservoir of profit the world has ever known, in order to consume it in Europe. The situation is far too complex, the play of world-forces far too incalculable, to render this or any other single interpretation of the future very

probable; but the influences which govern the imperialism of Western Europe today are moving in this direction, and, unless counteracted or diverted, make towards some such consummation."

Hobson, the social-liberal, fails to see that this "counteraction" can be offered *only* by the revolutionary proletariat and *only* in the form of a social revolution. But, then, he is only a social-liberal! Nevertheless, as early as 1902, he had an excellent approach to the question of what the "United States of Europe" means (for the information of the Kautskyan, Trotsky!) and to all that is now being glossed over by the *hypocritical Kautskyan*s of various countries, namely, that the *opportunists* (social-chauvinists) are working together with the imperialist bourgeoisie *precisely* in the direction of creating an imperialist Europe on the backs of Asia and Africa, that objectively the *opportunists* are a section of the petty-bourgeoisie and of those strata of the working class who are being *bribed* out of imperialist super-profits and converted into *watch-dogs* of capitalism, into *corruptors* of the labor movement.

We have repeatedly pointed to this very profound economic connection between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the opportunism that is now victorious (for how long?) in the labor movement, not only in articles, but also in our Party's resolutions. From this, among other things, we drew the conclusion that a split with social-chauvinism was inevitable. Our Kautskyan preferred to evade the

question! Martov, for instance, in his lectures, gave utterance to a sophism, which in the "Bulletin of the Foreign Secretariat of the O.C." (No. 4, of April 10, 1916), is expressed as follows:

"... The cause of revolutionary Social-Democracy would be in a very bad plight, even hopeless, if those groups who approach most closely the mental development of the 'intelligentsia' and the most highly skilled groups of workers fatally drifted away from it towards opportunism."

By means of the silly catchword, "fatally" and a little "shuffle," he *evades* the fact that *certain* strata of workers *have deserted* to opportunism and to the imperialist bourgeoisie! And all that the sophists of the O.C. want is to *evade* this fact! They make shift with that "official optimism" which the Kautskyan Hilferding and many others are flaunting at the present time: Objective conditions, they say, guarantee the unity of the proletariat and the victory of the revolutionary trend! As much as to say: We are "optimistic" about the proletariat!

As a matter of fact, all these Kautskyan, Hilferdings, the O.C.-ists, Martov and Co. are *optimistic* . . . about *opportunism*. This is the whole point!

The proletariat is the child of capitalism, of world capitalism, not only of European, and not only of imperialist capitalism. On a world scale, fifty years earlier or fifty years later—on *such* a scale, this is a minor question—the "proletariat" "will," of course, be united, revolutionary Social-Democracy will "in-

evitably" be victorious in its ranks. But this is not the point, Messrs. Kautskyans. The point is that *you* are now in the imperialist countries of Europe *cringing* before the opportunists who are *alien* to the proletariat as a class, who are the servants, the agents, the conduits of the influence of the bourgeoisie, and of whom the labor movement must *rid* itself if it does not want to remain a *bourgeois labor movement*. Your advocacy of "unity" with the opportunists, with the Legiens and Davids, the Plekhanovs or Chkhenkelis and Potresovs, etc., is, objectively, the advocacy of *enslaving* the workers to the imperialist bourgeoisie with the aid of the latter's best agents in the labor movement. The victory of revolutionary Social-Democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, but it is marching and will take place *against* you, it will be a victory *over* you.

These two trends, even *two* parties in the present-day labor movement, which so obviously parted ways all over the world in 1914-16, were *traced by Engels and Marx in England* for many *decades*, approximately from 1858 to 1892.

Neither Marx nor Engels lived to see the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which began not earlier than 1898-1900. But as early as the middle of the nineteenth century, England's peculiar feature was that she displayed at least *two* of the distinguishing features of imperialism: (1) vast colonies, (2) monopoly profits (due to her monopolist position in the world market). In both respects, England at that time was

an exception among capitalist countries; but Marx and Engels, analyzing that exception, clearly and definitely indicated its *connection* with the (temporary) victory of opportunism in the English labor movement.

In a letter to Marx dated October 7, 1858, Engels wrote:

"... the English proletariat is becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat *as well as a bourgeoisie*. For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable."*

In a letter to Sorge** dated September 21, 1872, Engels informs him that Hales*** kicked up a big row in the Federal Council of the International and secured a vote of censure against Marx for saying that "the English labor leaders had sold themselves." On April 4, 1874, Marx wrote to Sorge:

"As to the urban workers here (in England) it is a pity that the whole gang of leaders did not get elected to Parliament. This would be the

* *The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, pp. 115-16.—Ed.

** Sorge, Friedrich Albert (1826-1906) German Communist. He took part in the Baden rising in 1849. He emigrated to the U.S.A., where he played a prominent part in the German and American labor movement. Sorge, who was in constant correspondence with Marx and Engels, fought for the line of the General Council in the American Sections of the First International. After the transference of the General Council to New York (1872) Sorge became General Secretary of the International.—Ed.

*** Hales, John, Member of the General Council of the First International and Secretary in 1871 during the final period. After the Hague Congress (1872) he was one of the opposition in the "British Federation," which refused to accept the decisions of the congress.—Ed.

surest way of getting rid of these blackguards.”

Engels in a letter to Marx, dated August 11, 1881, speaks about “the worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie.”

In a letter to Kautsky dated September 12, 1882, Engels wrote:

“You ask me what the English workers think about colonial policy. Well, exactly the same as they think about politics in general. . . . There is no workers’ party here, there are only Conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, and the workers gaily share the feast of England’s monopoly of the world market and the colonies.” *

On December 7, 1889, Engels wrote to Sorge:

“. . . The most repulsive thing here [in England] is the bourgeois ‘respectability’ which has grown deep into the bones of the workers. . . . Even Tom Mann, whom I regard as the finest of them, is fond of mentioning that he will be lunching with the Lord Mayor. If one compares this with the French, one can see what a revolution is good for after all.” **

In a letter dated April 19, 1890:

“But *under* the surface the movement [of the working class in England] is going on, it is seizing ever wider sections of the workers and mostly just among the hitherto stagnant *lowest* [Engels’ italics] masses, and the day is no longer far off when this mass will suddenly

find itself, when the fact that it is this colossal self-impelled mass will dawn upon it. . . .” *

March 4, 1891: “. . . the failure of the collapsed Dockers’ Union, the ‘old’ conservative trade unions, *rich* and therefore cowardly, remain alone on the battlefield. . . .”

September 14, 1891: At the Newcastle Trade Union Congress, the old unionists, opponents of the eight-hour day, were defeated and “the bourgeois papers recognize the defeat of the *bourgeois labor party*. . . .” ** (Engels’ italics.)

That these ideas, repeated in the course of decades, were also expressed by Engels publicly, in the press, is proved by his preface to the second (1892) edition of his *Condition of the Working Class in England*, where he speaks of the “aristocracy of the working class,” of a “privileged minority of the workers” as distinct from the “broad masses of the workers.” “A small, privileged, sheltered minority” of the working class, he says, alone enjoyed “lasting benefits” from the privileged position of England in 1848-1868, whereas “the broad masses at best enjoyed only a short-lived improvement.” “. . . With the collapse of England’s industrial monopoly the English working class will lose its privileged position. . . .” The members of the “new” unions, he continues, the unskilled workers’ unions, “have one immense advantage: their psychology is still virgin soil, entirely free from inherited ‘respectable’ bourgeois prejudices which muddle the heads of the bet-

* Cited place, p. 399.—Ed.

** Ibid., p. 461.—Ed.

* Ibid., p. 480.

** Ibid., p. 488.—Ed.

ter placed 'old unionists.' . . ." In England, "the so-called labor representatives are those who are forgiven for belonging to the working class because they are themselves ready to drown this quality in the ocean of their liberalism."

We have deliberately quoted the direct statements of Marx and Engels at length in order that the reader may study them *as a whole*. They must be studied; they are worth pondering over, because they reveal the *pivot* of the tactics in the labor movement that are dictated by the objective conditions of the imperialist epoch.

Here, too, Kautsky has attempted to "ruffle the waters" by substituting sentimental conciliation with opportunism for Marxism. In controversy with the avowed and naive social-imperialists (like Lensch) who justify Germany in fighting this war on the grounds that it is destroying England's monopoly, Kautsky "*corrects*" this obvious falsehood by another equally obvious falsehood. Instead of a cynical falsehood he employs a sentimental one! England's *industrial* monopoly, he says, has long been broken, it was destroyed long ago, there is nothing left to destroy.

Why is this argument false?

First, it overlooks England's *colonial* monopoly. As we have seen, Engels, as early as 1882, thirty-four years ago, pointed to this very clearly! Although England's industrial monopoly has been destroyed, her colonial monopoly has not only remained, but has become extremely acute, because the world is already divided up! By means of this

sentimental lie Kautsky smuggles in the bourgeois-pacifist and opportunist-philistine idea that "there is nothing to fight about." The contrary is the case; the *capitalists* not only have something to fight about, but they *cannot help* fighting if they are to preserve capitalism, because, without a forcible redivision of the colonies the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain the privileges enjoyed by the older (*and less powerful*) imperialist powers.

Secondly, why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because monopoly yields *super-profits*, *i.e.*, profits over and above the capitalist profit which is normal and usual throughout the world. The capitalists *are able* to spare a part (and no small part, at that!) of these super-profits to bribe *their* workers, to create something like an alliance (remember the famous "alliances" of the English trade unions with their employers as described by the Webbs) between the workers of the given nation and their capitalists *against* the other countries. England's industrial monopoly was destroyed about the end of the nineteenth century. This is beyond dispute. But *how* was it destroyed? Has *all* monopoly disappeared?

If that were the case there would be some justification for Kautsky's "theory" of conciliation (with the opportunists). But the whole point is that it is *not* the case. Imperialism is monopoly capitalism. Every cartel, trust and syndicate, every gigantic bank is monopoly. Super-profit has not disappeared, it has

remained. The exploitation of *all* other countries by one privileged, financially rich country has remained and has become more intense. A handful of rich countries—there are only four of them, if we are to speak of independent, and really gigantic “modern” wealth: England, France, the United States and Germany—have developed monopoly to vast proportions, obtain *super*-profits amounting to hundreds of millions, even billions, “ride on the backs” of hundreds and hundreds of millions of the populations of foreign countries, fight among one another for the division of the particularly rich, particularly fat and particularly easy spoils.

