

SOCIALIST REVIEW •

Vol. 6 - - No. 4

Jan. - Feb., 1938

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

LARGO CABALLERO For Revolutionary Unity in Spain

NORMAN THOMAS
Reflections on the New Depression

SAM BARON
Behind the Scenes in Spain

AL HAMILTON AND ALVAINE HOLLISTER
Left Jingoism on the Campus

CLARENCE SENIOR
Mexico's Social Revolution

BEN FISCHER
Detroit's Labor Election

GUS TYLER
Labor Party Tactics

BOOK REVIEWS
by Liston M. Oak; David P. Berenberg

SOCIALIST REVIEW: Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.
Published Bi-Monthly at 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y., by the Socialist Party of the United States.
Subscription: One Dollar and Fifty Cents for 12 Issues. Fifteen Cents a single copy.
Entered as second class matter, November 8, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WE MAY BE PREJUDICED . . .

But . . . the editors of the Digest Magazines Are Not

THAT IS WHY A Large Proportion of the Socialist Review Articles Are Summarized in the Various Digest Magazines.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

Carries Material Not Found in Any Other Magazine

FUTURE ISSUES WILL CONTAIN ARTICLES BY

HEINRICH EHRLICH—Spokesman of the Revolutionary Socialists of POLAND.

SIDNEY HOOK—Outstanding American Marxian Writer.

LOUIS M. HACKER—Foremost American Historian.

TRAVERS CLEMENT—Author of "Rebel America"

and others

SUBSCRIBE NOW

12 Issues For
\$1.50

SOCIALIST REVIEW
301 West 29th St., New York

PARTISAN REVIEW

A LITERARY MONTHLY

Independent and experimental; free of connections with any political party or group; providing a forum for the discussion of critical problems and for new tendencies in creative writing.

Theater . . Movies . . Editorials , , Communications.

25 cents a copy \$2.00 a year

Edited by: F. W. Dupee, Dwight Macdonald, Mary McCarthy, George L. K. Morris, William Phillips, Philip Rahv.

PARTISAN REVIEW

22 East 17th Street, New York, N. Y.

Enclosed find \$2.00. Please send me Partisan Review for 12 issues, beginning December, 1937.

NAME.....

STREET.....

CITY.....STATE.....

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933

Of Socialist Review, published monthly, at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1937, State of New York, County of New York, N. Y.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Herbert Zam, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of the Socialist Review and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Socialist Party of the United States of America, Chicago, Ill., Editor, Herbert Zam, New York, N. Y., Managing Editor, none, Business Managers, none.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and address of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member must be given.)

Socialist Party of the United States of America, 549 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill., Roy E. Burt, National Secretary.

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

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

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication, sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is.....(This information is required from daily publications only.) Herbert Zam, Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of September, 1937. Notary public, New York county, Clk. No. 69, Reg. No. 9M 69. (Seal.) Audrey Mandel. My commission expires March 30, 1939).

SOCIALIST REVIEW

Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.

HERBERT ZAM, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Devere Allen, Jack Altman, Anna Bercowitz, Andrew J. Biemiller, Robert Delson, David H. H. Felix, Harry W. Laidler, Margaret Lamont, Alfred Baker Lewis, Lou H. Mann, Paul Porter, Harold Siegel and Gus Tyler.

VOLUME SIX

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1938

NUMBER FOUR

Reflections On The New Depression

by Norman Thomas

MID-SUMMER 1937 saw the United States enjoying what is called under capitalism prosperity. True, there was a very large army of the unemployed. Nothing had yet happened to alter greatly for the better the President's description of a country in which one-third of the people are ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed. But business was booming, crops were good and farm prices better than for many years, and employment was certainly at a higher level than in the long and bitter years of depression. The greatest boom of all was on the stock market where prices had risen to a point quite out of line with the values of the stocks indicated by the dividends they paid. Yet it was supposed that various New Deal reforms had established some social controls over capitalism's great gambling institution.

As suddenly as a thunder storm on a hot August day, out of what seemed clear skies arose another storm of depression, or as we now prefer to say it, recession. Stock market values declined by some 30 billion dollars, and what was of more importance to the workers, the average of those indices by which business activity is judged entered upon a decline more precipitant and continuous than marked the beginning of the depression at the end of October 1929. The reliable index of business activity in the New York Times showed a drop of 23.6 percent in four months. Everywhere the demands for relief for the unemployed are rising although the funds available have been greatly reduced.

This situation inevitably has stimulated a great deal of fresh inquiry. In all parts of the country one hears such questions as these: *Is this a temporary slump or the beginning of another long depression? Did the big capitalists make it in order to hurt Roosevelt and stop labor's advance? What is Roosevelt going to do about it? Is he going to turn to the right or to the left? What effect will this recession have on new labor organization, especially the newer unions, and how can they best meet the situation with which they are confronted?* Let us consider these questions, especially in relation to our socialist propaganda.

Concerning the duration of this slump, I do not pretend to be an expert prophet. It took no special study or insight for a socialist to predict that under capitalism new depression was inevitable, but I confess that I had accepted the almost universal belief of economists that that depression would probably not come until around 1940, or possibly 1941, and that it would probably be preceded by a more extensive inflation of one sort or another than we have yet experienced. Today it is obvious that even if the present recession should be definitely checked within the "60 to 90 days" of optimistic predictions, it is an exceedingly serious phenomenon involving great suffering for the workers and raising in sharper form than ever the incapacity of capitalism to meet our elementary needs. It is a grim joke to talk about prosperity being normal. Prosperity as things are now going is like a brief bit of sunshine on a raw and stormy day. The business cycle apparently has contracted the years of comparative well-being as never before. This, I repeat, is a true observation even if the present recession should be checked by spring. There are some factors, I think, that make it possible that there will be such a check in recession: for example, the greater spending power of farmers and a continuance throughout the world of a rearmament boom. But on the most optimistic possible developments, what we are now experiencing is no temporary slump but a serious economic disaster, and moreover a disaster which has happened under a New Deal which had confidently promised to prevent, or at least postpone it.

Whatever doubts may be legitimate for socialists concerning the duration of this new depression, there should be no doubt at all that it is a predominant characteristic inherent in the capitalist system. It is not a disaster produced by the evil plots of wicked men. Capitalism cannot be made to work simply by a better policing of it than the New Deal has yet provided. It is a dangerous thing for the workers to be led by Communists and other supporters of Roosevelt into thinking that this recession is primarily an anti-Roose-

vult or an anti-labor plot by big business. It is quite true that big business wants to discredit Roosevelt and to check labor's advance. It is also quite true that capitalist speculators are always ready to gain what they can out of general disaster and that finance capitalism does what it can to take advantage of disaster by increasing the proportion of its control over productive enterprise. Nevertheless it is absurd to say that capitalists plotted so great a destruction of their own stock market values and of their business profits. The sincerity of the alarm in capitalist circles over the recession is as obvious as are the reasons for it. This Roosevelt recession is, as we used to say about the Hoover depression, already too big to have been made by any one man. It was not made by the capitalist plotters, as certain New Deal supporters think, nor was it made by the Roosevelt program, as the business interests vociferously assert. To some extent it is a world phenomenon, and is rooted in the very nature of capitalism.

The thing that can most definitely be affirmed about the Roosevelt program is that our socialist prediction is confirmed. Crisis is inherent in the capitalist system and cannot be prevented under New Deal capitalism. The pump won't work without priming and in time (not yet, I think) that priming becomes impossibly expensive. Mr. Roosevelt himself has shifted his grounds. During the 1936 election campaign he boasted that prosperity had not returned without his planning. "We planned it" was his slogan. Now he calls attention to the fact that what business does or does not do is more important than what the government does.

As a matter of fact, there is something in the argument of capitalist economists that if profit is to be the mainspring of activity the profit system cannot be too much regulated. Not long ago in the *Call* I called attention to the fact that Mr. Roosevelt could not at one and the same time expect to continue government competition with the private electric utilities by experiments like T.V.A. and yet persuade those same private utilities to spend a great deal of money on new developments which might break the depression. I emphasized the wastes inherent in the so-called yardstick program when what we want to achieve is an integrated and planned system of power development under social ownership. It is characteristic of the present line of the Communist Party, its intellectual bankruptcy, and lack of intellectual integrity that the *Daily Worker* tried to twist this into a criticism of the excellent work done by the T.V.A. We socialists cannot insist too earnestly that it is impossible for any reformers of capitalism—Rooseveltian or progressive—to push their pragmatic social reforms to a point which seems to attack the profit system in which they themselves profess to believe, without provoking an instinctive strike by capital. And no particular good comes from denouncing that strike in moralistic terms. Nevertheless this sudden recession was no more due to the New Deal's

tax policy or to its regulation of the stock market than to the capitalist plot. Taxes in America cry out for revision, but the worst victims are the consumers who pay an indefensible burden in taxes disguised in the price structure. One of the worst indictments of capitalism is its own wailing complaint that it cannot be reformed without being paralyzed.

In my contacts with various parts of the country the question that I have heard most often is this: "*What is Roosevelt going to do? Will he turn right or left?*" In several instances I have run across the conviction that the present situation isn't very good; that the New Deal isn't working; that relief funds have been badly cut; but that it is all the fault of Congress or some secret and sinister manipulators that Roosevelt's magnificently good intentions have been frustrated. This is plain bunk. This depression would not have been averted by a continuance of N.R.A. which was in a pretty bad shape when the courts knocked it out. It certainly would not have been averted by paying farmers to produce less in a country that is ill-fed. The Senate's agricultural bill will hurt, not help. The Wages and Hours Bill which Congress did not pass ought to be passed in a better form than Roosevelt has asked for it, but will not avert depression under the profit system. Roosevelt is far more responsible than Congress for the reduction in government spending, especially of relief funds, and for some sort of attempt to balance the budget. Sooner or later the capitalist system will have to balance its budget or take the consequences. But with the coming of new depression, partly as a consequence of diminution of government spending, it is immediately better to resume that policy as the only way to balance the human budget in terms of any sort of decent satisfaction of elementary human wants. In short, responsibility for the present failure of government tactics to relieve the situation in so far as it is personal at all, is Roosevelt's and the present turn to the right is Roosevelt's.

How long that turn will last is another matter. But some of Roosevelt's words and deeds in the early stages of this depression closely parallel the words and deed of that peerless statesman, Herbert Hoover, in 1929 and 1930. He also wanted to balance the budget and he also wanted to persuade private business to take up the slack of employment. He also was more hospitable to the demand for expenditures for armies and navies than for great social needs. The world's present prosperity has been largely based on a war boom or on rearmament, and rearmament neither creates productive machinery nor satisfies consumers' wants.

To be sure, Mr. Roosevelt does know that housing might be one of the best ways to get people back to work as well as to provide for a great human need. But his program for housing is definitely a conservative program. He proposes to give the profits, if any, to private enterprise while the government takes the

risk. The rate of interest set on loans to prospective builders of small homes is so great that in the New York area no worker would be justified in taking out such a loan unless he was sure of steady employment at a minimum of from \$30 to \$35 a week. The suggestion that building tradesmen receive an annual wage rather than wages based on hours is of itself reasonable, but the President has given us no indication how that change can be accomplished without jeopardizing the gains labor has made. All in all his housing program, one of his major moves against depression, will not break depression, much less rehouse America, nor in its present form give any very material aid thereto. Equally indicative of Mr. Roosevelt's turn to the right is his definite repudiation of social ownership as the only satisfactory cure of our sick railroad system.

If this swing to the right coincides with a check in recession, or another temporary return of comparative prosperity, the President will probably settle down in a fairly conservative position from which now and then he will throw a scare into the reactionaries. If on the other hand, as is quite probable, there is no recovery of temporary prosperity there is an excellent chance that the President again will swing to what the capitalist press will call the left. It will not be a left based on any philosophical convictions. It will be pragmatic, experimental, and enforced largely by a government bureaucracy which is neither very able nor possessed of any very definite convictions. Mr. Roosevelt has not been happy in the choice of his subordinates. He may decide, however, to push his war against the private utilities after some fashion and perhaps renew his attack on finance capital, let us say through an investigation of life insurance companies which richly merit such investigation. The point that socialists must stress is that this will not be enough.

Far more important than speculations about the President's future conduct is an examination of the position of labor and the drive against labor. This recession has come at least a year too soon for labor to consolidate its gains and to discipline its forces in the new unions. The task that now confronts these new unions will require the highest order of statesmanship. If they are to be held together against the mounting unemployment they must be made centers of the life of the workers culturally as well as economically. Members must be protected by the union against the discrimination of straw bosses. This will require probably the assertion of seniority. Then active steps must be taken to keep the younger men, who may be the first to lose their jobs, in close and sympathetic relations with the unions. Otherwise they will be used in America as Hitler used them in Germany. It is the unions which must lead in the fight for proper unemployment relief and for a proper housing program. SWOC has done well to make a beginning at this.

Under no circumstances can the unions surrender the principle of aggressive industrial organization in order

to curry the favor of business or the middle class. But they must examine their tactics so as to prevent unnecessary irritations which will not be confined to the middle class. I am frankly alarmed at the evidence I discovered of real progress in making the C.I.O. a kind of bogeyman among farmers, smaller business men, and even some sections of the workers. This can be more effectively counteracted than it has been, but the task will require planning. Above all things, the bitter quarrel between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. plays straight into the hands of the reactionaries. It discourages many workers and makes them cynical. Peace between these labor organizations is worth any price except the surrender of aggressive industrial organization, and socialists must work for that peace.

It is also essential at this time that labor leadership assert a true democracy and drive all racketeering out of the unions. More than once in the last few weeks I have had workers say something like this: "Before such and such a union came into the picture we had one boss, the employer. Now, we've got two bosses, the employer and the labor racketeer." Perhaps such criticism isn't wholly justified, but every excuse for it must be removed if labor is to stem the tides of anti-union reaction stimulated by the bosses with all the instrumentalities that they control.

In Chicago I overheard two workers getting off a train. One said to the other: "A year ago plenty of work, no union. Today plenty of union and no work." That kind of remark is unavoidable. The unions will have to counteract it by an effective educational program to show how essential unionism is even in bad times. Division and civil war in labor's own ranks or the continuance of labor racketeering will be fatal.

I dwell on these things with no feeling of despair. Labor's achievements have been glorious in the last 18 months. They can be equally glorious in the difficult situation which now confronts the workers. But success will require hard thinking and hard work. On the political field it cannot be achieved merely by trailing along after Roosevelt or by endorsing any program which is primarily concerned with the size of the subsidy that a particular group can get.

It is, of course, the supreme function of socialists to educate for socialism as the one hope of the world with new enthusiasm and new wisdom. We must work with the workers inside of mass organizations, not outside, and that means that we must find a way to work in labor parties when they become genuine labor parties, no matter if at first they are rather unsatisfactory. In working with them we must also keep our identity. The type of propaganda and of education which will succeed cannot be sectarian. Our first job is to bring home the truth that socialism is our hope and to illustrate that truth in every practical situation that arises. We are not primarily concerned with elaborate analysis of what we may have to do in some situation five or ten

(Concluded on page 13)

BEHIND THE SCENES IN SPAIN

by Sam Baron

SOME months ago Anita Brenner called attention to two dispatches sent to the New York Times from Moscow by Walter Duranty, that able journalist who writes as the Kremlin pleases. King Alfonso had been forced from his Spanish throne a short time before and the Republic established, but the whole world anticipated that these acts were only the prelude to a real revolution. Mr. Duranty, in the New York Times of May 17 and 18, 1931, is quoted by Miss Brenner, as follows:

"The organ of the Russian Communist Party seems none too jubilant over the prospects of the revolutionary struggle which it clearly expects will follow Alfonso's downfall . . . it is believed here that the peace of Europe hangs literally on a thread . . . and that Spanish fireworks might easily provoke a general conflagration . . . it may almost be said that if the Spanish revolution 'swings Left', as Moscow now expects, Moscow will be more embarrassed than pleased. One would naturally have expected *Pravda* to salute the chance of a Spanish proletariat's struggle . . . *Pravda's* first reaction was a dismal editorial, stale as a damp squib . . . the Kremlin's policy today stands much more on the success of socialist construction in Russia than upon world revolution."

If that was official Russia's attitude in 1931, how much more confirmed it has grown in the passing years. Today, Russia's reactions to events in the Iberian peninsula are, however, no longer confirmed to "dismal" editorials in *Pravda*, "stale as a damp squib," but find expressions in the very heart of Spain.

In his famous "Return from the U.S.S.R." Andre Gide tells of a banquet—one of many tendered to him in Russia. One of Gide's companions, Jef Last, "rose and in Russian, suggested that they drink a glass to the triumph of the Spanish red front. They applauded tepidly, but with some discomfort, it seemed to us; and immediately, as if in reply: *A toast to Stalin*. At my turn, I lifted my glass for political prisoners in Germany, Yugoslavia, Hungary . . . They applauded, this time with genuine enthusiasm; they clinked and drank. Then, once more, immediately: *A toast to Stalin*. Concerning the victims of fascism in Germany and elsewhere, they knew what attitude to have. But concerning the disturbances and the struggle in Spain, public and private opinion awaited the directions of *Pravda* which had not yet spoken up." Of course, a short time later, sympathy for the Spanish masses was officially permitted to flow.

Today, Spain is engaged in two wars: (1) the struggle against the invading armies of Hitler and Mussolini and (2) the fight against the nations of Europe, all of which are determined to keep Spain from following

the course of self-determination which ultimately would lead her to socialism. In this second of the two wars, Russia by its participation in the farcical non-intervention committee—the efficiency experts of intervention—has allied itself with the European nations. England of course led the way, dragging a reluctant France with her and a Russia, fearful of isolation in the event of war. Because the streets and alleys of Europe are dark, Russia relieves her dread by going with the gang.

England was in a position only to insist that there be no workers' government in Spain; but Russia was in a position to *effect* this purpose through the Spanish section of her international. And the first step was to drive workingclass groups out of the then-existing government by using the pressure of dire necessity. The P.O.U.M. (Party of Marxist Unity) was forced out of the Catalanian Generalidad; then the Anarchists were subjected to fire; and then the climax: Caballero was forced out because of his refusal to accept the Communist policy.

These events are directed toward one end; they contemplate the ultimate settlement of the civil war on the basis of a compromise with the fascists, a compromise which by its very nature will preclude the establishment of socialism. If today Caballero is being reviled, it is because he is recognized as a major obstacle in the way of that program. Were Caballero the insignificant political figure that he is painted in communist-inspired stories, what would be the necessity for repeatedly attacking him? The most powerful leader, you can be sure, is the man who is assassinated daily; each new murder implies a resurrection. The fact that eight months after Caballero's ouster, the newspapers continue to report that he has no influence is indicative of two things: first, that he has influence, and secondly that his influence is being feared particularly at this time. And when your newspaper reports in the same article that Caballero is "through" and that the government is hopeful of a compromise with Franco, it should be clear that Caballero's elimination is one of the conditions precedent to that compromise.

Since Caballero's strength lies in the organized workingclass of Spain, his destruction could be brought about only by destroying the labor movement. That is why the Communists began their systematic attempt to shatter the *Union Generale de Trabajadores*, (U.G.T.) the trade union movement of which Caballero was and is the leader. For more than 45 years this Socialist leader has been identified with the Spanish labor movement. During these years he was sent to jail many times. In 1934 he insisted on remaining in Spain and suffering arrest while others—who now revile him—were making their escape wrapped up in

SOCIALIST REVIEW

bales of silk. After reaching the age of sixty-nine, Caballero is still fighting for a worker's Spain, with all the vigor of a powerful character.

The fight against the U.G.T. began simultaneously with the critical May days. The Communists in the Caballero cabinet were demanding the repression of other workingclass groups. As Caballero later describes these events in the one speech permitted him by the government after his removal:

"It was asked of me that the government dissolve a political organization not in agreement with the Communist Party. I who have been persecuted in organizations to which I belonged and to which I still belong, by reactionary elements in our country, insisted that by no act of the government would I dissolve any organization, political or trade union; that I had not come to the government to serve the political interests of any one of the factions which were contained in it; that whoever felt the necessity of denouncing criminal acts or misdemeanors, however they may be called, should do so and the courts would take charge and would dissolve the organization or not as they saw fit, but that Largo Caballero, the president of the Council of Ministers, would not dissolve any of these organizations."

Caballero's firmness on this question led the Communists to manipulate the downfall of the cabinet. They succeeded and were then shocked to find that the executive committee of the U.G.T. stood squarely with Caballero. The anarchist trade unions—the *Confederación Nacional de Trabajo*—had been under fire from the Communists for a long time; in fact, their hostility to the Anarchists was in great measure responsible for the May crisis. Now both sections of Spanish labor were arrayed against the Communists. The next step for the Communists was to split the U.G.T. and the long history of Stalinist "wrecking" afforded an ample catalogue of methods. The details of the Spanish trade union split are not new.

Announcing that they had the majority of the "rank-and-file" the Communists demanded the convening of the national committee. Meanwhile a campaign of slander was under way. Caballero's activities as premier were misrepresented; efforts were made to identify him with anarchists, Trotskyites, etc. Earlier the Communists had sought to hide their activities under Caballero's name. It will be remembered, for example, that the *American Daily Worker*, which was howling for the repression of the P.O.U.M., had written in February 19, 1937:

"Disturbing to Norman Thomas is the fact that Largo Caballero, Spanish Socialist Premier, has ordered the arrest and imprisonment of the Trotskyites as traitors! This seizure of the Trotskyites, which every honest friend of Madrid will greet with the greatest pleasure, becomes for

Thomas a gloomy presentment of 'tragic disunion!'

"Is not this galling to every red-blooded Socialist? The Trotskyites have been yelling for mutiny in the Madrid ranks, and Norman Thomas dares to be hurt that Caballero claps these vile traitors into jail! He wants 'unity' with them! he looks for a 'Communist plot.'"

Now in Spain, Communists raised the exactly contrary cry. Caballero would not lift a finger against "traitors" and as a matter of fact denounced the Madrid suppression. The truth, of course, was that the Communists regarded good anti-fascist fighters, of rival political faiths, as traitors, whereas Caballero respected them as fellow-fighters in the same cause. Having laid the basis for their campaign in the muck of slander, the Communists then insisted on the meeting of the national committee.