This is the economic and political essence of imperialism, the very deep contradictions of which Kautsky does not expose, but covers up.

The bourgeoisie of a “Great” imperialist Power is *economically able* to bribe the upper strata of its workers, devoting one or two hundred million francs a year for this purpose, because its *super*-profits probably amount to a billion. The question as to how this little sop is distributed among the Labor Ministers, the “labor representatives” (remember Engels’ splendid analysis of this term), the labor members of War Industries Committees, the labor officials, the workers who are organized in craft unions, salaried employees, etc., etc., is a secondary question.

Between 1848 and 1868, partly even later, England alone enjoyed a monopoly; *that is why* opportunism could be victorious there for decades. There were *no other* countries

with very rich colonies, or with an industrial monopoly.

The last third of the nineteenth century witnessed the transition to the new imperialist epoch. Monopoly is enjoyed by finance capital *not* in one, but in some, very few, Great Powers. (In Japan and Russia, the monopoly of military power, vast territories, or special facilities for robbing minority nationalities, China, etc., partly supplements and partly takes the place of the monopoly of modern, up-to-date finance capital.) Because of this difference England’s monopoly *could* remain *unchallenged* for decades. The monopoly of modern finance capital is furiously challenged; the epoch of imperialist wars has begun. Formerly, the working class of *one* country could be bribed and corrupted for decades. At the present time this is improbable, perhaps even impossible.

On the other hand, however, *every* imperialist “Great” Power can and does bribe *smaller* (compared with England in 1848-1868) strata of the “labor aristocracy.” Formerly a “*bourgeois labor party*,” to use Engels’ remarkably profound expression, could be formed only in one country, because that country alone enjoyed a monopoly, and enjoyed it for a long period. Now the “*bourgeois labor party*” is *inevitable* and typical for *all* the imperialist countries; but in view of the desperate struggle that is being waged for the division of the booty, it is improbable that such a party will remain victorious for any length of time in a number of countries; for while trusts, the financial oligarchy,

high prices, etc., *permit* the bribing of small upper strata, they at the same time oppress, crush, ruin and torture the *masses* of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat more than ever.

On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists to convert a handful of the richest, privileged nations into "eternal" parasites on the body of the rest of mankind, to "rest on the laurels" of exploitation of Negroes, Hindus, etc., by keeping them in subjection with the aid of the excellent technique of destruction of modern militarism.

On the other hand, there is the tendency of the *masses*, who are more oppressed than formerly and who bear the brunt of the suffering caused by imperialist wars, to throw off that yoke, to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Henceforth, the history of the labor movement will inevitably unfold itself in the struggle between these two tendencies: for the first tendency is not accidental, it is "founded" on economics. The bourgeoisie has already begotten, nurtured, secured for itself "bourgeois labor parties" of social-chauvinists in *all* countries. The difference between a definitely formed party, like Bissolati's party in Italy, for example, which is a perfectly social-imperialist party, and, say, the semi-formed, incomplete party of the Potresovs, Gvozdevs, Bulkins, Chkheidzes, Skobelevs and Co., is unimportant. The important thing is that the economic desertion of a stratum of the labor aristocracy to the side of the bourgeoisie has matured and become an accomplished

fact. This economic fact, this change in the relations between *classes*, will find for itself political form of one kind or another without much "difficulty."

On the economic foundation mentioned, the political institutions of modern capitalism—the press, parliament, trade unions, congresses, etc.—created *political* privileges and sops for the respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic salaried employees and workers corresponding to the economic privileges and sops. Lucrative and easy berths in the Ministries or War Industries Committees, in parliament and on various commissions, on the editorial staffs of "respectable" legal newspapers, or on management boards of no less respectable and "bourgeois law-abiding" trade unions—these are the means with which the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and adherents of the "bourgeois labor parties."

The mechanics of political democracy work in the same direction. It would not do to dispense with elections in our age; the masses cannot be dispensed with, and in this epoch of book printing and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to make the masses follow you without a widely ramified, systematically managed, well-equipped system of flattery, lies and fraud, without juggling with fashionable and popular catchwords, without scattering right and left promises of all kinds of reforms and blessing for the workers, if only they abandon the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. I would

call this system, Lloyd-Georgian, after one of the most prominent and subtle representatives of this system in the classic land of the "bourgeois labor party," the English Cabinet Minister, Lloyd George. A first class bourgeois man of affairs and master of political cunning, a popular orator, able to make any kind of speech, even r-r-revolutionary speeches before labor audiences, capable of securing fairly considerable sops for the obedient workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, etc.), Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly,* and serves it precisely *among* the workers, transmits its influence *precisely* among the proletariat, where it is most needed and most difficult morally to subjugate the masses.

And is there much difference between Lloyd George and the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Hendersons and Hyndmans, the Plekhanovs, Renaudels and Co.? It may be argued that of the latter, some will return to the revolutionary socialism of Marx. This is possible, but it is an insignificant difference in degree, if we take the question in its political, i.e., in its mass aspect. Certain individuals among the present social-chauvinist leaders may return to the proletariat; but the social-chauvinist, or (what is the same thing) opportunist *trend* can neither disappear nor "return" to the revolutionary proletariat. Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers,

this political trend, this "bourgeois labor party" will swear by the name of Marx. You cannot prevent it from doing so any more than a trading firm can be prevented from using any label, any sign, any advertisement it pleases. It has always happened in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies attempted to assume their names in order to deceive the oppressed classes.

The fact is that as a political phenomenon "bourgeois labor parties" have already been formed in *all* the advanced capitalist countries, and unless a determined, ruthless struggle all along the line is conducted against these parties—or, what is the same thing, against these groups, trends, etc.—it is useless talking about the struggle against imperialism, about Marxism, or about the socialist labor movement. The Chkheidze fraction, *Nashe Dyelo, Golos Truda*,* in Russia, and the "O.C.-ists" abroad, are nothing but varieties of one or other of *these parties*. We have not the slightest grounds for thinking that these parties can disappear *before* the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution approaches, the stronger it flares up, the more sudden and violent the transition and leaps are during the course of the revolution, the greater will be the role in the labor movement of the struggle between the

* Recently, in an English magazine, I read an article by a Tory, a political opponent of Lloyd George's, entitled "Lloyd George, from a Tory Point of View." The war has opened the eyes of this opponent and made him realize what an excellent servant of the bourgeoisie this Lloyd George is! The Tories have made peace with him!

* *Nashe Dyelo (Our Cause)* a Menshevik Liquidationist newspaper published in St. Petersburg. *Golos Truda (The Voice of Labor)* was a Menshevik newspaper published in 1916 in Samara.—Ed.

revolutionary mass stream and the opportunist-philistine stream. Kautskyism is not an independent trend, for it has no roots either among the masses or among the privileged stratum which has deserted to the side of the bourgeoisie. The danger of Kautskyism lies in that it utilizes the ideology of the past in its efforts to reconcile the proletariat with the "bourgeois labor party," to preserve the unity of the proletariat with that party and thereby to uphold its prestige. The masses no longer follow the lead of the avowed social-chauvinists. Lloyd George has been howled down at workers' meetings in England. Hyndman has resigned from the party. The Renaudels and Scheidemanns, the Potresovs and Gvozdevs have to be protected by the police. The concealed defense of the social-chauvinists by the Kautskyans is the most dangerous.

One of the most widespread sophisms of Kautskyism is its reference to the "masses." They say: We do not want to break away from the masses and mass organizations! But ponder over how Engels approached this question. In the nineteenth century the "mass organizations" of the English trade unions were on the side of the bourgeois labor party; but Marx and Engels did not compromise with it on those grounds, but exposed it. They did not forget, first, that the trade union organizations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then and in Germany now, not more than one-fifth of the proletariat was organized. It cannot be seriously believed that it is possible to organize the majority of the pro-

letariat under capitalism. Second—and this is the main point—it is not so much a question of how many members there are in an organization, as of the real objective meaning of its policy: does this policy represent the masses? Does it serve the masses, *i.e.*, the emancipation of the masses from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, its conciliation with capitalism? The latter was true for England of the nineteenth century; it is true for Germany, etc., today.

Engels draws a distinction between the "bourgeois labor party" of the *old* trade unions, a privileged minority, and the "lower mass," the real majority. Engels appeals to the latter, which is *not* infected with "bourgeois respectability." This is the essence of Marxian tactics!

We cannot—nor can anybody else—calculate exactly what portion of the proletariat is following and will follow the social-chauvinists and opportunists. This will only be revealed by the struggle, it will be definitely decided only by the socialist revolution. But we know definitely that the "defenders of the fatherland" in the imperialist war *represent* only a minority. And it is our duty, therefore, if we wish to remain Socialists, to go down *lower* and *deeper*, to the real masses: this is the whole meaning and the whole content of the struggle against opportunism. Exposing the fact that the opportunists and social-chauvinists really betray and sell the interests of the masses, that they defend the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are the conduits of bourgeois ideas

and influence, that in practice they are allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we thereby teach the masses to understand their real political interests, to fight for socialism and the revolution throughout the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armistices.

To explain to the masses the inevitability and the necessity of breaking with opportunism, to edu-

cate them for revolution by a ruthless struggle against opportunism, to utilize the experiences of the war for the purpose of unmasking the utter vileness of national-liberal labor politics and not to cover them up—this is the only Marxian line to be pursued in the international labor movement. . . .

Written in the autumn of 1916
Sbornik Sotsial Demokrata, No. 2, Dec., 1916

INNOVATIONS AND BUSINESS CYCLES

A NEW "THEORY" OF CYCLICAL CRISES REVEALS OLD BOURGEOIS BANKRUPTCY

BY C. E. WISDEN

JOSEPH A. SCHUMPETER'S *Business Cycles** purports to offer not only a theory of business cycles but also "a theoretical, historical and statistical analysis of the capitalist process." It begins with a section which attempts to construct a theoretical model for varying kinds of cyclical fluctuation, the model supposedly derived from the static norm of bourgeois equilibrium theory and from the dynamic pattern of the author's *Theory of Economic Development*. The remainder of the book is largely a historical and statistical analysis of business cycles in the United States, Germany and England since 1787 in terms of this model, interspersed with digressions on economic and statistical theory.