The structure of the U.G.T. must be understood in this connection. The national committee is not made up of representatives apportioned according to membership, but the smallest of the organizations is entitled to its one delegate on the same footing with the larger organizations which also have but one delegate. Thus, the Federation of Land Workers, with some 750,000 members, will have one delegate and the Federation of Dentists, with 500 members, will have one delegate. The Communists depended for success on this situation. Let Caballero describe what was done:

"When they come to demand the convening, we observe that among those who make the request there are many who claim to represent Federations which do not pay dues, others which have not yet joined the Union like the tobacco workers and the urban letter carriers, and another like the sugar workers, the location of whose headquarters is not even known to us. They come to demand a convening of the national committee to pass judgment on the executive committee, and we observe that the intention is to attack the Union and to take over the offices of the leadership of the Union. In fulfillment of our elementary duty, since this is the principal responsibility we have, we say that we shall not hand over the Union."

Meanwhile, the Communists let loose a campaign in the press. *Claridad* in Madrid and *Adelante* in Valencia, the Caballero newspapers, were seized by the Communists—physically—and though court action is pending, there is little expectation of recovery. Only the *Correspondencia de Valencia* remained in the hands of the executive committee, and I have just received the news that while Caballero was away on a brief visit to Paris, a similar move was made to take over the editorial offices and the printing plant of the paper. How successful it has been we do not yet know. But in addition to the handicaps of a limited press, the executive committee found itself victimized by the Communist-controlled censorship.

Let us continue with Caballero's account of the events:

"The press campaign continued, and then other elements, from organizations which have been suspended for failure to pay dues, met and again demanded the convening of the national committee. We told them: 'We have no objection'. When they came to see us, we said to them: 'We are ready to convene the national committee; but you must produce documents from your Federations proving that you actually represent them and that they desire the convening of the national committee'. These friends considered that that was not necessary but they nevertheless offered to do so. I have here the letter in which they promised to send us the documents. We waited for them, but the documents did not arrive and instead of sending them, what they did was to convene the meeting in the very headquarters of the U.G.T. But they not only did this; they sent us a letter asking us to prepare the hall and all the necessary documents, because they had convened the national committee! Then the executive committee of the Union said: 'That national committee will not meet here!' and we sent them a letter reminding them: 'We have told you that if you present credentials the national committee will meet, and if you do not present them, it will not meet. Consequently, we shall not authorize this national committee which you announce, because it is not legal, it has not been convened in accordance with our constitution and we shall not allow it.'"

Nevertheless, the opposition attempted to go through with its plan. It announced that it was convening the national committee in the U.G.T. headquarters—on October 1st, the very day when the Cortes was opening and the government was to give an account of the political situation, which Caballero and other leading figures in the U.G.T. wished to attend as members of the Cortes. The struggle in the U.G.T. succeeded in keeping them away. When the dissidents found that the hall was locked, they held their national committee meeting on the staircase, set up a new "executive committee," and designated Gonzales Pena, a Right Socialist close to Prieto, as the leader.

It is difficult to give more than estimates as to the number of supporters that each side has due to the absence of many at the front, the fact that some sections are behind the fascist lines, etc. It is quite clear, however, on the basis of the national federations that have expressed themselves, that Caballero has the overwhelming majority. The numerically stronger federations, like the landworkers, the metal workers, the transport workers, representing the basic industries of the country, have expressed their loyalty to the old executive under the leadership of Caballero. What

makes his strength all the greater is the fact that these industries are vital to the winning of the war. What the Communists have succeeded in taking with them is what they brought in—the paper unions of the professionals like the dentists. Even where they took the national organizations, the local branches have indicated their support for the old executive and are paying their dues directly, as proved to be the case with the Asturian miners. In addition, Caballero's championship of the civil rights of the Anarchists, whose numbers and sympathizers are estimated at 2,000,000, has made him the unofficial spokesman of the C.N.T.. As has proved to be the case before, the Communists, setting out to capture an organization, have succeeded in capturing themselves—a prize that is hardly worth the effort.

Thus Caballero still remains the leader of the Spanish workers—the "Spanish Lenin", as he has been frequently called. This is the man whom the Communists are vainly trying to destroy.

One of the associates of Julius Deutsch, who had led the heroic Austrian Socialists on the barricades of Vienna and has since been aiding in Spain's struggle, quoted to me the great leader of the Schutzbund as saying of Caballero: "When I speak to him, I know that I am talking to the workingclass of Spain."

In spite of this, some reporters still write as if Caballero and his followers do not even exist.

I have in mind, in particular, two articles recently published in the New York Times, written by Lawrence Fernsworth, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Spain. Mr. Fernsworth is a very able journalist, but like all war correspondents, he is compelled to rely heavily on government sources for his information. On December 20th, he wrote from London: "*Further news from Barcelona indicates that ex-Premier Francisco Largo Caballero, despite his violent recent speeches or because of them, has been nullified as a political factor, although he and his cohorts may still be considered to have some nuisance value. How he nearly lost Madrid and lost Malaga is remembered.*"

This is the official line of the Communists who have imposed their views on the government and through it on the press of the world. It is not true, as stated in Mr. Fernsworth's article, that Caballero has delivered "violent" speeches, impliedly against the government. The fact is that after five months of silence and in answer to communist attacks, he delivered *one* speech after which the government stopped him from holding any other meetings. The speech was a judicious statement of his point of view, free from violent language of any kind. It has been translated into English and published in Spanish Labor News, issued by Labor Research Front at 112 East 19th Street.

The occasion of that one speech amply demonstrated that Caballero is still the leader of the Spanish workers organized in the Union General de Trabajadores and

(Concluded on page 14)

SOCIALIST REVIEW

FOR REVOLUTIONARY UNITY IN SPAIN

by Largo Caballero

(The following are extracts from Caballero's famous Madrid speech. It is printed in full in Spanish Labor News, published weekly at 112 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y.)

What has taken place in the UGT of Spain? I am going to tell you briefly. The origin of this campaign against the Union stems from the political crisis of May. Although I shall not enter into many details—for I shall do so on another occasion—I must point out to you that this crisis was provoked by the representatives of the Communist Party in the government. The day before the precipitation of the crisis, several Madrid newspapers were already announcing political events as a result of that meeting of the Council. In it the Communist representation instigated the scandal, as we may well call it, by demanding a change of policy both in the war and in the maintenance of public order. This was a pretext, because, so far as the war was concerned, the Communist Party knew as well as I what was happening, since it had representation in the Superior War Council. And, as for the question of public order, with regard to Catalonia, we, as a central government, had no jurisdiction.

It was a pretext. In that meeting it was asked of me, that the government dissolve a political organization not in agreement with the Communist Party. I who have been persecuted in organizations to which I belonged and to which I still belong, by reactionary elements in our country, insisted that by no act of the government would I dissolve any organization, political or trade union; that I had not come to the government to serve the political interest of any one of the factions which were contained in it; that whoever felt the necessity of denouncing criminal acts or misdemeanors, however they may be called, should do so and the courts would take charge and would dissolve the organization or not as they saw fit, but that Largo Caballero, the president of the Council of Ministers, would not dissolve any of these organizations . . . (tremendous applause which prevented the hearing of the last part of the sentence.)

And before the meeting of the Council of Ministers concluded, because the proponents did not receive satisfaction, the Communist Ministers arose and left the Council, as is done in committees, in a country town, in a social club, with the greatest irresponsibility. In the meeting, before adjourning, I stated several times that it appeared to me a crime to raise political questions in such critical moments. If that had been done a few days later it would not have had such extreme importance, but in those moments I considered it a crime.

In this situation the crisis was created. Afterwards, after some consultations, the one man who was em-

powered to do so (President Azana) charged me once more with the formation of a new government. I spoke with everyone, absolutely everyone; and, as always—because we immediately adapted ourselves to these hypocracies of bourgeois politics—all spoke politely, everyone offered his services, but as soon as they left the offices of the head of the government they agreed among themselves to set up all sorts of obstacles. I well remember that one of the conditions that the Communist Party demanded for collaboration in the government which I was again given the responsibility of forming was that I should not be Minister of War. I answered them: "What reason can you have for this?" "Because the Ministry of War and the Premiership are too much work, (laughter) and it is not proper that you should have so much work." (more laughter) I said to them that this did not seem to me a real and substantial reason because it was I who had to judge of that, not they. I appreciated very much their concern, (the laughter continues) their good intentions in wanting to relieve me of this work which weighed upon me . . . but it wasn't that; it was something of that other matter of which I was speaking before. If I cannot enter into details today, I shall do so at another time.

You all know that there was a working class movement abroad favorable to us; that as a matter of fact this movement later on diminished through no fault of ours but because of political errors which were committed in Spain. Shortly after the crisis, there came a time when beyond the borders rumors began to circulate to the effect that there was being carried on here a policy of persecution against elements in disagreement. . . . (several lines censored) This has spread, comrades, so far that representatives of the Internationals have come to Spain to find out exactly how much truth there was in it, and they have told us personally: "Since this has occurred, we cannot arouse the same enthusiasm abroad, among our own comrades, because they suspect that those who dominate here and those who have influence are—they say so openly—the Communist elements, and everyone wonders if Spain is to be aided so that afterwards the communists may guide the destinies of Spain." They have come to ask us this! And let it not surprise you, because one of the things which I objected to was the series of excesses which, in my judgment are being committed.

I spoke for some time about the unification of the Socialist Youth, for example. When I used to speak of the unification of Socialist Youth, or rather Marxist Youth, I referred to Socialist youth, Communist youth, and even to Libertarian youth, to the entire revolutionary youth. They had to be fused organically but loyally. Oh! But since then, not I but others who also used to

speak at that time of the unification of the youth movement have interpreted it in the sense that the true unification of youth must be effected by the criterion of age, not of ideology; that is to say, that they are no longer going to attract only Socialists, Communists, and Libertarians, but even Catholics, and enemies of the regime which we want to establish. But not that, never! (applause)

The unification of the Spanish youth must be accomplished with the purpose of preparing the way for the revolution which we desire and only those can accomplish it whose ideologies are the same or similar, those who at least are enemies of the present capitalist regime, but alliance—not alliance but fusion—fusion with Catholics who are enemies of the regime which we want to establish and who want to maintain the regime of privilege which exists today, and who have brought us to this war . . . with these Largo Caballero cannot stand. (shouts of approval and applause)

They say that happiness and amusement are fundamentally necessary for the young. I don't deny this. We would be crazy if we said to the youth: "Do not have a good time, don't be happy." Naturally—it has been said very simply but very exactly—in order to have a good time and to be happy, many things are necessary, and in the war situation in which we find ourselves it is not easy for people to be happy or to amuse themselves as they should like. The tragedy here is that they want to entertain the youth with dances, with sports, things that are all right when there is time for all that. But now when we are at war, we cannot speak of those things. Besides, a revolutionary youth will be able to have a good time. That will be the reward. But that an organization should consider that the most important thing is dancing and carousal . . . that, no. (laughter) First come ideals, and after ideals as young people, they will do what they have to do, but that revolutionary organizations with two r's, as they say . . . (applause), that revolutionary organizations, with ten or a dozen r's, should occupy their time in organizing amusements, instead of educating the working-class masses of youth in the ideas which will redeem all humanity, that appears to me a veritable crime, whoever may have encouraged it. (cries of "We are on guard!")