Through this voluminous work, the author tries to give the impression of being ultra-scientific; he makes use of all the externalia of scholarship; he overwhelms his reader with technical terms, self-

stultifying and therefore presumably impartial qualifications, ponderous footnotes, abundant charts and erudite references. From his Olympian heights, he disclaims partiality and judgments of value. Welfare becomes merely a side issue. The cry is all for "scientific method."

But all these pretenses are a disguise for bourgeois apologetics and for the inculcation of fascist ideology. The author's utterly unscientific theory of crises and of capitalist development but reflects in the realm of scholarship the decadence of capitalism. However, this work, by its sheer avoirdupois, may deceive certain students of the history of capitalist crises, and, should therefore, be exposed.

Who is this Schumpeter? He is an Austrian bourgeois economist who made his reputation by distorting an idea which is a commonplace among Marxists. Thirty years ago he wrote a book called *Die Theorie der Wirtschaftliche Entwicklung* (now available in English as *The Theory of Economic Development*) in which he emphasized

* *Business Cycles*, by Joseph A. Schumpeter, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1939. Two volumes, 1095 pp., \$10.00.

the need for interpreting capitalism as an economic process in motion. But of course he dared not uncover the economic laws of motion of capitalism. He makes the driving force of the capitalist system, not the never-ending quest for surplus value through the increasing exploitation of the laborers but the innovating activities of the entrepreneur. This spurious discovery won him wide acclaim among bourgeois economists and paved the way for his appointment as the Social-Democratic Minister of Finance in the first coalition government of the Austrian Republic in 1919.

We know of his official activities from Otto Bauer's *Die Oesterreichische Revolution*. In a government which, on Bauer's own admission, had as its main function the suppression of the revolutionary upsurge of the Austrian working class, Schumpeter's role was particularly shady and opportunistic. When it seemed that not even the Austrian Social-Democracy could arrest the tide of revolution, Schumpeter—to use Bauer's words—coquetted with Bolshevism and was a fervent apostle of socialization. But when the fate of the Austrian Revolution was sealed in the blood of the Viennese workers, he moved over violently to the Right. He strongly opposed a capital levy and promoted the catastrophic inflation entailing starvation for the Austrian proletariat with a slogan which is still a by-word among Austrians. While the purchasing power of the krone was visibly vanishing, he insisted that "the krone remain a krone."

Most nauseating of all was the episode in which he collaborated with the Viennese banker Kola and with Italian finance capitalists to prevent the nationalization of the Alpin Montangesellschaft, the largest industrial concern in Austria. Behind the backs of his Social-Democratic colleagues, who could only too easily be dissuaded from any socialist enterprise, he engaged in a shady transaction by which shares in the Alpin Montangesellschaft were transferred from Austrian to Italian ownership. Consequently when the Social-Democrats announced their intention to nationalize, they were presented with the *fait accompli* of Italian capitalist ownership, engineered by the intrigues of their own Minister of Finance.

Schumpeter was rewarded for his faithful services in practical politics with a banking job, then with a professorship at Bonn, and a decade ago with a professorship at Harvard. His academic activities have consisted in the regurgitation of ideas which were stale in his youth, and in the criticism of any and every progressive economic theory and policy. His usefulness to the American bourgeoisie has been enhanced by the prestige of his European scholarship and by his passing familiarity with Marxism.

We know then what to expect from this work of scholarship hailed by Algernon Lee as "one of the three or four most important works of general economic theory since Marx's *Capital*." (*The New York Times Book Supplement*, December 17, 1939).

*Innovations and Economic
Development*

The crux of Schumpeter's theory of the capitalist process is his conception of the entrepreneur or innovator and of the role of innovations. Innovations are not inventions and technological changes, though these may constitute a part of innovations. They are new combinations of the factors of production, and as such include not only the application of inventions, the opening up of new markets, the introduction of new commodities and of radical improvements in old ones, but also Taylorization and speed-up, mergers and consolidations. Schumpeter's entrepreneur is not the entrepreneur of the ordinary parlance of bourgeois economics, he is not the ordinary business man, he is the business man who introduces an innovation. Thus the innovator becomes the dominant character and innovation the dominant characteristic of capitalism.

"... innovation is the outstanding fact in the history of capitalist society or what is purely economic in that history, and also . . . it is largely responsible for most of what we would at first sight attribute to other factors." (p. 86.)

This theory of innovations on which Schumpeter builds his whole theoretical structure is a piece of bourgeois apologetics. It covers up the essential features of the capitalist system. It conceals the exploitation of the working class by the owners of the means of production, who through that ownership are able to extract surplus value. It

paints the drive inherent in the capitalist system towards an intensified extraction of surplus value, not as robbery, but as "innovation." It makes the source of profit and interest, not the surplus value expropriated from the workers, but innovation. It glosses over most of the violent contradictions which are now riving capitalism apart.

It idealizes the vilest creatures of the last hundred years. The captains of finance are not swindlers and robber barons, they are public benefactors. As innovators they are engineers of social progress. Cecil Rhodes was not a colonial plunderer, he was an innovator. (p. 380.) Hill and Harriman were not financial sharks, they were innovators. (p. 405.) The great innovation in rubber was not the spoliation of the colonial peoples of Malaya and the East Indies, it was the planting of the rubber tree, and as such it was "a purely English performance." (pp. 430-31.) So gross a travesty of the functioning of the capitalist system is this picture of innovators and innovations that the author himself is cynical enough to admit that the bootleggers of the early 'twenties were also innovators. (p. 784, note 1.)

Schumpeter makes his so-called innovators the mainspring of the economic system. He dares not admit that the way in which they function derives immediately from their position in the capitalist mode of production, and therefore he puts them above class.

"... entrepreneurs as such do not form a social class. Although, in case of success, they or their descen-

dants rise into the capitalist class, they do not from the outset belong to it or any other definite class. As a matter of historical fact, entrepreneurs come from all classes which at the time of their emergence happened to exist." (p. 104.)

Schumpeter here is guilty of several vulgar errors. First, membership in a class is determined, not by immediate class origin, but by one's position in the system of production relations. Carnegie may have started as a laborer, but he became a capitalist by virtue of the fact that he "earned" his income by means of his ownership of the means of production. All Schumpeter's innovators are capitalists, and are members of a specific social class. As the most successful capitalists, they are the exemplars of their class.

Secondly, Schumpeter deliberately gives the impression that men are innovators, not as a result of their place in a given historical mode of production, but as a result of their own individual abilities, their restless search for new methods of production, and their capacity for leadership. Their talents are "primarily volitional." (p. 85.) He even goes so far as to say that these same people show their innovating ability under different systems of production. They are innovators, not because they are owners, but because they are leaders. (p. 103.) To make his picture more convincing, he associates innovation with "New Plants, New Firms, and New Men." This talk of "New Plants, New Firms and New Men" is so much hokum; the

formation of U.S. Steel was an innovation *par excellence* in the Schumpeterian sense of the term, but it had nothing to do with either "New Plants, New Firms, or New Men." This picture is a particularly crass example of pre-scientific animism, for these innovators, these successful capitalists, are actually "the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class relations and class interests." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume I, p. XIX, International Publishers, New York.) They are not only not outside or above any social class, they are actually the sharpest and most striking embodiments of the capitalist class and of capitalist class interests.

Innovators and innovations are not the motive power of economic development under capitalism. The behavior of the so-called innovators and the emergence of innovations can be understood and explained only in terms of the processes of capital accumulation.

"Only as personified capital is the capitalist respectable. As such, he shares with the miser the passion for wealth as wealth. But that which in the miser is a mere idiosyncrasy, is, in the capitalist, the effect of social mechanism, of which *he is but one of the wheels* [italics mine—C.E.W.]. Moreover, the development of capitalist production makes it constantly necessary to keep increasing the amount of capital laid out in a given industrial undertaking, and competition makes the immanent laws of capitalist production to be felt by each individual capitalist, as external coercive laws. It compels him to

keep constantly extending his capital, in order to preserve it, but extend it he cannot, except by means of progressive accumulation." (*Ibid.*, p. 603.)

Marx here tears off the fig leaf with which apologists such as Schumpeter cover the nakedness of the capitalist. Schumpeter tries to endow the capitalist with respectability by making him the prototype of innovation. Marx shows that he is respectable only in so far as he is capital personified. Schumpeter makes him the driving force of the social mechanism; Marx demonstrates that he is only a wheel in that mechanism. Schumpeter tries to make innovation the mainspring of capital accumulation; Marx proves that technical progress is the concomitant and not the cause of capital accumulation. The capitalist in his quest for more and more surplus value must accumulate. "That is Moses and the Prophets." And in order to accumulate he must seek out and introduce ever more effective methods of exploiting the labor power he buys, and in so far as inventions and technical advances serve this purpose, they are introduced. If another capitalist adopts more efficient methods of exploiting the laborer, he must imitate them or go to the wall. The tendency of the rate of profit to decline with the heightening of the organic composition of capital—a heightening which the very process of capital accumulation promotes—accentuates the drive towards the greater exploitation of the worker. Thus, far from being "primarily volitional," the so-

called innovating activities of the individual capitalist are the product of the immanent laws of capitalist production which, in the words of Marx, he feels as external coercive laws.

Schumpeter's theory of innovation can explain neither the technical progress that occurs under capitalism in its period of ascendancy, nor the retardation of technical progress under capitalism in decay. In the era of ascendancy, when capitalism was performing its historic role of unleashing the forces of production on a hitherto unprecedented scale, the restless search for profits was not only not incompatible with—but demanded—technological advance. In order to produce more surplus value, to produce more profits, it was necessary to introduce machinery. It was necessary to extend the use of machinery to all the basic industries and to complete the technical foundations of industry by also mechanizing the processes of producing machinery. This historically progressive function could be performed only by the application of science, by the great discoveries in engineering, chemistry and physics and their application to industry. It is common knowledge that most of the great inventions were not the work of capitalists; they were the work of craftsmen and scientists whom the capitalist had as little compunction in exploiting as he did the workers in his factory. Nevertheless, he did not retard or suppress the use of these inventions, he filched and expropriated them for his own profit.

But with the emergence and domination of finance capital the whole picture is transformed. The progressive stage of capitalism has long been over. The continued existence of the capitalist system acts as a barrier to further increases in the social productivity of labor. Machine industry signifies the socialization of the process of production, in that it is carried on, not by isolated but by associated labor; but the continuing private ownership of the means of production acts as a fetter to the productive forces.

In the imperialist epoch this private ownership is concentrated in the hands of a dwindling number of monopoly capitalists. Through their financial power they monopolize first whole industries and then whole groups of industries until they obtain a stranglehold on the whole economic system. Their primary consideration is the preservation of monopoly profits, and these profits can only be preserved by the consolidation and extension of this stranglehold, even if this entails the suppression of new productive methods and the curtailment of production. While under industrial capitalism the capitalist was usually tied up directly with the process of production, if only in his capacity as a supervisor, the monopolist is completely divorced from the productive process. His only function is to clip coupons and collect his monopoly profits.

In this stage of capitalism the clash between the productive forces of capitalism and its production relations is heightened and this clash

is reflected in all spheres of life. The struggle to maintain monopoly profits leads to the sharpening of the imperialist conflict for world hegemony with its irresistible drive towards imperialist war. It leads simultaneously to the sharpening of the internal class conflict, as a result of the monopolists' renewed onslaughts on the standards of living of the working class and of the efforts of the working class to stave off imperialist war and lighten the intolerable burdens monopoly capitalism imposes on it. Thus is ushered in the era of the general crisis of capitalism.

Technical progress now assumes a very different character. Whereas previously the capitalist increased his profits and accumulated capital by adopting technical innovations, now the great aggregations of capital generally find it increasingly necessary to *suppress them* in order to maintain profits. In a large number of instances these innovations threaten to render valueless existing huge agglomerations of capital; they threaten to displace old processes in which such large and profitable investments have been made. In the words of the petty-bourgeois liberal Brandeis, who sighs for the old days when the small firm and not the large corporation was the characteristic unit of capitalist production, "the great corporations of this country are constitutionally unprogressive."

In the hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee of the Seventy-sixth Congress to investigate the concentration of economic power, case after case of the suppression of inventions in lead-

ing industries was exposed. To give but one instance out of many: The Bell Telephone Company now has a patent by which a radio vacuum tube with a life of 50,000 hours can be produced, but the only product available on the market is a tube with a life-time of 1,000 hours! (Hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Part 3, pp. 963-68.) This same company, it was found in the preliminary report of a Congressional investigation of the telephone industry, owned 44.4 per cent of all the outstanding patents relating to long-distance telephone, of which two-thirds were unused. In the words of the Commissioner in charge of this investigation, such a procedure:

“ . . . brings about patent suppression, since a large number of patents and patent rights are acquired for the purpose of *fostering a monopoly and with no intention of use.*” [Italics mine—C. E. W.] See *National Research Project on Re-employment Opportunities, Industrial Research Changing Technology*, p. 49, Note 2.)

It does not, of course, follow that technical progress ceases altogether in the epoch of monopoly capitalism. Because capitalism develops unevenly, in certain sectors of industry—especially in those connected with war and destruction—technological progress still occurs. But it becomes more and more sporadic, more and more confined to war industry; the systematic suppression of inventions increases,

and in some branches of production there is even reversion to more primitive methods of production, while deliberate curtailment of output becomes less the exception and more the rule.

It was necessary to spend so much time on Schumpeter's theory of innovations, because since its hollowness is revealed, the whole structure of his theory of economic development and of the cyclical pattern of that development collapses. Innovators and innovations are not the driving force of economic development under the capitalist mode of production. On the contrary, the emergence of innovations and the historical change in the type of innovations can adequately be explained only by the Marxist theory of economic development, which reveals the essential features of the capitalist mode of production. Innovations cannot serve as the explanation of the development of capitalism. They must themselves be explained in terms of the historical laws of capitalist development. These innovations do not come from the sky; they do not spring Minerva-like from the minds of a peculiar set of men called innovators; they derive from a particular historically conditioned mode of production, in which the unleashing of the forces of the production inevitably clashes with the production relations. Any account of innovations which ignores the quest for surplus value, the increasingly higher organic composition of capital, and the consequent tendency of the ratio of profit to decline is bound to be impressionistic, is

bound to evade the main problem.

Why do innovations occur? Why do a given group of people have this urge to introduce innovations? Why do they not go on producing in the old way? Without Marx's general law of capitalist accumulation, these so-called innovations become an unfathomable mystery.

Innovations and Crises

Schumpeter gives the following picture of the occurrence of cyclical fluctuations. A successful innovation results in an immediate expansion of output as a result of the capital accumulation necessary to put the innovation into effect. This expansion is accentuated by the stimulation given to other industries or by the fact that other businessmen in the same industry follow suit, that the initial innovation encourages or induces other innovations. Finally the innovation evokes a secondary wave of expansion by old firms and industries. Hence prosperity and boom. But the wave of innovations must eventually come to an end. Hence recession and depression. But why does the successful innovation occur in the first place? And why must it eventually come to an end? Why must economic development under capitalism occur in "waves" of innovation of an indeterminate regularity? There is no rhyme or reason to this rhythm of economic activity.

The arbitrariness of this approach to capitalist crises is exposed in the author's analysis, in which he uses a three-cycle schema of different length types super-imposed on each other. First, there is

the Kondratieff cycle (named after the Menshevik Professor Kondratieff) for from fifty to sixty years, then the Juglar cycle of eight to ten years, and last the Kitchin cycle of about forty months. Schumpeter attempts no theoretical defense for this classification of cycles; it is merely a "convenient descriptive device" (p. 170); the reader can attempt other classifications if he prefers. (*Ibid.*)

This approach allows no systematic construction of the history of capitalist crises; only a chaotic subjectivist construction becomes possible. The "long list of wars, foreign entanglements, revolutions" of the Kondratieff of 1842-97 constitute a series of factors "external to that social pattern." (p. 311.) The first world imperialist war in its entirety and the history of revolution and counter-revolution in Germany from 1918 to 1923 are excluded from the post-1897 Kondratieff. (p. 692.)

Marx's brilliant suggestion that the best way to approach the duration of cycles is through the duration of the cycle of production and reproduction of machinery is dismissed with the following characteristic distortion:

"The writer is at a loss to understand how Marx—who when speaking of capitalist industry, primarily meant textile manufacturers—could have spoken of 'a ten-year life cycle' of the fixed 'capital' of that industry." (p. 190, Note 1.)

In the first place, Marx did not primarily mean the textile industry when talking of capitalist industry. In the passage to which

Schumpeter is apparently referring, Marx specifically mentions the lifetime of machinery in "*the essential branches of great industry.*" [Italics mine—C.E.W.] (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, p. 211, Charles H. Kerr Co.)

In the second place, Marx makes it clear in the same passage that it is not a question of a definite number of years, but of an approximate number of years. Lastly, Marx's suggestion fits in very well with the facts; if we inspect the cycles before the first world imperialist war, we find that their average duration is about ten years, 1825 to 1837, 1837 to 1847, 1847 to 1857, 1857 to 1866, 1866 to 1873, 1873 to 1882, 1882 to 1893, 1893 to 1900, and 1900 to 1907.

Critique of Schumpeter's Theory of Crises

Schumpeter's classification of cycles, however, besides facilitating the juggling of history and statistics, also renders it possible for him to minimize the significance of the qualitative changes in the operation of capitalism which manifest themselves with the emergence of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism. His theoretical scheme is applied indiscriminately to the period since 1900 without any reference to the fundamental changes of which Lenin gave the classical analysis in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, or to the accentuated contradictions of capitalism in the epoch of its breakdown.

The year 1929 is treated as more or less similar to 1873. The rise in economic activity in fascist Ger-

many, which was based almost entirely on state capitalist preparation for war and intensified exploitation of the vast majority of the German population, is handled with the same "theoretical schema" as is used for German capitalism in its period of expansion. Needless to say, this vulgar mechanistic point of view is convenient for the purpose of apologetics, but is totally inadequate for a serious scientific investigation.

Schumpeter cannot ignore the general crisis of capitalism altogether. It is too stark a fact for even a bourgeois economist to be blind to. But he does his best to explain it away in terms of the rise of "anti-capitalist attitudes." (pp. 400, 710, 1038), which are an inherent product of the operations of capitalism itself. This subterfuge which confines itself to a surface psychological phenomenon in itself reflects the thoroughgoing decay of bourgeois political economy since the day when Ricardo contemplated the threat to capitalism arising from the possibility of a declining rate of profit. Schumpeter denies the tendency of the rate of profit to decline (pp. 1032-38) and invokes instead a psychological *deus ex machina*. If capitalism is doomed, it is not because of its own inherent economic laws, it is because it regrettably produces "anti-capitalist attitudes."

The futility of Schumpeter's "theoretical schema" and of his three-cycle pattern as scientific weapons is further illustrated by his use of the concept of "external factors," which is invariably ap-

pealed to when his analysis is unsatisfactory. Bourgeois economists never deal with the capitalist system as a whole; they always confine themselves to certain limited aspects of it. The reason for this is simple: that is the only method by which they can continue to function. They must abstract from reality, they must not approximate it. Therefore, when their theoretical system breaks down, as it inevitably must when applied to concrete historical situations and problems, they must fall back on "external factors." *i.e.*, factors which are an integral part of the functioning of the capitalist mode of production, but which they abstract from in order to be able to build up a favorable picture of the economic system they are paid to defend. Schumpeter is no exception to the rule. As we have seen, the wars and revolutions of the second half of the nineteenth century and since 1914 are politely dismissed as external factors. Economic phenomena like changes in population are also regarded as "external factors." (p. 74.) Such an approach involves an admission of scientific bankruptcy. If the first and second imperialist wars are external factors, what are internal factors? If the most striking events of the history of capitalism must be shunned by political economy, what precisely is its subject matter? If the economic laws of motion of capitalism propounded by Schumpeter do not explain these things, what in the world can they explain?

But Schumpeter is both more intelligent and more slippery than the run-of-the-mill bourgeois econo-

mist, who refuses to budge beyond the paper world of his pricing mechanism. While drawing a "line between the phenomena directly incident to the working of the economic system and the phenomena produced by other social agencies acting on the economic system" (how and where can such a line be drawn; what kind of a science is it that confines itself to the former and excludes the latter?) he confesses that this action is obviously "conditioned by economic situations" and "propelled by economic aim or class interest" and that drawing this line "limits us to the surface of things." (pp. 7-8, and p. 7, Note 2.) In other words, the only difference between Schumpeter and most other bourgeois economists is that *he knows what he is doing*. He consciously abandons science. He restricts himself to "surface phenomena" not because he does not realize that they are surface phenomena, but because he does.