So much for the youth. As for the unification of the Socialist Party and the Communist Party I have not changed my views. All that I ask is that those who once wanted to create this fusion still hold to the same purpose which we used to put forth, which was to bring about the fusion of the two parties *with a revolutionary program*. I well remember that when we used to speak about that, the Communist Party set as a condition (a few words censored) that we break relationship with all bourgeois parties. Do they hold to that today? (cries of "No! No!") Do they insist today that we break with all bourgeois parties as they used to do? No, on the contrary. The slogan today is that we return once more to the period before July 18th. And if the unification

must be on the condition that all the blood which has been shed must serve to revive once more in our country that class which has been principally responsible for the war which we are now enduring, Largo Caballero is not for that system! (cries of "Nor are we!") We cannot be foolish enough to wish to establish a new regime overnight—(several lines censored)

With the CNT fusion is more difficult. We must not deceive the comrades by talking to them about fusion between the CNT and the UGT. Who knows whether after some time . . . but not now. But I tell you that with the CNT which has entered political life (you will excuse me a certain trace of vanity, but one of the things which I shall always consider a reward of my political career is having contributed to the full entrance of these comrades into political life in the country, and I consider myself historically responsible for everything which may occur in that field), (shouts of approval and long applause) with those comrades who have recognized our honesty, our good intentions, our desire to establish a new regime which may be better than that under which we live, we must go together, we must collaborate, in everything upon which we can agree, because I am confident that with the passage of time these comrades will recognize their ideals, in my judgment, a little . . . I should not say fantastic, but perhaps somewhat unrealistic; to create a society in which we shall all be honest and good—as the Constitution said—is not possible because humanity is not like that. And so that humanity may reach that point, many stages of socialism, of communism, and even of anarchism must be passed through, because anarchism, contrary to what our enemies say who think that anarchism is a chaos which no one understands, is an ideal which seeks to establish a regime which in my opinion is today utopian, because it demands the perfection of humanity, and that is not possible. But we do not have to attack them for that reason, and when they become convinced of the imperfections of humanity, they will have to recognize that we must all progress in common accord in order to overcome those obstacles and achieve what they desire to achieve. Who can oppose this? No one. Consequently it seems to me that if we cannot fuse with the CNT, we can at least have some bonds of unity, of understanding, of relationship, so that we shall not attack each other, so that we may respect our own organizations, and so that we may become more convinced that at some future time we must unite as one. I feel that this can be done.

Is that not to the advantage of the working class? Does that mean that I am an anarchist, as some groups are saying? And besides, I should not be ashamed of that. What I *should* be ashamed of, would be to become a Catholic, after having been a Marxist socialist. (loud and prolonged applause) What I *should* be ashamed of would be that, having been in this Party and having had a public career of some modest im-

(Concluded on page 18)

LEFT JINGOISM ON THE CAMPUS

by Al Hamilton and Alvaine Hollester

THE American Student Union, founded as the agency of American students to combat war, war preparations, and militarism, was converted, at its third congress, into an agency to support war when it comes, to justify war preparations and to condone militarism. This change, brought about largely by the Communists within the Student Union, foreshadows a campaign by the united jingoists to sweep the campus into the war camp, as was done in the pre-war months in 1916-17.

In 1916-17 the growing sentiment for American entrance into the World War on the behalf of the "democratic allies" found its expression during the summer conference of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. Practically the only center for anti-militarist activity in the colleges had been the I.S.S. Then as war madness increased there developed a group even in the I.S.S. that argued their belief in "wars where the liberties of the people are deemed by a people to be at stake." From right wing Socialists such as John Spargo came support of the United States in a war "deemed by the people essential to the overthrow of tyranny". The termination of the debate in the ranks of the I.S.S. and its refusal to support the war resulted in its being labelled pro-German.

Those liberals, right wing Socialists and pacifists who swept across the campus urging support for the war became the organizers for such slogans as: "save the world for Democracy", "defeat Kaiserism and Czarism", "down with Prussian militarism". The cries of the Belgian babies likewise became part of the humanitarian appeal of these pro-war forces that had sprung from the peace movement.

American students today, reading newspapers filled with the most recent atrocities of Japanese militarism, the bombing of the Panay, living in a period of undeclared wars and faced with the threat of impending world war, are being subjected to the same slogans as in 1917. Today one need only substitute the name of Communist Browder for right-wing Socialist Spargo and you have the perfect parallel.

Today the organizers among progressive students for another war "for democracy" are the collective security adherents, who fill student ears with the cry of "fascist aggression" and who label their opponents not pro-German, but pro-Fascist.

Compare the slogans of the collective security followers of today with the slogans of 1917:

Democracy or fascism - Democracy or Kaiserism
Protect China's babies - Avenge Belgian babies
Save democracy; Stop fascist aggression -
Save the world for democracy;
Stop German militarism.

Many things have happened in the twenty years since

the war. Consideration of the history of the student anti-war movement from 1917 to the present day is valuable as a source of inspiration and guidance to the mass of American students who have not fallen prey to the pro-war cries of their generation. The conduct of the student fight against war during this period is important as a comparison with pseudo-peace sentiment of collective security supporters, who believe, through some type of mental conjuring, that support of a war by capitalist democracy is the way to achieve Socialism.

On the post-war campus the center for anti-militarist activity was military training. The sporadic revolts of students and faculty became crystallized nationally around the fight at City College of New York led by Felix Cohen, a Socialist. During the years 1925 to 1932 campus anti-war forces went their own individual and sporadic ways. Donaly Timmerman, student pastor at Ohio State University, was recommended for discharge for condemning military training. 1926 saw the organization of a Committee of One Hundred against R.O.T.C. at the University of Nebraska. Thirty eight students were ousted from the University of Minnesota for refusing to take drill.

Then in 1932 more than six hundred delegates gathered in Chicago for the Student Congress Against War. A brief description of this Congress is in order as a contrast with the recent convention of the American Student Union at Vassar. It is significant because it demonstrates all too vividly the fact that Communist students, who played an important role in the Chicago Congress and were one of the prime movers in the struggle against imperialist war, now have become a pro-war force.

James Wechsler, Communist student leader, reporting the Chicago Congress wrote:

"At the outset the assemblage could not fail to set forth a fundamental assumption. . . : International conflict is primarily an outgrowth of the profit system, inherent in the status and politics of imperialism. . . ."

"By 1932 there had been sufficient revelation to demonstrate that Morgan was more guilty than mankind. Even the once fervid advocates of the League of Nations . . . had seen their vision evaporate in each major trial. They perceived . . . that the most convincing pacts could not swerve the quest for markets and the placement of capital. The League of Nations as a permanent bulwark against war, was not to be trusted. . . ."

"Effective opposition to the menace of imperialism . . . would require vigorous combat with the essence of imperialism and the vested interests involved."

This description of the Student Congress of 1932, may very well serve as characteristic of the student anti-war movement from then until the Vassar convention of the American Student Union. The shift in the student movement from the individual action of conscientious objectors, from League of Nations Associations and from belief that the Kellogg Pact really meant peace, took the form of militant mass demonstrations.

The success of this type of demonstration was adequately demonstrated at the University of Minnesota. On the day of the annual R.O.T.C. review, "Jingo Day", a demonstration was called against military training. Fifteen hundred students thronged the Union building and two weeks after the demonstration the Board of Regents declared drill optional at Minnesota. Mass action began to replace individual action and academic timidity began to recede.

Mass student anti-war action found its first nationwide expression in the student anti-war strike. April, 1934, saw the first strike of students initiated by the Socialist S.L.I.D. against military preparation. The 25,000 students who answered the call of the two left-wing student organizations responded actually to the challenge to build a real mass movement against war.

But when in April, 1935, 150,000 students responded to a call against American preparation for war, Socialists and leaders of the student anti-war movement felt that at last there was being forged a real student weapon against war. It had taken many long months of painstaking education in the ranks of the Students, Y.M. and Y.W., the ranks of the denominational groups, led by the National Council of Methodist Youth, to develop an understanding of the strike.

Of course this strike was not a strike against capitalist society; but uniformly it was a manifestation of opposition to one aspect of capitalist society—imperialist war. The national Strike Call signed by a variety of groups was in fact a call for a "strike against imperialist war". There was accord among these student strikers that this was a demonstration against the militarist enemy imperialism as represented by the Roosevelt government.

From California to New York, students chanted as a mass slogan the Oxford Pledge, "*We refuse to support the government of the United States in any war it may undertake.*"

In these words was embodied the idea that imperialist war could be stopped only through mass action of the people against a war-making imperialist government. To quote James Wechsler from the book, "Revolt on the Campus", "one conservative student addressing a strike rally stated this case: . . . I do know that the government will listen to a strike a good deal sooner than it would head a peace picnic."

In the period between the strike of April 1935 and April 1936 the American Student Union was formed by an amalgamation of the Communist National Student League and the Socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy, plus a tremendous number of local liberal

clubs. And likewise in this period there occurred the 7th Congress of the Communist International.

The heart and backbone of the student strike and the mass anti-war movement that had developed in the colleges had been the combined strength of Socialist and Communist students. Consequently, the meeting of the Communist International and the policies that came from Russia in that period were to have real importance in the student anti-war movement.

This period saw a shift in the principles of the Communist movement on the question of war. The traditional policy embodied in Lenin's concept of imperialism and the role of the working class in the struggle against imperialist war underwent a sharp reversal. In the name of the "defense of the Soviet Union", the Communist movement began a flirtation with capitalist democracy that eventually was to end in a marriage of the Communist movement and the capitalist governments of many of the democratic countries. The defense of "small" nations, (even Belgium with its tremendous colonial empire), support for the League of Nations, support for Collective Security, and sanctions (which in the case of Italy's invasion of Ethiopia reached the point of calling for the use of military sanctions to close the Suez canal) became the peace policy of the Communist movement.

In the student movement this international policy found an echo at the first convention of the American Student Union, where Communist students who had been ardent supporters of the Oxford Pledge began to question its "validity". From this convention till the third convention of the A.S.U. this Christmas vacation at Vassar, the policy of the Communists in the student movement was to educate for a policy of collective security, quietly sabotage all opposition to Roosevelt's militarism, and for dropping of the Oxford pledge from the program of the American Student Union.

(Gill Green, National Chairman of the Young Communist League, at Vassar said, "We haven't changed our position on the Oxford pledge in the last three years. We knew we could not get it dropped from the program before.")

The Third Convention of the A.S.U. met in this period when the Communists, with a mechanical parliamentary majority at the convention, had the outlook of support for a coming war in which the United States may engage if that war is directed against Japanese militarism or a fascist nation. Communist Browder has stated, "I would fight in the army of the United States." Communists acting in the Far Eastern situation are refusing to support the campaign for the withdrawal of troops and warships from Far Eastern waters.

In addition to this internal development in the student movement there is the very obvious preparation of America for war. Militarization of America has proceeded at a pace faster than at any period except during the World War. Roosevelt has his M-day

(Continued on page 19)

MEXICO'S ROAD TO SOCIAL REVOLUTION

by Clarence Senior

THE first real campaign in many years took the 1934 presidential candidate to almost every section of the nation, even on mule back. The humblest villager got a chance to tell the candidate what was wrong with the scheme of things. According to an agronomist with whom I discussed the question, Cardenas thought only in terms of the previous revolutionary practice on the land problem when he started his tour. When he ended it, he had begun to swing over to the idea of collective farming as contrasted with the previous emphasis on distribution of small parcels to individuals. The failure of this system is written all over the face of Mexico. The success of the collective system is beginning to bring new hope to millions who do not yet directly benefit from the Cardenas program.

Land is now primarily given to ejidos, community groups. With the land, credit and technical advice are now made available, something that was not done before. The government has set up the National Bank of Ejido Credit, which within about twenty-five years will automatically become the property of the ejidos under a plan whereby a small portion of the loans of the bank purchases shares in it.

The ejidos are not new to the Indians; they are roughly the equivalent of the landowning forms of pre-Conquest days. Their inspiration is the same tradition with the Indians as the Russian *mir* is with the peasants of that country. The Communists will seldom mention that angle of their collective farming forms, whereas the Mexicans boast of their wiping out of another result of the Conquest as their program advances.

Ejidos are democratically managed. Even the overseer, the counterpart of the dread riding boss of our own cotton lands, is elected by the members of the community. Out of a total of over 300 overseers who had been elected in the great Laguna region when I was there in April, only 7 had turned out to be unsatisfactory either to the community or to the bank which supervises the work of the groups.

La Laguna is becoming a household name throughout Mexico. It was in this ancient lake bed that the government took over, last November, more than 200 privately owned plantations largely devoted to raising cotton. Most of the land was held by two British companies. Cardenas went to the region after a delegation of striking land workers had petitioned him to intervene in their dispute with the companies and socialize the land. When he decided to take over the farms, he set the whole machinery of government to work remaking the communities. Schools, sanitary facilities, medical equipment, better roads, new irrigation canals and pumps all found their way to the Laguna region. New machinery was made available to the more than 30,000

heads of families organized into 221 ejidos. The Bank of Ejido Credit advanced almost 30 million pesos in various forms of credit, more than 20 million of which has just been repaid out of the first collectively raised cotton crop in the country. More than 4,600,000 pesos goes to the ejidaterios as "profit" in addition to their wages which were paid regularly during the season by the bank.

Now that La Laguna is definitely a success, the government has tackled the knotty problems of land socialization in the state of Yucatan with the same verve that marked the launching of the Laguna project. Four other great cotton developments have also been launched, and the growth of collective farms in other sections of Mexico will only be held back by lack of technical and administrative assistance available to the government—unless the land owners who are citizens of the United States are able to secure the powerful backing of Washington when their interests are jeopardized. The oil interests have done so in the past decade, any they may again in the near future. The two demands may coincide and place too great a strain on the "good neighbor" policy that thus far has aided us in combating Japanese and other competition in the sales territory south of the Rio Grande.

"How Socialist is 'Socialist Education'?", I asked one of the officials of the Ministry of Public Education. "One can't have Socialist education in a country that does not have Socialism" was the unexpected reply. Education has been made an official part of the attempts to lay the basis for Socialism in Mexico however.

There are two phases of it. The first, and necessarily the most important at the present time over most of Mexico is the teaching of a naturalistic interpretation of every day happenings. The Church, coming to Mexico as an arm of the exploiters, has always kept the Indian masses steeped in superstitious beliefs. Illiteracy was almost as prevalent as in Russia before the revolution, and the church and state relation was the same. This phase is the one stressed most in the rural schools and in the early grades in the cities.

Socialist education, written into the constitution by an amendment in 1934 over the opposition of the combined reactionary forces of the country, does not stop there however. A fourth grade primer for city schools contains such significant chapters as: A Strike, Agrarianism in Mexico, Liberation of the Peasant Woman, The First of May, First Phases of Trade Unionism in Mexico, with an account of the shooting of the union pioneers in the 1907 mining strike, and an essay entitled Individual Interests Must Always Be Subordinated to Collective Interests!

Recently a new outline for discussion of current events

in all the schools was published with five divisions: the popular struggle against the increasing cost of living, distribution of land to the ejidos, the trade union struggle to obtain social and economic betterment, the expropriation of the Mexican railways, and the war in Spain and its international complications.

High school students study a text written by one of the heads of the government's official propaganda agency—The Class Struggle in Mexican History. The Workers' University, headed by Lombardo Toledano, is part of the public education system, and publishes the only independent Marxist literature in Mexico.

The full story of education in a country cursed by geographic and language divisions, by centuries of exploitation, and by poverty of the most degrading sort has yet to be told. The chapters of Frank Tannenbaum's *Peace by Revolution* are the best available and should be read, along with the rest of the book, by everyone who wants to know Mexico and its multitude of problems.

Probably the public in this country has read more about the "persecution of the church" than any other topic on our Southern neighbor. A history of the relations between Church and State would be helpful in understanding the present situation. Since space forbids, one can do no better than quote from a recent book by a Catholic educator from New Mexico on the subject. George I. Sanchez, in *Mexico — A Revolution by Education*, says of the church:

"It has financed revolts, has given moral support to minor and major rebellions, has participated in sedition against the government, and has displayed a material greed that is not only scandalous but that is most unworthy of the high religious ideals for which it stands . . . The Church-State controversy in Mexico is purely an internal question of political and economic supremacy".

What could a radical add to a summary of that kind? There are calmer days ahead on the church front however, since the economic and political power of the Church has been broken during the revolutionary regimes, and the tendency is now to relax some of the strenuous regulations that so irked the Church authorities.

In 1929, the present governing party was organized. Its purpose was to consolidate into one organization all of the existing political groups built around one man or strong in one district alone. Calles, the "strong man of Mexico" for ten years, was the guiding spirit. Its avowed ambition was to aid in shifting Mexican politics from the old leadership basis to "democratic institutionalism". It set up committees to work out programs; in 1934 the Six Year Plan was reported to a national convention and adopted as the basis of the government's work for the ensuing presidential term. It was the first attempt ever made to rationalize the various raw forces that had buffeted the revolution about since it started in 1910.

Cardenas won the election with 1,091,000 votes. Two conservative opponents got about thirty thou-

sand together, and the Communist got 1,100.

Soon after he became president he cleaned house in the Partido Nacional Revolucionario and began to broaden its base. This spring the newspapers carried banner headlines announcing "Workers and Peasants to be in the new Congress" after an agreement had been reached for the CTM and National Peasant Confederation forces to participate in the PNR primaries. The primaries have been open to women, who up to now do not vote, although Cardenas has included women suffrage in his legislative program for this session of congress.

One of the objective keys to the sincerity of any government using revolutionary slogans seems to me to be its attitude toward the army. Under Cardenas, the army has been turned in the direction of real support for the revolutionary program on the land. For instance, the garrison in the Laguna region had its officers replaced when the collective farming experiment started. There had always been antagonism and frequent clashes between the peasants and the soldiers whose job was to protect the plantation interests. No soldier would go to a native fiesta alone. Now there is the greatest comradeship, based on instructions to the soldiers that they are part of the class to which the peasant belongs and their job is to protect the gains made by the peasants. Soldiers are now invited to participate in the peasant gatherings.

Reactionary commanders are being transferred to where a watch can be kept on them. The rank and file is being educated; their children sent to schools where they are taught along socialistic lines. A large portion of the army budget is now spent for road building and other public works.

More important is the fact that the peasants in the collective communities are now being given arms by the government, a step previous administrations would not have dared to take in view of their reluctance to carry out land distribution.

Socialization of industrial properties has not kept pace with agrarian advance, although the expropriation law of September 1936 enables the government to take over anything "affected by the public interest". There are two important reasons; first, Mexico is still a colonial country, economically, and the biggest owner of her industries has a large army which can reach her borders in a few hours if necessary; second, the pace of socialization depends upon the internal strength of the government and the resources in manpower that it can swing into industries run largely by foreign personnel, most of which would not be useable under social ownership.

Economic trends may force socialization faster than the government now plans. Prices are rising, and a boom period is in full swing. Inflation is the greatest single danger facing the country. Labor unrest with increased prices and lagging wages is leading to increased demand for higher wages that will soon turn

THOMAS ON DEPRESSION

(Concluded from page 3)

into a demand for ownership of the industries. The oil companies are now bracing themselves for such a demand.

Producers of all the prime commodities have been forced into associations run by the national government which tries to stave off price increases in that manner. The peso has been pegged at an artificial level to attract tourists, and that contributes to the rising cost of living, but the central bank of issue, government owned, refuses to lower the ratio between the peso and the dollar.

Fascist organizations, outlawed by the government during the period when Calles was contesting with Cardenas for power are making their appearance, but give little indication of mass strength. That the government will not be caught napping is indicated by recent demotions of the dictator of the state of San Luis Potosi, General Cedillo, probably the only real personal menace to the regime. Cedillo was minister of agriculture, following Garrido Canabal, a similar character from Tabasco. He was ousted from the cabinet just recently and went home, it was said to get ready his private army for anything that might happen. Cardenas promptly moved two national regiments into the state and withdrew all the airplanes in an army flying school located in the state capital.

Mexico has faced more and graver problems than any other country has ever solved within one quarter of a century. Problems of separation of Church and State, of dislodging a well-intrenched land owning class of building up an industrial machine without giving industrialists complete control; these problems were faced by Russia. And there are many other similarities. Russia, however, was not the colony of imperialist powers that Mexico has been and, although not as completely, still is.

There has always been great sympathy in Mexico for the Russian struggle to build Socialism, but Mexico is one of the few nations that does not recognize the Soviet Union. The ambassador was expelled in 1929 for interfering with internal affairs. The act indicates one feature of the Mexican revolution which is also present in the Russian, but which is not played up. A recent press release of the National Revolutionary party sums it up in telling of the plans to transform a new region along lines successfully used in La Laguna:

"Yucatan is to be transformed into a state where Mexican socialism will be thoroughly carried out. We say MEXICAN socialism advisedly. Socialism is the most ancient system of social organization known to the Mexicans. Before the Spaniards arrived in 1519, the social organization of the more advanced tribes of Mexican Indians was based upon two principles: a democratic form of government and collective ownership of the land. The Spaniards destroyed this system. All of Mexico's history can be read as a steadfast strug-

years hence. That situation may not arise, or the way in which it arises may be determined by what we are able to do now. If we cannot win the workers now there is no particular reason to think that we can do it in some future emergency. Is not the present crisis bad enough to "start them broad awake"?

I am speaking, of course, concerning our internal political and economic situation. Already that situation is affected more than most of us may realize by wars and rumors of wars. It may be profoundly changed should the area of war be greatly enlarged. Never forget that depression is in some degree a propaganda for war. Already I have been asked by a worker at a forum whether I did not think that war might be better than continued unemployment. Of this war issue I am not now writing except to emphasize this truth: Since our Communist friends are so engrossed in an international strategy of protecting Russia above all things else they have become complete opportunists in domestic policy. "Anything that makes it more likely for Roosevelt to go to war on terms advantageous to Stalin's Russia"—that is their real principle. It follows therefore that we are more alone in educating for socialism than ever before. It is a great responsibility and one that ought to inspire and unite us.

gle on the part of the people to recover their old system".

While that is undoubtedly, largely true, enough has been said to indicate that the Mexican social revolution does not confine itself entirely to trying to regain the ancient rights for its peasants. The seeds of Socialism, planted by exiles from Spain and by Wobblies from the United States fell on soil made fertile by the radicalism of the agrarians who saw natural allies in the exploited city worker. Working together in the revolutionary forces, often shortsighted, often down blind alleys, often betrayed by their own people, they have started Mexico on the road to the cooperative commonwealth.