Schumpeter Rewrites History

It is impossible here to follow Schumpeter through his consistent falsification of the history of capitalism. This falsification has two functions only: first, to glorify the capitalist system, and, second, to prepare the way for fascism. There is room only for a few examples. The lie that the standard of living of the working class rises in periods of prolonged depression is dutifully repeated. (pp. 142, 277.)

The workers who joined the swelling industrial reserve army in the depression of the 'seventies and 'eighties had the consolation that

the goods they had no money to buy cost less than before. The British bourgeoisie is praised for its "ruthless energy" in imposing the burden of the Napoleonic Wars on the British proletariat. (p. 266.) The land robberies perpetrated by the American railroad kings in the era of American railroad expansion are justified "from a purely scientific point of view." (p. 328, Note 3.) "The story of the way in which civilized humanity got and fought cheap bread [who got and fought?] is, for our period [from 1865 to 1897] the story of American railroads and machinery." (p. 319.) It is not the story of the blood and sweat of the pioneers, of their being fleeced by the railroads and land speculators; it is the story of the initiative and, if you please, the educational activities of the railroads who "prepared many things for the would-be farmers, sometimes even furnished instructions." (*Ibid.*)

The task of selecting samples of falsification is an unenviable one, but one cannot refrain from alluding to the post-1919 economic history of England, Germany and the United States. The fact that capitalism in England and Germany was breaking down is ascribed to progressive taxation (pp. 712-13, 721, 727, 840), which in England resulted in "the greatest transfer of wealth in history outside the Soviet Union." (pp. 727-28.) In fact, progressive taxation is one of his pet bogeymen. The income tax was too progressive in the United States in the 'twenties. (p. 719, Note 1.)

While he regrets "the insuperable prejudice that defeated the sales

tax" (p. 942) in the United States in 1932—it is an insuperable anti-capitalist prejudice on the part of the masses to resist the attempts of the bourgeoisie to impose the burden of the depression on those least able to bear it—the long overdue and inadequate New Deal reforms of the tax structure are condemned as "involving a transfer or redistribution of wealth which in the highest brackets amounted to the socialization of the bulk of private income, and in some cases, taxation for taxation's sake." (p. 1039.)

The shortage of consumer purchasing power in the United Kingdom, Germany and the United States after 1919 is a "pure myth." (p. 733, Note 1.) The great English building boom of 1932 solved the housing problem in the same sense that the clothing and food problems had already been solved, *i.e.*, "leaving many things to be done, no doubt, but only things of the *second order of difficulty and importance.*" (p. 751.) [*Italics mine—C.E.W.*] Yes, the only things of the second order of difficulty and importance that remain to be done, according to such bourgeois social observers as Sir John Orr, are to provide the English people with enough food, clothing, and housing, which is precisely what capitalism cannot do. But perhaps the establishment of socialism in England is only a matter of "the second order" to Schumpeter!

His narrative of the post-War economic scene in the United States is manufactured out of the whole cloth. It is a perfect example of "innovation" in the realm of history. The Harding-Coolidge government

"promptly abolished war-time restrictions and refrained from social and economic intervention." (p. 710.) No doubt it abstained from social and economic intervention in participating in the Teapot Dome scandal which, incidentally, was a first-class specimen of an economic "innovation," i.e., a new combination of the factors of production.

Readers who are familiar with the United States Government's role in the Washington Conference of 1922, the Dawes Plan of 1924, the suppression of the Chinese Revolution in 1927, and the numerous interventions in Latin America will be pleasantly surprised to learn that it "successfully kept out of entanglements abroad" (*Ibid.*) in this period. Unemployment before 1929 can in large part be explained by "the nomadic habits of the American workman and the high level of earnings that made it easy to tide over a short spell of unemployment and even to look upon it as a holiday." (p. 840.)

The learned author finds the automobile and rubber industries characterized by perfect competition rather than by monopoly. (p. 775.)

Yet Schumpeter has the temerity to claim that these Munchausen fables are not intended to "whitewash capitalism." (pp. 701-04, 710, Note 2.) They are all told in the interests of the purest of pure science, and are not motivated by any desire to prejudice the reader in favor of the perpetuation of a moribund economic system.

Admires Nazi Economy

But it is hard to believe that

Schumpeter is very serious in his pretense of objectivity or he would not have juxtaposed his economic analysis of German fascism (pp. 971-83) with that of the American economy since 1932. (pp. 983-1050.)

He cannot resist the opportunity to applaud the Nazi economy on every count on which he scores the New Deal, with all its limitations and deficiencies before it was abandoned in 1939. Capitalism on its last legs is driven to seek a solution in a war economy, by piling up the production of armaments and drastically reducing the production of everything not immediately pertaining to the waging of war. The ghastly German boom in arms is avidly eulogized by Schumpeter. Its performance is "exactly the kind of performance that our model would have led us to expect from unfettered capitalism." (p. 972.) While Nazi policy offered an opportunity for entrepreneurial activity (p. 973)—Schumpeter overlooks the obvious point that the only innovations of which such entrepreneurial activity is capable are innovations in instruments of death—the New Deal engendered an atmosphere in which the big bourgeoisie shrank from such activity. (p. 1038.) The "conspicuous success of the spending policies of the German Government" (p. 974) stands out in sharp relief to the inept spending policy of the U. S. Government (p. 1011, pp. 1031-32); this policy is criticized, not for its insufficiency, not for its hesitation and timidity, not for its final abandonment, but because it was not in the pattern of the fascist model he so ardently admires.

For its labor policy, i.e., the complete suppression of trade unions, the drastic curtailment of wages and the standard of living, the regimentation of the German proletariat by heavy industry, Nazism scores full marks from Schumpeter. The Government's wage policy produced the results to be expected in that Utopia of bourgeois economics—perfect competition (p. 977), it substantially contributed to what Schumpeter euphenistically calls "the Hitler regime's success." (*Ibid.*) Even more startling: "This policy of *making and keeping labor a cheap factor of production* [Italics mine—C.E.W.] greatly helped to increase the total income of the working class" and "real per capita income increased all along and in 1936 and in 1937 surpassed that of 1929." (pp. 978-79.)

It is a mistake to think that fascism lowers working class standards of living; Schumpeter has discovered that it has actually raised them! This barrage of nonsense is concocted from a statistical analysis which would disgrace a tyro. German official statistics are accepted uncritically by a man who elsewhere is always too glad to throw in a disarming qualification, and the fact that half the national income was being spent *directly* on war purposes is conveniently forgotten.

But the United States, that is a different story.

". . . The persistent official [?] efforts to raise the whole structure of wage-rates must on balance have had an adverse effect both on the expansion of output and on employ-

ment per unit of output." (p. 994.)

The increases in wages wrested by the American working class in the great labor struggles of 1933-35 can be attributed by Schumpeter only to "official government policies" which reduced investment opportunities by forcing up wage-rates. (pp. 1009 and 1042.)

To sum up; whereas ". . . the strength of the 'fascist' [why the quotes?] state as against group interests [which groups? the heavy industrialists?] . . . in this case [of Germany] constituted a behavior in accordance with the rules of long-term economic rationality" (p. 976), in poor benighted America; "the coincidence in time between them [anti-capitalist policies] and the disappointing performance of the economic engine is indeed striking." (p. 1038.) The moral is simple. If only the American bourgeoisie had been able to enforce one-hundred-per-cent fascism in 1933, Schumpeter would have found the results fully in accord with "long-term economic rationality."

Schumpeter "Quotes" Marx

In conclusion, it is necessary to mention the author's references to Marx, which are a deliberate trap for the unwary. In one passage, he has the effrontery to call himself a Marxist (p. 7), in another, he "entirely agrees with Marx" on the nature of technological progress (p. 10). It is so clear that Schumpeter is as much a Marxist as an intelligent capitalist who hopes to profit in dollars and cents from distorting Marx. Schumpeter has read Marx

only for the purpose of grotesque caricature. We have already had occasion to deal with one such distortion. It is but one among many. Marx as well as the classical economists are criticized for emphasizing the class nature of entrepreneurial activity. (p. 104.) *Contra* Marx, there are very real instances of capital accumulation resulting from "abstinence" (p. 106, Note 1)—but Schumpeter doesn't bother to mention them. The materialist interpretation of history is rejected out of hand (p. 228). Marx's teachings on primitive accumulation of capital are falsified by making Marx raise the problem of how the exploiters secured an initial "stock of capital." (p. 229.) Actually, Marx explicitly avoided raising this kindergarten hen and egg problem by calling the phenomenon Schumpeter is alluding to "the so-called primitive accumulation," and, as always, gives a concrete historical account of its emergence.

"The so-called primitive accumulation is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of produc-

tion." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 738.)

At a time when the whole capitalist world is being plunged into the bloodiest war in its history, entailing mass starvation and destruction, Schumpeter talks of the "failure" of the Marxian predictions about increasing mass misery. (p. 499.) The hoary fallacy about the emergence of a new middle class is once again repeated to discredit the "simple and unrealistic contrast between property owners and proletarians" (p. 699), and a ludicrous statistical verification for post-War Germany appended in a footnote. (p. 698, note 2.) Finally, whenever he refers to what he calls the neo-Marxist theory of imperialism, it is to the work, not of Lenin, but of the notorious Social-Democrat Hilferding. Such is the level of his "Marxist" scholarship!

Schumpeter's work has been called monumental by bourgeois scientists. It is a monument—to the death of bourgeois political economy.

BOOK REVIEWS

OLIVER WISWELL—
AN IMPERIALIST DISTORTION
OF HISTORY

OLIVER WISWELL, by Kenneth Roberts. Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1940, 836 pp., \$3.00.

"He that is not a supporter of the independent state of America . . . is in the American sense of the word a *Tory*; and the instant that he endeavors to bring his Toryism into practice he becomes a *traitor*."—Thomas Paine.

KENNETH ROBERTS' widely-heralded *Oliver Wiswell* is only one of the more recent expressions of a reactionary trend toward rewriting and re-evaluating American history from a viewpoint antagonistic to our revolutionary-democratic traditions. Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind*, Knollenberg's *Washington and the Revolution*, Roosevelt's 1940 Jackson Day Dinner Address, to say nothing of Hollywood's contributions, amply evidence this trend.