As long as the United States holds an economic chain fastened to their ankles there is danger that their attempts will run up against the stone wall of intervention. Our job is to see that the workers and farmers of the United States know of the struggles of their brothers South of the Rio Grande, learn from their mistakes, thrill with their successes, and keep Wall Street from trying to snuff out the light in Mexico that is becoming a beacon for the whole Western Hemisphere.

(This is the final of two articles. The first one was published in the Dec. issue of the SOCIALIST REVIEW.)

BARON ON SPAIN

(Concluded from page 6)

the Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo, the two powerful trade union movements. To be sure, the Communists have split the former, but by far the greater number of Spanish workers follow Caballero's leadership. Four theatres in Madrid were filled to overflowing by the crowds that came to hear Caballero, and thousands listened on the outside to amplifiers which carried his voice. When he was scheduled to speak in Alicante and was stopped by the authorities, tremendous crowds lined the highways to pay tribute to him. The city itself was bedecked with flags in his honor. It is a further tribute to the influence of Spain's leading trade unionist that his opponents are afraid to have him speak.

Mr. Fernsworth's repetition of the Communist charge that Caballero nearly lost Madrid and that he lost Malaga is rebutted by the files of every newspaper that has reported the war. The Socialist became premier in September 1936, in the hour of blackest defeats, when Franco had already succeeded in marching triumphantly across half of Spain. Two months later, Franco found himself checked. It was under Caballero's leadership that the fascists were turned back at the very gates of Madrid and halted all along the line. It was during his premiership that the Loyalists began to gain ground. The splendid victory recorded in the Guadalajara rout of the Italians, the even greater defeat of the fascists at Pozoblanco, the Loyalist drive into Badajoz bordering on Portugal—all these occurred under the guidance of the man who is now being maligned by those who have lost much that was gained. True, Malaga fell, but let the Communists explain the internecine warfare that was going on between working-class groups engaged in its defense.

The greatest measure of unity that the Loyalist forces have experienced was that which prevailed under Caballero's cabinet—with even the Anarchists taking part in the government in spite of their traditions. Now that Caballero has been forced out—in part, because he would not oust the Anarchists on the insistence of the Communists—the old enthusiasm has suffered. Fernsworth hints at the tale when he writes: "The food problem frankly is bad."

But the major cause of dissension is the fact reported in Mr. Fernsworth's story of December 5th and again, as he reports it, in the issue of December 20th: "Although there has been talk of peace gestures by some friendly power, it seems that no European power which might be in a position to act considers the time ripe. Spanish government circles are wondering whether President Roosevelt might be the one finally to make a friendly gesture of peace." This explains why the Communists, following the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, find it necessary to crush the Anarchists, the P.O.U.M. (Party of Marxist Unity) and the left Socialists who will accept no peace with

Franco. Caballero and the others will accept no compromise with fascism.

It is significant that in Caballero's administration there was no talk of anything but victory. Now Fernsworth reports that "it is doubtful the Republican government hopes for complete victory" and "probably still aspires to a stalemate in which it will have the upper hand." Is that the best Caballero's successors can offer to the cause of anti-fascism? In the face of the above, Caballero, after five months of silence, had to speak up, and in his one speech, that delivered in Madrid, he explained:

"I can assure you that one of the greatest sacrifices which I have ever made in my life has been to keep silent during these five months. But I do not regret it because, though the slanderers and defamers have driven their nails and their teeth into my person, I have the consolation of knowing that my silence has contributed to the well-being of Spain and of the war."

Now, however, that a truce with fascism is being considered, Caballero must speak. Today he is demanding the unity of all working-class and anti-fascist forces in a war that will not end until the plague has been conquered. And behind him stand the workers of Spain who have known the life-long record of devotion that this sixty-nine year old Socialist has rendered to their cause.

Let us hope that the taking of Teruel will not be viewed by the government as the winning of "the upper hand" referred to by Mr. Fernsworth which can become the basis for a compromise with Franco. The world dare not feed the appetite of Fascism.

We in other lands, while continuing all material aid to the Loyalist government, must recognize that in Caballero's insistence on representation for all working-class groups in the government, the cessation of persecutions aimed at anti-fascist workers and the continuation of the war until Franco has been decisively defeated, lies the one hope that the rising tide of international fascism can be stemmed.

(EDITOR'S NOTE—As we go to press, the New York Times of January 6th carries the report that the UGT conflict has been "settled" by the resignation of Largo Caballero as General Secretary and the recognition of Gonzalez Peña, Right-Wing Socialist and Chairman of the Spanish Socialist Party, as his successor. According to the settlement, the Caballero group is given a representation of four members on an enlarged Executive Committee of fifteen. This arrangement followed a conference in Paris last month at which the two contending factions presented their cases to the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Trade Unions, with Caballero and Peña both present. The IFTU Executive appointed a special investigating committee of Citrine, Jouhaux and Schevenels, but it seems that Jouhaux was the only one of this committee to go to Spain to arrange the settlement. While final comment must be reserved until direct information is received from Spain, especially in view of the obviously misleading nature of the Times article, it could hardly have been expected that the IFTU Executive Committee or such a sub-committee as was appointed would decide in favor of Revolutionary Socialists as against a reformist faction.)

DISCUSSION SECTION

The Lesson of Detroit's Labor Campaign

by Ben Fischer

SOCIALISTS have often said that when the workers begin to move forward in great numbers, then it will be easy to be principled and bold. The opposite is true. When the workers begin to move forward in great numbers, then the temptation to quickly identify oneself completely with a great vital mass is strong. Principle and perspective can easily be brushed aside. Michigan offers Socialists and Socialist principle a testing ground. The Detroit elections are significant in this light.

Socialists see events as part of a greater struggle going on from year to year and generation to generation. Socialists understand each event as part of a class struggle which will reach its highest point in the struggle for Socialism. The development of class forces is of greatest importance. The direction of this development is what we must constantly watch and attempt to guide.

A labor party is not a goal with us. It is an instrument for developing the class struggle in a correct direction. It is useful when the workers have not yet realized their own identity as a class in their political activities.

A labor party can teach the workers to fight together and therefore it is of great value just as a union is of great value. But a labor party must teach the workers not only to fight together but to fight separately from their class enemies and against their class enemies. Whenever the worker and boss feel an identity of interests, this is a victory for capitalism. Capitalism can continue to live only as it extends the myth of class peace.

In Detroit, the *Vote Labor* campaign was a step in the direction of class independence. The workers voted together for their own candidates, their own power, and against the employers. A year ago no one would have dared to predict that 150,000 workers would have marched to the polls under their own banner. The *Vote Labor* campaign was controlled by the labor unions, primarily by the United Automobile Workers of America. The financial and organizational basis for the campaign was the labor movement. The campaign was based on the program adopted by the UAW and other unions. It was a labor program. By adding a section on the ultimate aims of the Socialist Party, it could have been adopted as a Socialist program. The *Vote Labor* campaign was divorced from the political instrument of the employers except for one minor tieup with the McCrea machine. This tieup did not succeed in altering the character or control of the campaign except insofar as Socialists and advocates of a thorough-going labor party program failed at certain points in the campaign to be sufficiently vigilant.

The *Vote Labor* campaign was not conducted by a labor party. Socialists would have wanted a labor party capable of consistent political education and disciplining its officers and elected officials. The organization which did conduct the campaign was controlled by labor and operated in its interests but it was not a permanent organization and it had no way of directly disciplining officers or elected officials. The political organization was a hastily thrown together apparatus for getting out the labor vote. For this reason, Socialists gave critical support to the labor slate. Socialists pointed out the need for discipline, for responsibility of officials to a labor political

organization and for a permanent political machinery to accomplish these purposes. Socialists do not trust individuals even though they be labor men or Socialists. Socialists trust only labor itself when it is organized independently.

Socialists want labor political action to be conducted independently of the old parties. In Detroit, it was no simple matter to examine this situation thoroughly. The non-partisan form of election is respected by the old parties. It is difficult to find a party label. No official support is given by old parties to candidates as a rule. However, an intimate examination reveals who is doing what. The Republican Party supported the reactionary slate. The Democratic machine supported the same slate. The labor slate was supported by individuals and groups in the Democratic Party in the last days of the campaign as the issue became—labor vs. reaction. Liberals chose the lesser of two evils—labor or reaction.

One section of the Democratic Party, the McCrea-Boggio group, did support O'Brien from the outset and gave some support to the full labor slate. This group consisted of the country prosecutor's office and some miscellaneous ward heelers and politicians who put their political hopes in this group. It is a negligible group, strongly New Deal in word and action, highly ambitious, and out of grace with the political powers that be. It did not play a dominant role in the campaign once the labor movement entered the field. It did not have a voice in determining the program, the policies, the makeup of the slate, or the organizational conduct of the campaign. It hoped to cash in on an O'Brien victory.

Aspects of Labor Campaign—

The labor character of the *Vote Labor* campaign was determined by a number of factors:

1. The police pursued an anti-labor policy in Detroit during the strikes in the Spring. Heinrich Pickert, police commissioner, is a Fascist in the true sense of the word. The police, acting as agents of the employers, caused great resentment among the workers.

2. The City Council refused to grant a permit for the famous UAW Cadillac Square meeting in May. This outraged the labor movement and at the demonstration a firm resolve to make reprisals against the council was made.

3. The enormous victories of the auto workers in a short space of time, coming on the heels of a long and bitter period of oppression and apparent hopelessness, gave the auto workers a feeling of power and independence. The workers generally assumed that the labor slate would be overwhelmingly victorious.

4. The developing anti-labor drive by the manufacturers and the press, as well as by the New Deal in steel and other situations, tended to consolidate the working people politically. Probably the strongest factor in determining the clear class lines in the campaign was the attitude of the daily press, especially the Detroit News, which was vicious in its opposition to the labor slate. Despite every effort by some elements in the labor movement to achieve a false respectability in the eyes of the middle class and to avoid the issue of labor vs. reaction, the attitude of the press forced this lineup.

5. The large number of progressives in the leadership of the Detroit labor movement was a factor in determining the campaign's character.

The organizational character of the *Vote Labor* campaign was determined by three factors:

1. Detroit is virtually a one-union, one-industry city. Therefore, the overwhelming number of workers can express themselves directly through the auto union. There is no absolute necessity for bringing many unions together in order to promote political action (though it is more desirable). It was easy to use the UAWA for political action without setting up any special political organization.

2. The time element was important. The first action for a campaign was initiated in May and before any definite action could be taken it was already late in August. The attempt to achieve a united slate with the Detroit Federation of Labor was largely responsible for this delay. There was no time for developing a specific labor party machinery. There was not even time enough to set up adequate political machinery within the UAW.

3. During the period from May to the primaries in October, the auto union was attempting to get settled. A small union had suddenly become one of America's largest labor organizations. It had difficulty in adjusting itself. The limited personnel and experience of the union was strained and therefore plans for political action were made as simple as possible so as not to unnecessarily tax the union.

Favorable conditions were present for a genuine *labor* campaign but at the same time there were great obstacles to the development of this drive for independent labor action into a permanent labor party.

Weaknesses in Campaign—

The actual progress of the campaign was affected by various factors which need examination and explanation.

Non-partisanship became a primary issue and caught the labor movement off guard. The farce of non-partisanship was not combatted adequately. Various answers were given to the charge that labor was attempting to destroy the non-partisan system. A careful, united campaign was needed to offset these charges.