What social forces operating on the American scene today are giving rise to this recrudescence of Toryism? Obviously, the imperialist bourgeoisie and the social groups dependent on and dominated by this driving force of reaction. This "ideological" campaign is but one aspect of the general offensive

against democracy and the democratic forces. It is waged by the warmongering American bourgeoisie bent on saving European capitalism from social revolution and salvaging for itself, through an alliance with British imperialism, as much of the imperialist booty of colonies and dependencies as is possible.

This, and this alone, accounts for the "rewriting" and "re-valuation" of the American tradition; for that tradition squarely challenges the predatory and anti-democratic designs of the American imperialist bourgeoisie. This trend is not accidental. It has been consciously developed to accomplish two quite necessary objectives. First, through its present fear of the people, of the democratic masses and of their nascent revolutionary aspirations, the bourgeoisie feels impelled to repudiate its own revolutionary antecedents, and to call in question the virtues of the popular masses in motion—Kenneth Roberts' "mob" and "rabble" which fought and won the Revolutionary War for American independence. Secondly, there is the effort to overcome through the rewriting of American history the traditional popular American mistrust of the British ruling classes, and thus lay the groundwork for winning support for the

British-American imperialist alliance.

That the contemporary situation is responsible for the literary effusions of these modern Tories is quite well understood by the bourgeois critics. R. L. Duffus, writing of Knollenberg's and of Roberts' books in *The New York Times* of December 15, observed that "it may even be that a realistic [sic!] approach to American history will have its use in guiding our present-day policies." (Our italics—G.P. and D.M.L.)

William Soskin, writing in the *Herald Tribune* of November 25, is even more explicit. He writes:

"It is not possible to say that Mr. Roberts had his eye on the present when he wrote his really magnificent story, but the fact remains that almost every chapter which portrays the responsible people—has its parallel in modern resentment at another revolutionary movement." (Our italics—G.P. and D.M.L.)

Furthermore, Mr. Soskin assures us that in a world which has a "pragmatic attitude to such values as 'liberty' and 'freedom,' it is quite apparent that Mr. Roberts' iconoclastic defense of the Tories will be popularly acceptable." (Our italics—G.P. and D.M.L.)

The judgment of the literary critics of the *Times* and the *Herald Tribune* is certainly borne out by Mr. Roosevelt, whose recent praise of the Tory and monarchist Alexander Hamilton, coupled with his taking Thomas Jefferson to task for his "excessive enthusiasm for the French Revolution," was quite pat-

ently fashioned after the historical conceptions of the economic royalists.

Nor is there anything unexpected about this new "revisionism" of American traditions. Earl Browder, whose services to the American people in resuscitating, popularizing and revitalizing our great revolutionary-democratic heritage are widely known and appreciated by all progressive people, warned long ago that the reactionaries would seek to rob us of our past traditions, to justify their present attacks against our liberties.

* * *

A case in point, *Oliver Wiswell* serves admirably to show the meaning of this new trend. The leitmotif of the book is hatred of the people—hatred born of fear. Whether it be the first chapter or the last, or practically any page in-between, the motif is the same. This basic theme underlies the denunciation of the Revolution of '76 as mob rule.

The common people, the mechanics and farmers, were the life force of the American Revolution. Organized in the Sons of Liberty, they made it impossible for the British to enforce the Stamp Act and other measures directed against the colonists. Mass action was not a frenzied outburst of destruction, but a necessary weapon, consciously employed by the people against the weapons of autocracy. People's justice was meted out to informers, to merchants who scabbed on the boycott of British goods, to Tories who used their special privileges to up-

hold reaction against the interests of the great majority.

With the courts controlled by the Crown, the colonial legislatures limited in their powers, and the majority of the people denied the right to vote, the state machinery was in the hands of British autocracy. Without mass action by the people, reactionary laws could not have been blocked, nor armies raised, nor new revolutionary organs of government established. There could have been no revolution! Furthermore, it was due to the independent power of the people that the revolution resulted not only in independence from England, but also (in a struggle which continued for years afterwards) in a wider extension of democratic rights to the masses than in all previous history.

But to Roberts the Revolution is but mob rule and the handiwork of two rabble-rousers, Sam Adams and John Hancock! Smouldering under personal grievances, these two despicable demagogues, we are told, set out to prevent the peaceful and fair settlement of grievances, which the colonies are on the point of securing from his Majesty, George III. Unable to convince the ignorant unwashed mob by reason, they set out to inflame the passions of the people, inciting them to mob and plunder every man of intelligence who dares express hope of a peaceful settlement.

The revolutionary army is a rabble of thieves, rapists and yokels who run at the first gunshot but glory in terrorizing innocent "Loyalist" women and children. The men of the army are "ignorant-looking, pock-marked, furtive-eyed, slack-

lipped, shambling, hoarse-voiced . . . and misshapen." (p. 51.) Headed by utterly incompetent officers such as Washington, the despised mob continues to ruin the country only because the British are too stupid to annihilate them.

Not so, however, the Tories. They, in the words of one of Mr. Wiswell's associates, are the fine people of the colonies:

"We are the people who have land, belongings, position, and we're standing by our guns in opposition to the people who have nothing. We're the conservative people, and what has been true of conservative people in all ages and all lands is true of us. We dissent from extreme and injudicious measures, from violence, from oppression, from revolution, from reckless statements and misrepresentation. We can't stomach liars, bullies or demagogues, or leaders without experience, ability or sound judgment. . . . There's no denying that within our ranks are a fair portion—and in this statement I'm again conservative—of the cultivation, of the moral thoughtfulness, of the personal purity and honor that exist in the American colonies." (pp. 258-59.)

The contemporary meaning of this glowing tribute to the eighteenth century Tories is not lost on the aforementioned Mr. Soskin. He assures his readers that "a large public will identify its own interest in a civil, individually responsible type of society with that of the earlier Loyalists; that it will feel a certain reasonableness in the Tories' hatred of the people who for years had threatened them with the loss of their homes, property and coun-

try." Even Mr. Soskin's formulations are interesting. The "earlier Loyalists" is obviously a bid for identifying the warmongering reactionaries of today as the "Loyalists" and patriots of the present time.

Nor is it accidental that the one "rebel" who wins the sympathy and admiration of Mr. Wiswell and his friends should be none other than Benedict Arnold. Arnold is no stranger to Mr. Roberts, for it was Mr. Roberts who rescued from a deserved oblivion and published the diaries of this classic symbol of the American Judas Iscariots. Sam Adams and John Hancock were "rabble-rousers," Jefferson was a "demagogue," Washington and Greene were "incompetent" military leaders, and LaFayette was a "fop"—but Arnold: "He was a great soldier, doing his utmost, single handed . . . to save America from self ruin and French domination." (p. 577.) This sire of treachery to the people stirs Mr. Roberts greatly. Oliver Wiswell "thought often of Arnold—of his astuteness, his great ability, his kindness. . . ." (p. 575.)

* * *

Finally, Mr. Roberts' book serves admirably to lay the foundations for the new lachrymose talk of the "mother country" which is designed to give emotional substance to the developing Anglo-American military alliance and the hoped for Anglo-American empire of Mr. Roosevelt's coming "New Order." Mr. Wiswell and his friends were partisans of the "Galloway Plan," which, according to them, would have equitably solved the problems of the relations between "the colo-

nies" and the "mother country"—without "patricidal" strife. Of that plan Mr. Roberts writes:

"The Galloway Plan had been a wise and noble-minded measure for a practical and permanent union between the American colonies and England, introduced in the Continental Congress by Joseph Galloway, a distinguished Philadelphian, speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly. He had called it 'The Plan of a Proposed Union between Great Britain and the Colonies. . . .'"

Irish, Indian and British colonial experience in general makes it quite obvious that the "rabble" and their "rousers" and "incompetent" leaders showed good judgment in rejecting this fifth column proposal.

However, there is a growing movement for Anglo-American union today that can well use the "great tradition" of the eighteenth century Tories to provide a respectable historic "basic" for their reactionary objectives. Mr. Walter Lipmann and Miss Dorothy Thompson, those outstanding intellectual warmongers of the *New York Herald Tribune* columns, are among the most lyrical of the exponents of a modern "Galloway Plan."

Trying to justify her advocacy of a "union of the English-speaking world," Dorothy Thompson asks quite bluntly, in her column of January 10: "Is Hitler going to be the only person in the world allowed to dream dreams and see visions?" Obviously not, for Miss Thompson has her own hallucinations, equally as valid as Hitler's. Nor, protests Miss Thompson, is such a dream un-American. Why? "For it is crystal clear which organ-

ization will dominate it," she replies. "Its center would be here, in the spot of greatest military and naval security and industrial and technological power." Or expressing the thesis in homelier words, Miss Thompson says, "It's a good old American *Saturday Evening Post* story about the boy who left home and came back with a fortune and invited the old folks to live in his house." Mr. Roberts' "contribution" is to depict the American Revolution as an unfortunate family misunderstanding which split us away from the "old folks" before we set out independently to make our "fortune."

It is also clear that the current version of the "Galloway Plan" reverses the roles of the original. Obviously, Miss Thompson's British "cousins," the shrewd imperial politicians of the Crown, have other ideas on that score, not nearly so far removed from the original.

Kenneth Roberts' plea for Anglo-American union is subtle, and therefore the more dangerous. Rather than openly whitewash British rule, he repeatedly suggests that only the stupid arrogance of the royal bureaucracy (coupled with the "demagoguery" of Hancock and Adams) prevented a happy partnership between colonies and "mother country." However, his nostalgia for the tie with Britain is revealed mainly in his nauseating glorification of the American Tories in their traitorous struggle against American independence.

* * *

In contrast to the "rebels," Ken-

neth Roberts' "Loyalists" are all noble characters without a blemish. They make the best soldiers in the world, and, with the least bit of encouragement from the British, could have beaten the "rebels." But, at every turn, they find the British bureaucracy filled with stupidity, corruption and (strange—is it not?) aristocratic contempt even for the "Loyalist" Americans. In spite of every rebuff, they cling to their masters, realizing that only through the restoration of His Majesty's rule can the land they love be freed from the follies of a people misled by "demagogues."