Vote Labor was the slogan which did much to give the campaign its character. It was opposed by certain Communist functionaries and by some liberals who wanted a slogan not identified with labor for fear that this slogan would produce antagonism. This slogan, however, proved valuable even in practical vote getting terms. Workers felt that this was their campaign and their fight.

City government cannot be neglected in a municipal campaign. The labor campaigners knew very little about city government generally and less about city government in Detroit. Some of them knew some of the general principles of proper city government but not until the closing weeks of the campaign was a real effort made to analyze city finances, the records of city officials, and such matters. This neglect was apparent in the vague advocacy of good things in a manner which did not prove at all convincing. It was also partly responsible for the failure to get a substantial slice of the middle class vote.

There can be no question that the labor slate failed to make the best possible appeal to the middle class voters. However, the view of some elements that this failure was due to the labor character of the campaign is not valid. The labor movement does not seek middle class support on the basis of giving up its program and its character; it seeks middle class support on the basis of the validity of its case. Because the middle class is less dynamic than the working class and because its fundamental interests do not lead so clearly to an acceptance of a labor platform, careful persuasion and proof is needed to win over the middle class voters. Watering down will not help except if you are willing to divorce your political activities completely from labor's interests.

Labor unity would have aided the labor slate and would have made the issues clearer. The enemies of labor made an effort to deny that the issue was labor vs. reaction. It attempted to make the issue—a group within the CIO against the people, law and order, Americanism, democracy, non-partisanship and what not. The strongest weapon the anti-labor forces had was the fact that a section of the labor movement, long established in the city of Detroit, was opposing the labor slate.

Much has been written about the treachery of Martel and the A. F. of L. Few people, after the primary defeat of the Martel candidate, Johnny Smith, believed it possible that Martel would support Reading. But, inspired by the reactionary atmosphere and decisions of the Denver convention, Martel aligned himself openly with the most reactionary elements in the city.

Some elements believed that Martel could have been persuaded to support the labor slate by more tactful approaches and more skillful maneuvering. This belief arises not out of conviction but out of the desires of the Communist leadership to prove a point which is not valid. Martel could have been won over to the support of a slate if it was sure to win and if it could give the CIO no substantial advantage in the City Hall. But what sort of a labor slate would this be?

Factional struggle within the UAW hurt the labor campaign. The dismissal of Victor Reuther during the campaign was interpreted by most people as an attack on Walter Reuther, one of the council candidates. The attacks on union elements by the UAW administration in the labor and public press were harmful. The crowning blow was the Hotel Eddystone incident when Homer Martin poked a gun into the ribs of Dan Gallagher, a rank and file leader of the union. The newspapers used this as front page material and editorialized about it at great length. Important middle class elements were alienated from the labor slate by this incident.

An indirect result of the factional fight was the demoralization of many members of the union whose enthusiasm was necessary for a successful campaign.

Machine politics in the union proved harmful. Capable campaigners were not used; incompetent people who were in some way related to the ruling group were used, in some cases in key positions. This led to inferior organization work. Organization work is an important item when it comes to getting votes.

The Communist party played an active role in the campaign work. Its line of playing down the labor angle, identifying the campaign with the New Deal and spending much time and money on getting Democratic and middle class leaders to support the slate met with no success in the primary campaign. It was generally felt that no outside help was needed; the workers were strong enough.

The results of the primary voting tended to change the situation. The labor candidates received a minority of the whole vote. Two courses were open—a drive to get out additional labor voters or a drive to get Smith voters and middle class and white collar voters who had not participated in the primaries to support the labor slate. The Communist leadership and some liberals interested themselves primarily in this second course. They had some success in directing the speeches of some of the candidates in some of the campaign activities in this direction. Associations with the New Deal were brought to the forefront. O'Brien spoke more of his being a Democrat and less of the labor campaign.

This tendency became so strong, and the work in the districts and the shops so comparatively neglected, that a last-minute drive had to be made to change the character of the campaign back to its original form. Labor was again put in the foreground.

The Socialist Party played an important part in the campaign

LABOR PARTY TACTICS

by Gus Tyler

THE Labor Party movement in America has its own peculiar characteristics of development, which compel us to junk old formulae based upon European analogies solely. A program of relations with the labor party movements in America must be worked out in terms of the special peculiarities of that movement itself.

In one respect, the current movement for a labor party in America resembles the similar movement in Britain at the beginning of the century. The mass trade unions, finding the capitalist state as an obstacle to them in their economic struggles, turn to labor political action. The class conscious worker, who looked upon his trade union as the traditional class weapon, increasingly sought political expression through a party of trade unions. Hence a labor party.

In another respect, however, the British development was vastly different from the present American movement. And precisely because the British Labor Party grew up at the beginning of the century and because the American movement began in a crisis, which may well become capitalism's last.

Thus, when the British movement began, some trade unions and trade union committees continued to back capitalist politicians locally. But gradually this habit wore off, because all the factors in Britain, in this period of expanding capitalism, were operating in the direction of separating labor from capital politically. And there were few forces dragging labor into the bourgeois political camp. Labor did not fear Fascism. Neither the Conservative nor Liberal Party of Britain wished to outlaw unionism. Talk of dictatorship was unheard. The threat of reaction which constantly drives reformism into the hands of liberal capitalists was then inoperative. Hence one could say with a degree of certainty that the Labor Party movement of the 1890's would almost inevitably develop into a labor party, despite errors in beginnings.

But this cannot be said today of the American movement for a labor party. This is the era of war, crisis, and fascism. Reformism runs for shelter, in these storms, to the liberal capitalist parties—as the lesser evil. So powerful is this force toward a fusion of labor and liberal capitalists in times of stress (the Popular Front), that such great parties as German Social-Democracy, with years of independent and Marxist tradition behind them, increasingly surrendered an independent class role. If this is what happened to the Socialist minded Social-Democracy, what may we expect of an immature, non-Marxist, Bourgeois - political - minded Labor Non - Partisan League, or American Labor Party?

future. To some extent the political structure is being used to promote the drive to organize Ford on the basis of house-to-house work in the neighborhoods.

Detroit teaches two outstanding lessons:

1. A vigorous, strong and militant labor movement will make easier the development of sound political consciousness among the workers. The hope for such a labor movement is industrial organization of the mass production industries on a successful fighting independent basis. Every blow against the solidarity and strength of the union was a blow against the political development of the workers in the Detroit *Vote Labor* campaign.

2. The labor party question does not depend entirely on objective conditions. Socialists, Communists, liberals, union leaders, employers, all play a role in determining the development of the workers politically. Socialists can help to develop a labor party most effectively by playing a militant independent role in the labor movement on the basis of class struggle policies and democratic unionism. The effectiveness of this work on the economic field will make it easier for Socialists to play an important role on the political field.

and helped substantially in steering its course. Many active workers in the neighborhoods and in the local unions were Socialists. District organizers were Socialists. Key persons in the central office were Socialists, including Alan Strachan, campaign director. A special campaign edition of the *Socialist Call* setting forth the Socialist attitude toward the campaign was issued before the primaries. A large and effective mass meeting was held before the elections. Walter Reuther, one of the five labor candidates for the city council, is a member of the Socialist party.

The Socialist Party did not issue as much literature of its own as it should have and could have, had it had more energy and finances. The Socialists did not foresee all the problems of the campaign well enough and did not act soon enough to meet them. The Socialists led in the initial fight to clip the wings of the politicians. Since the actual labor campaign did not get under way until September, ambitious politicians began to lay the groundwork for control during the summer months. But short work was made of this. Socialists did not give adequate attention to the issue of non-partisanship and the details of city government. Some work was done on these things. Socialists were responsible for filling the gap on city government during the closing days of the campaign but this was late.

Though the danger of over-emphasis on getting the middle class and liberal vote was recognized by Socialists immediately after the primaries, plans to cope with this situation were not sufficiently well worked out. The great press of work and responsibility in relation to other campaign and union matters resulted in a lapse of valuable weeks before any attempt was made to rectify this situation.

Workers Not Disheartened—

The election result was favorably received by the workers. There was no feeling of despair among unionists. Some were disappointed because at least two councilmen were not elected. Some Communists speak of the election as a defeat and blame a sectarian policy for this defeat. These same Communists hail the New York City election as a victory even though the straight labor vote in New York was proportionately smaller than the Detroit labor vote.

Actually, between 100,000 and 200,000 workers who are registered voters did not vote. The gigantic task of getting out that labor vote in full force was not fully accomplished. Given all the conditions described above it can be understood why it was not accomplished.

There was general resentment, even among New Dealers, against the Democrats. The Democratic friends of the labor slate did not deliver votes. Not only did they not deliver votes for the labor slate but they did not even deliver votes for O'Brien.

The middle class went overwhelmingly to the reactionaries. Political lines were wiped out as the result clearly shows. The lineup was not along party lines of any sort but along class lines. Even the Democratic liberals who campaigned for the labor slate campaigned on a straight class basis, often going even further than the radicals dared to go.

Among rank and file active unionists, the reaction to the election was, "We'll show them next time!" There is a real resolve to build a labor party which is independent of the politicians. They have a distrust of the old political leaders and their organizations. The degree to which the formation of a genuine labor party is delayed plays into the hands of those who want no labor party. The political consciousness and structure built up during the campaign will tend to disappear unless it is now channelized into some permanent organized party and into some consistent labor political activity.

Lack of funds, the depression and organized anti-labor party forces all contributed to the delay in launching extensive labor political organization and activities. It would be criminal if the 150,000 labor votes were not utilized for the

A very likely, although not inevitable development, in the movement for an American Labor Party is a *fusion* of the current labor forces *with the liberal forces* to form a *lib-lab* party. And there is scarcely a single political commentator who does not consider this a probability by 1940. And this they conclude from an examination of *real politik* and not Marxian theory.

This is a likely, *although not inevitable* development. Not "inevitable" because there is one counter-force that is growing in America to weight the scale in favor of independence. This force is to be found in the new mass industrial unions. These unions have grown up in a period of crisis. They will not be able to enjoy the ease that enervated the typical conservative trade unions in long periods of comfortable class collaboration. These babies of the crisis will be fierce youngsters: their temper will be short, their methods direct, their class consciousness high. The liberal politicians will be able to do little for them in terms of economic legislation; and the liberal executives will be compelled to lose their friendship by breaking their militant strike struggles.

These militant elements will not inevitably turn to a labor party. Many of them will turn to syndicalism. *Especially if there is no place else to turn.* If the choice is support of bourgeois liberalism or direct action only, thousands will choose the latter.

One of the great, and most hopeful, tasks of the Socialist Party will be that of providing a political expression for these militant workers. *To the extent that there is no independent labor party to do it, the Socialist Party must do it directly.* We did it once before. We can do it again.

This brings us to the general question of our relations to the rising labor party movement.

Because of the two-sided development of the movement in America, we must pursue a balanced, two-sided policy.

Can we afford to plunge our party organizations and units into the labor party movement, surrendering all independent electoral duties? Certainly not! There is no assurance, no likelihood, that the labor party movement in America will be in a position to run working class candidates for gubernatorial, congressional, senatorial or presidential office in 1938 and 1940. The Socialist Party must maintain its right, and its machinery, to run such independent candidates, where the labor parties fall down on the job.