Such a caricature of the American Revolution has been derived by Roberts from the biased Tory writings of the times. It is as if one were to write a history of the Russian Revolution based on the "escape from the Soviet" type of history so popular with the Tory press of our day. Yet even his paraphrase of the Tories is distorted. Thus, he has skilfully kept the reader from fully realizing that Hutchinson, Leonard and other historical figures in the novel actually opposed the fundamental principles of democracy.

Roberts' Hutchinson was a "lover of his country, able historian, man of taste and penetration," object of the rage of the mob "for no reason except that he held office under the Crown." (p. 5.) Compare this "noble" figure with the reactionary governor who actually wrote that the common people always outnumber "men of weight and value" in Boston Town Meetings, and proposed "to compel the town to be a corporation. The people will not

seek it, because every one is sensible his importance will be lessened. If ever a remedy is found, it must be by compelling them to swallow it, and that by an exterior power—the Parliament." (Quoted by Vernon L. Parrington in "The Colonial Mind," *Main Currents in American Thought*, Vol. I, p. 201.) Likewise, the fictional Leonard fought for "freedom of thought and speech" (p. 58), while his historical counterpart was more concerned with the rights of peers and kings, and hailed the house of peers as "the bulwark of the British constitution" which has withstood the "sappings of democracy." "The prince, or sovereign, as some writers call the supreme authority of a state, is sufficiently ample and extensive to provide a remedy for every wrong, in all possible emergencies and contingencies." Therefore, all independent political power of the people is a "usurpation" of the "rightful prince." (Parrington, *Ibid.*, pp. 211-12.)

In his characterization of the revolutionary forces, Roberts has sought to escape all responsibility for distorting historical reality by putting the whole story in the mouth of a biased Tory. No character in the book gives a clear argument for the patriots' "cause." The actual issues of the Revolution are ignored, as are the roles of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and other great leaders of the struggle. The name of Tom Paine is not even mentioned. Adams and Hancock are apparently responsible for the whole revolution.

"Before Lexington and Concord, there was time for Adams and Han-

cock to agree to a peaceful settlement, but they never wanted to and now they won't. . . . Adams is a perpetual malcontent. . . . Since he can't save anything, he believes no one should be allowed to save, but that all earnings should be distributed among those who can't earn. Sam Adams is powerful in this province because he tells the malcontents, the incompetents, the lazy, the idle that they're the only honest people; that they're held down by the wealthy English, the wealthy merchants, the wealthy shipowners. He makes 'em want to kill every Englishman, every shipowner, every merchant, so that they can be wealthy shipowners and merchants themselves." (p. 58.)

Certainly, Adams and Hancock played a great role in the Revolution. But, like all truly great figures in history their power came from the fact that they understood and gave expression to the demands of a rising mass movement. They did not create the resentment of the farmers and mechanics of Massachusetts at the arrogance of the king's representatives and of the Tory aristocracy. They did not invent the demand that the common people be given a voice in government. They did help build organization and confidence of the masses in their own power to win satisfaction of their demands. They did help develop a greater perspective in the struggle. Sam Adams and Tom Paine especially performed a great task in showing the people of the colonies that they had embarked on a struggle that must end either in independence or in enslavement to Britain.

The source of the strength of such

men as Adams, Paine, Franklin and Jefferson lay in their deep-rooted confidence in the people. Their attitude to the masses was that of Tom Paine:

“As far as my experience in public life extends, I have ever observed that the great mass of people are always just, both in their intentions and their objects; but the true method of attaining such purposes does not appear at once.” (Parrington, *Cited Work*, p. 336.)

Adams felt that the best “constitution of civil government” is that which “admits equality in the most extensive degree.” He exposed the hypocrisy of the Wiswells with the following words:

“The fear of the Peoples abusing their Liberty is made an Argument against their having the Enjoyment of it; as if anything were so much to be dreaded by Mankind as Slavery.” (Parrington, *Ibid.*, p. 246.)

Jefferson, perhaps, saw best of all that:

“Men according to their constitutions and circumstances, in which they are placed, differ honestly in opinion. Some are Whigs, Liberals, Democrats, call them what you please. Others are Tories, Serviles, Aristocrats, etc. The latter fear the people and wish to transfer all power to the higher classes of society; the former consider the people as the safest depository of power in the last resort; they cherish them, therefore, and wish to leave in them all the powers to the exercise of which they are competent.” (Arthur

M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History*, p. 104.)

* * *

Oliver Wiswell was deliberately produced, and is as deliberately promoted, as a weapon of reaction against the progressive forces of today. Kenneth Roberts has wide experience as both agent and propagandist in the service of privilege and oppression—as a Captain of Military Intelligence in the Siberian Expeditionary Force, as European correspondent of the *Saturday Evening Post*, as campaign biographer of Coolidge, and as distorter of American history. As early as 1919, Roberts wrote a play which embodied the main theme of his latest novel. But instead of “liberty loving” Tory martyrs, his heroes were the “martyred” family of the Russian Tsar!

When Roberts has his characters denounce the “rabble” of 1776, he is attacking the exploited and oppressed of 1941. When Wiswell rants at “mob rule,” Roberts is expressing the hatred of the imperialist bourgeoisie for the emancipated peoples of the Soviet Union, and the fear that the masses in the capitalist world will follow their example. His “Loyalists” running for shelter to British reaction are intended as an example for the middle class of today to line up under the wing of monopoly capital.

Lastly, it is surely not without significance—although the bourgeois critics saw fit to pass over this aspect of *Oliver Wiswell* in silence—that this Tory brew is savored with anti-Semitism, attacks against the French Catholic population, and

vicious chauvinistic slanders against the Negro people. Political reaction inevitably spawns reactionary, divisive prejudices.

* * *

We are witnessing today a widespread systematic drive to revise and distort American history. The war drive against the democratic rights of the American people is of necessity accompanied by an attack upon the ideological bases of American democracy. The reactionaries are out to destroy the confidence of the people in their own ability to rule, and to destroy their love for those figures in American history who have been the most advanced champions of the common people. Yet this offensive is demagogically carried on in the name of democracy, in the guise of an attack on "mob rule" and "violence." "Liberty" and "freedom" are turned into ideal abstractions. In the name of "liberty" and "democracy" the people are asked to sacrifice their democratic rights, to give up hope of economic well being, and to die for imperialist war-makers. *Oliver Wiswell* is part of this reactionary drive to distort American history, which includes *Gone-With-the-Wind* slander of the Negro people and their allies among the whites in the Reconstruction period; Knollenberg's "debunking" of Washington's fight against reactionary sabotage in the Revolutionary army, Lippmann's thesis that the British empire has been an historical ally of American democracy, and Hollywood's lying caricature of John Brown.

A constant ideological struggle is necessary to preserve the historical traditions of the American people. Much work must be done to enable us to utilize most effectively the great heritage of our past experience as an aid in our present-day struggles against reaction. Each turn of events today gives new opportunities to apply the lessons of the past. The penetrating analysis of various phases of American history by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and in recent years by Earl Browder, provide an excellent foundation. Much work is still to be done to bring the American people a realization of the full significance of their revolutionary heritage.

When the futile attempt of the Robertses to distort the American Revolution will long have been forgotten, the people will still turn to Tom Paine's writings to read these words written at the close of the Revolution:

"The times that tried men's souls are over. . . . It would be a circumstance ever to be lamented and never to be forgotten, were a single blot, from any cause whatever, suffered to fall on a revolution, which to the end of time must be an honor to the age that accomplished it; and which has contributed more to enlighten the world and diffuse a spirit of freedom and liberality among mankind than any human event . . . that ever preceded it." ("The Crisis," No. 13, April 19, 1783. Selections from *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, pp. 112-14, Carlton House, New York.

GORDON PLACE and
DONALD M. LESTER.

LABOR'S LESSONS FROM THE LAST WORLD WAR

LABOR IN WARTIME, by John Steuben, International Publishers, New York, 160 pp., \$1.00.

AS PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT relentlessly pursues his drive towards imperialist war, the dire consequences of a war economy of "bullets not butter" are already becoming a reality to the American people. Step by step he has followed the dangerous path President Wilson trod in 1917, with even greater speed and audacity. His vast rearmament program, peacetime conscription, the scrapping of social welfare measures, the increased tax burdens on lower incomes, the persecution and imprisonment of labor leaders, the establishment of the Knudsen-Hillman war board and the most recent Lease-Lend Bill exceed Wilson's shameful record.

The fundamentals of a correct labor policy in this situation and the paramount importance of a militant labor leadership, uncompromising in its defense of peace and of labor's interests, are skillfully set forth in *Labor and Wartime*, a spirited and invaluable book by John Steuben. This carefully documented study of labor's experiences in the last World War offers necessary information and interpretation by which labor can guide its course. It provides, not only striking parallels in the methods used by the government, then and now, to crush anti-war sentiment and to plunge the country into the world conflict, but helps to evaluate the significant differences which strengthen the

anti-imperialist forces in the present historical period. These differences stem from the fact that organized labor is numerically stronger and more experienced, that it is now established in the mass production industries and is an important political force. Other new factors in this period are the significant role of the Communist Party, the existence of the socialist state, the Soviet Union, and the weakened position of world capitalism.

In World War I it was possible for the Government to tie organized labor to the war machine, although there was a deep-going sentiment for peace among the American people, revealed in the election of President Wilson on a peace platform in 1916. This was achieved by the Government's manipulation of labor's top leadership. The A. F. of L. was in a strategic position, despite the fact that it represented a small section of American labor. As Steuben says, the Government "did not fear to give organized labor a degree of recognition as long as labor's policies were shaped by leaders who not only supported the war but even demanded a 'directing part' in its prosecution." Once the policies of the A. F. of L. could be controlled through its traitorous leadership, the Government could unloose its full and merciless might against those sections of labor which were not war-minded and which could not be bribed, coerced, or terrorized from their fight against the imperialist war.

Samuel Gompers and a group of labor officials were willing to serve

the Government's ends. As early as 1915, Gompers was working secretly with the National Civic Federation on joint war plans, although officially the A. F. of L. was on record in support of a position of neutrality. To the demands for peace from the trade unions and peace councils, he turned a deaf ear. On the eve of declaration of war, at a conference of leaders of all A. F. of L. affiliates, he succeeded in forcing through a declaration in which the war was described as a struggle between the institutions of democracy and autocracy. Full labor support was promised. Steuben points out that: "Gompers was not satisfied with labor's declaration assuming the role of a supporter of imperialist war but advanced the idea that labor must be a *driving force*."

The declaration as passed asked for concessions to labor, but Gompers did not even present labor's demands to the Government. Appointed a member of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense by President Wilson, Gompers, like Hillman and Green today, directed his efforts towards aiding the Government's war plans and the intensified exploitation of labor unhampered by demands for higher wages to meet rising living costs.

The Socialist Party failed to rise to the emergency created by Gompers' role. Steuben shows that it:

"... could have led in organizing and crystallizing anti-war sentiments in the trade unions. It could have weakened or destroyed Gompers' usefulness to the warmongers. The least that could have been done was to reduce Gompers to an open

and exposed betrayer of labor in the eyes of the working class. . . . The unions which they [the Socialists] led were in no way distinguished from unions under conservative leadership."

This is in direct contrast with the leading role of the Communist Party today in its vigilance in exposing treacherous actions of pro-war labor leaders in and out of Government posts.

The absorption of Gompers into the war apparatus by no means stifled the struggle for peace and labor's fight for higher wages and the right to organize. The battle was waged from coast to coast even after the war broke out by workers in the A. F. of L., I.W.W., by Left-wing Socialists and by progressive groups. The courageous struggle against conscription and war and the subsequent imprisonment of Debs, Haywood, Ruthenberg, Earl Browder and others in a period of frenzied war hysteria is an inspiring record of working class history.

The I.W.W. bore the brunt of the Government's repressive measures against labor. The extent of the stark violence which was generated by wartime reaction and the I.W.W.'s unremitting struggle is effectively, although all too briefly, sketched in this book. Gompers gave overt aid to the Government in its furious onslaught on these workers. Today new war-makers in the labor movement have assumed similar responsibility. Even before the country is officially at war, the Government has instigated cries of "fifth column" to force through anti-alien laws and to imprison and persecute

Communist leaders. Indictments against A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders under laws supposed to combat trusts have already resulted in the imprisonment of a number of militant leaders of the fur workers.

Steuben raises a crucial question. Will the employers succeed in browbeating labor by creating the same hysteria against Communists as in the first World War against the I.W.W., with the obvious intent and inevitable consequence of destructive attacks on the entire trade union movement? Upon the answer to this question the future well being of the masses rests.

In this important review of the policies of government toward labor in the last World War which merits careful study by every worker, Steuben reveals the basic aims of government and industry during an imperialist war. Profits induce the capitalist owners of the means of production to provide the materials for war. The nation's manpower and productive resources are geared to intensified performance. Slogans of patriotism and democracy are used deceptively to urge a "common effort" and "national unity"; but the laboring masses alone are obliged to make the sacrifices, while monopoly reaps vast profits and strengthens its grip on the people. Basic to this program is the employers' drive to maintain the status quo in wages, to lengthen hours, to stop the spread of unionism, to prevent and break strikes and to impose compulsory arbitration.

How labor fought valiantly dur-

ing the last war for its interests in the face of such coercive measures is presented in pertinent detail by Steuben. Strikes were fought for higher wages, for the closed shop and for union recognition. During the first six months of the war, 72 per cent of all strikes for higher wages were successful. On the other hand, only 12 per cent of strikes for union recognition and the closed shop were won, revealing, as Steuben says, "that Wilson's recognition of Gompers and other labor leaders did not mean recognition of the trade unions."

As the war progressed, and terrorism and vigilanteism had failed to stop the strike movement, the President appointed a Mediation Commission of liberals to accomplish the task. He even deemed it necessary to address the A. F. of L. convention in person and insist upon increased production without interference. He openly warned that "the horses that kick over the traces will have to be put in corral." There is similar meaning in President Roosevelt's threat contained in his recent annual message: "The sovereignty of government will be used to preserve government."

When the National War Labor Board was finally set up with full dictatorial power by President Wilson in April, 1918, the pretense of "equal" representation of labor and the employers did not disguise the fact that the labor officials had surrendered the labor movement to the employers. Implicit in the Board's policy were the rulings prohibiting strikes and ordering disputes to be settled

by compulsory arbitration. When the officials of the Federation voluntarily gave up this right to strike, Steuben says, "it practically meant the transformation of the A. F. of L. from an independent trade union center to a government department. . . ." Compulsory work-or-fight laws were invoked to force acceptance of the War Labor Board's decisions and became the legal basis for vigilante violence inspired by the employers.

In the last Congress a sub-committee of the Judiciary Committee was already studying Wilson's method of drafting militant workers as a means of heading off or crushing strikes. The threat to the labor movement today comes not only from outlawing strikes by Federal and State legislative enactments but especially from the dictatorial powers now vested in the new setup in which Hillman plays the counterpart of Gompers.

Steuben's account of the disastrous consequences of World War I to labor is illuminating because of the perspectives the war holds for labor today. The end of the war in Europe in 1918 did not bring to an end the repressive measures and anti-labor policies of the monopolies, which came in the wake of the war economy imposed on the people. Gompers' surrender of labor in wartime was merely a step in an open shop offensive against unionism which continued with increasing magnitude and fury after the war. The masses experienced continued rising living costs, lowered living standards and widespread unemployment. The Gompers policy had

unleashed the anti-labor forces which sought to ride roughshod over the trade unions to stop organization and prevent any labor gains. The war to save democracy had brought terror and suppression of democratic rights and threatened the destruction of the trade unions and of social legislation.

The heartening message of *Labor in Wartime* is that, although there were repeated setbacks, the workers did not yield. The vitality and power of the working class emerge in the great class battles which the book describes: the Seattle General Strike, the great Steel Strike, the miners' struggle, and many others. Close to a million and a quarter workers went out on strike in 1918. Hundreds of thousands entered the unions, although the status quo policy was intended to freeze the Federation's membership to the pre-war level. The employers' offensive later weakened the trade unions, but rank-and-file initiative and militancy and the leadership of William Z. Foster, Jack Johnstone, and others saved the unions from complete disaster.

One misses in the book a more thorough discussion of the effect of the war on Negro labor. The mass migration of Negro workers to the industrial centers of the North during the war, encouraged by the employers for the purpose of using Negro labor to break down wage standards, provided rich opportunities for the organization of Negro workers into the trade unions. Pressure for organization came from local unions and from Negro leaders outside of the A. F. of L. But the

entrenched old guard pursued its old policy of discrimination, segregation of Negroes into separate unions and exclusion. This policy was entirely compatible with that of the employers who counted on division of Negro and white workers to realize their assault on labor a whole.

Repression and division could not, however, prevent the Negro workers from taking their rightful place in labor's ranks. Negro labor has made significant advances in trade union organization in recent years through its own initiative and through the stimulus of a progressive industrial union policy fostered by the C.I.O. Unity of Negro and

white workers has been forged and cemented through common economic and political struggles in the past decade, in which the Communist Party has played a leading part. This growing unity constitutes a force to be reckoned with in any anti-labor program of the warmakers.

The labor movement can heartily welcome this excellent book which is especially effective because of its popular and simple presentation. Its broad distribution is imperative to prepare workers to understand and successfully meet the problems in the critical period ahead.

C.T.

LATEST BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

BOOKS

We Are Many, by Ella Reeve Bloor, International Publishers, N. Y., pp. 320, \$2.25.

The Soviet Power: The Socialist Sixth of the World, by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, International Publishers, N. Y., pp. 368, \$.35.

Labor in Wartime, by John Steuben, International Publishers, N. Y., pp. 160, \$1.00.

America Is Worth Saving, by Theodore Dreiser, Modern Age Books, N. Y., pp. 292, \$2.50.

The American Empire: A Study of the Outlying Territories of the United States, by William H. Haas, Editor, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., pp. 408, \$4.00.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, by Frederick Engels, International Publishers, N. Y., pp. 160, \$1.00.

PAMPHLETS

What Is Socialism?, by Ernst Fischer, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

Internationalism: Results of the 1940 Elections, by Earl Browder, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 3¢.

The Way Out of the Imperialist War, by Earl Browder, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 1¢.

Intellectuals and the War, by V. J. Jerome, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

A History of Soviet Foreign Policy, by M. Ross, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

The October Days 1917, by I. Mintz, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 15¢.

Saga of the Karelo-Finnish Republic, by I. Sergeyev, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

Trial of the Communist Deputies in France, by Gaston Richard, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

The United States and the Soviet Union, by William Z. Foster, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 1¢.

The New Lithuania, by Anna Louise Strong, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 10¢.

Youth's Road to Peace and Security, by Max Weiss, New Age Publishers, N. Y., 3¢.

3 NEW BOOKS

WE ARE MANY

By Ella Reeve Bloor

Friend and co-worker of such outstanding figures as V. I. Lenin, Eugene Debs, Charles E. Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, "Big Bill" Haywood, Tom Mann, Sacco and Vanzetti, Clara Zetkin, and a host of others, Mother Bloor's autobiography is the story of five decades of struggle and achievement in the cause of labor and socialism. 320 pages. Price \$2.25.

LABOR IN WARTIME

By John Steuben

Trade unionists will find in this factual and well-documented account of the experiences of American workers during the last war a full expose of the schemes used by the Government, the employers and the reactionary trade union leaders to harness labor to the war plans of Big Capital. 160 pages. Price \$1.00.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE

By Frederick Engels

In this work, which appears in a new improved edition, Engels traces the universal transition, among peoples in all parts of the globe, from primitive savagery through the various stages of barbarism to civilization, indicating when the state first comes into existence, with the appearance of private property. 160 pages. Price \$1.00.



Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

Second Hundred Thousand!

THE SOVIET POWER

THE SOCIALIST SIXTH OF THE WORLD

BY HEWLETT JOHNSON
Dean of Canterbury

"Literally millions of people would read THE SOVIET POWER if it were brought to them," declared William Z. Foster, Chairman of the Communist Party, speaking of the Dean of Canterbury's remarkable and dramatic best-seller about the U.S.S.R. "The widespread circulation of this book will do more than almost anything else to create a better understanding of the Soviet Union, to defend its borders from imperialist aggression and to bring about united action with the Soviet peoples for world peace."



368 pages. Complete. Illustrated.

Only **35c**

Three for a Dollar!

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.