Can we afford to turn upon all the labor party movements with intent to destroy, refusing all electoral collaboration, rejecting all trade union affiliation? Certainly not! So long as the Socialist Party can, as a party, maintain its right to run independent Socialist candidates where the labor party is backing bourgeois candidates, we must seek every possible form of collaboration and trade union affiliation with the labor parties. *Our main objective in such work is to strengthen the independent aspects of the labor party movements and increase Socialist influence with them.*

The labor party question is complicated not only by virtue of the two-sided character of the current movement but also by virtue of the diverse types in the separate states. Thus it may happen that a Detroit Labor Slate may enjoy more enthusiastic support than an American Labor Party, although the latter is, from an organizational point of view, more stable. The Detroit Labor Slate was far more *independent and class-conscious* than was the ALP.

In addition to a general perspective, outlined above, the party must work out concrete relations with each state party—depending upon the structure, the practices of each party. The very moot question of the ALP in New York presents an important special case in applying our perspective. The ALP of 1938 is not identical with that of 1936. In the two intervening years the ALP has moved slightly in a more hopeful direction, having run its own independent candidates for numerous lesser

offices, having elected a goodly handful to the city and state legislature.

The ALP reminds us today of Plekhanov's example of the dialectic, as illustrated by a youth who is just growing some down on his chin. Is he a bearded youth? Scarcely! Is he then without hair on his face? No! Then what is he? He is a young man who may become bearded. And he will become bearded—unless he is shaved.

And likewise of the ALP. In another era, we might have predicted with ease that it *will* become a labor party. But in this era there are forces to shear it of its virility, to "shave it", so to speak. In addition to the general historical forces outlined above, there are certain subjective forces—the Communist Party, which wants no labor party, the Hillman machine, which is wed to Roosevelt, the numerous Republicans and Democrats, all out to "shave" the ALP.

What shall the attitude of the Socialist Party of New York be toward the ALP?

Shall we seek common electoral slates? Certainly!

Shall we seek, *through the unions* affiliated with the ALP, *to influence ALP policy positively* in the direction of independence and Socialism? Certainly!

Shall we seek admission as a party to the ALP? **Yes—with one important minimum condition. We must, as a party, have the right to run our independent candidates where the ALP backs capitalist candidates.**

We know that it is not customary practice for a labor party to allow such exceptions. But neither is it customary for a labor party to make so many exceptions in support of bourgeois candidates as has the ALP. One is the result of the other.

Such a policy permits us to influence the developments in the ALP without liquidating the Socialist Party. It is in line both with our Socialist principles and with the needs of current development in the labor party movement.

(An article by Jack Altman presenting another point of view will appear in the next issue.)

End of Discussion Section

CABALLERO SPEECH

(Concluded from page 8)

portance, it should be known, for example, that I had enrolled in some bourgeois republican party, in order to grab a few jobs or a few tips which might be mine in some Ministry. (shouts of approval) Of *that* I should be ashamed! But if some day I should be theoretically convinced that anarchism was possible, and if through study and the evolution of my ideas I should understand anarchism, I should say so publicly and I should not be ashamed of it. It would be a fine thing if it should be considered a disgrace to be called an anarchist! These are the remains of bourgeois theories . . . (Several lines censored)

It was said in a meeting, not long ago, that they were ready for any kind of negotiations. So are we! We shall not refuse any proposition, if necessary, to arrive at a solution; but why will they not accept an armistice? Why will they not agree that, meanwhile, such campaigns as have been carried on be stopped, campaigns of calumny and slander? Oh! But they don't want that! Will they insist on party lines? Well then, we shall defend ourselves! Comrades! Let us fight until we win, both the war and the revolution! (The audience breaks into tremendous ovation which is continued until after the speaker leaves the hall.)

A.S.U. CONVENTION

(Continued from page 10)

plans, calls for an even larger navy, and cuts relief and social service expenditures in favor of the war budget. The network of American imperialism, big business, steel, the munitions interests, the financial interests upon which the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration rests, is beginning its campaign of preparation for the war they know must be waged to protect themselves abroad.

With this pro-war period facing this generation, it is tragic that in the student movement, known for its intelligent anti-war opposition, the Communists have been able to transform the American Student Union so far as its peace policy is concerned, into an arm of the Roosevelt administration. The myth now fostered by the Communist leadership of the American Student Union, that it is fascism rather than the clash of rival imperialist interests that will cause another war, is actually preparing the student movement for support of a war against Fascism.

Collective security followers in the student movement are of course raising the smoke-screen that collective security does not mean war. Unfortunately, many liberals and progressives on the campus have believed this slogan of the Communists. Nothing could be further from the facts. At this juncture any support for the foreign policy of Roosevelt, the policy of "quarantine the aggressor", the policy of maintaining troops and warships in the Orient under the pretext of support for an international peace policy can only result in the alignment of students for support of the Roosevelt war machine.

Those Socialists who say that in the conduct of the struggle against war we must wage a struggle against the democratic powers as well as the fascist powers have been charged with being isolationists. Despite the attempt to make the issue international action versus isolationism, there is one fundamental issue that confronts the student movement in America. That issue is: whether or not American youth is going to support the next imperialist war in which American capitalism engages. The issue is whether or not the student anti-war movement is going to expose and struggle against America's military preparations. The issue is whether in the coming student strike, this April, American students will strike against imperialist war, or whether they will strike to support Roosevelt in collective action even of a military nature against Japan.

Students who have rallied to the support of the Oxford pledge in the past must repeat this pledge today as the valid basis for serving notice on a war making administration that we will not support another war of American capitalism. This position today as three years ago is the only valid position for the building of a militant student movement against war in our colleges and universities.

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1938

BOOKS

STALINIST AND CATHOLIC DISTORTIONS ON SPAIN

"Counter-Attack In Spain" by Ramon Sender, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 288 pp., \$2.00.

"And Then the Storm" by Sister Monica, New York, Longman's, Green and Co., 231 pp., \$2.50.

One year ago I was dining in the Casa de Cultura in Valencia. In this cultural center of the People's Front, which housed artists, writers and scientists evacuated from Madrid, I met the most distinguished of Spanish writers, Ramon Sender. He apologized for being depressed. "I have just received word that my wife was executed by the fascists," he explained.

The outbreak of the fascist rebellion found Sender with his family at San Rafael, in the Guadarrama Mountains. The arrival of Mola's column was imminent, and it was decided that Sender should cross the mountains to join the anti-fascist militia. It was impossible for his wife and children to make the difficult trip over the high Sierras, and Sender thought that since they were good Catholics and conservative, his wife, his sister and her husband would be perfectly safe even if the fascists captured the village.

Contrary to his expectations, while Sender was fighting at Guadarrama, the fascists "turned San Rafael into a horrible slaughter-yard". His family escaped the first massacre, but later they were all murdered—his brother, a People's Front Mayor, his wife's brothers, his wife,—all but his children who were rescued by the International Red Cross. Sender tells this tragic story at the end of his book, after recording many other atrocities committed by the fascists.

There are numerous contrasts between the decency of the anti-fascists and the barbarism of the fascists in Sender's book. A loyalist pilot, Galarza, shot down behind fascist lines, was hacked into pieces and his mutilated body dropped by parachute over Madrid. The loyalist militiamen guarding Italian and Moorish prisoners became so incensed by this incident that they punished their prisoners—by depriving them of their daily ration of tobacco! I can testify that such things did actually happen frequently. The fascists committed atrocities systematically, on a wholesale scale, while the revenge taken by the anti-fascists was due to individuals maddened by memory of wives and children slaughtered, and the loyalist government sought to restrain such acts of retribution.

Ramon Sender writes eloquently of the battles in which he took part, but when he talks politics he becomes amazingly stupid. This book has value as a contribution to the literature of the Spanish Civil War *only* because he devotes 99 per cent of it to the story of events on the field of battle from the fighting in the Guadarramas in July to the siege of Madrid in November. His style is characterized by simplicity and restraint. He does not dip his pen into vitriol, but the reader is stirred to hatred of fascism none the less. The stark realities of war become vivid; but there is no straining after melodramatic effect.

Like all Stalinists, Sender places his faith even today after all the lessons of the Spanish Civil War, in the liberal bourgeoisie, in the governments of France, Britain and the United States, and in the middle class throughout the world. His book appeals to them; an eloquent cry for help. He does not understand that the democratic capitalist governments broke international law and refused the legitimate Spanish government its right to buy munitions because a decisive anti-fascist victory would lead inevitably to the completion of the proletarian socialist revolution which began in July, 1936, and

which has been checked by the People's Front, subservient to Russia and to Anglo-French imperialism.

Sender is a Spanish patriot above everything else. His passionate love of his country is woven into his story. Because he thinks the C. P. and Soviet Russia are aiding his beloved Spain to win independence from German and Italian fascism, he is lyrical with praise of the wisdom, the efficiency, of the Stalinists. He mentions other working class organizations disparagingly, and often lies outrageously, as for instance, his assertion that the CNT, in its eagerness to win members, opened its doors to people who were neutral or treacherous. (p. 165) That is exactly what the C. P. did. And again he says all organizations collaborated loyally with the anti-fascist government except the CNT. (p. 215) The fact is that all anti-fascist organizations collaborated loyally against fascism and maintained unity until the Stalinists disrupted that unity and ousted the left from the government, including both trade unions.

But mostly the book relates acts of heroism surpassing the imagination, such as that of Cornejo, a young worker who single-handed put out of action two Italian tanks and captured six Italian officers; or Llobera, who blew up a bridge, himself with it, so that the loyalists could capture a much-needed tank which had already crossed the bridge; or the 40 Communists who volunteered to go to certain death so that their bodies would fill a breach and serve as a barricade.

The book by Sister Monica, an American Catholic, can be dismissed in a paragraph. She also writes very well; which means that she lies eloquently. To her the People's Front even in February was nothing but "Soviets in disguise". She loved the old Catholic Spain; romanticizes about the charms of feudal society. It represents civilization to her, as the loyalists represent chaos, destruction, carnage, the rule of the ignorant mob. Hers is the reform program of "liberal" Catholics everywhere—education stressing concord in place of class struggle, spiritual awakening, a return to Christian ideals as a guide to "true social justice"; i.e., militant Catholicism, such as is resisting Hitler in Germany today.

Neither book gives any answer to the flaming issues and problems raised by the Civil War in Spain. There are hundreds of good books from every viewpoint about the French Revolution and many about the Russian Revolution, but not one as yet about the Spanish Revolution and Civil War. They are all superficial, whether by Catholics, liberals or Stalinists.

LISTON M. OAK

MORE FICTION ON THOREAU

"The Works of Thoreau", — Selected and Edited by Henry S. Canby. Houghton, Mifflin Co., N.Y.C., \$5.00.

It is not too difficult to perceive why Henry Seidel Canby should have decided at just this juncture in history to publish a collection of the works of Henry David Thoreau. Thoreau is an authentic American anarchist. He is the avowed enemy of the machine age and of the governmental and industrial centralization that the machine makes necessary. He is *par excellence* an individualist and an advocate of the "simple life". The "simple life", i.e. the escape from the unpleasant reality of revolution and reaction, of tumult and confusion is very attractive to the literary, to the "contemplative" mind.

It is interesting to note that, at one time, it was fashionable for "radicals" to tout the importance of Thoreau. His revolt against the Mexican War, his essay on civil disobedience, his refusal to accept the *mores* of bourgeois society seemed to many to identify him with the more modern social revolution. Such an attitude argues for failure to read what Thoreau actually said, even in *Walden*, the most widely quoted of his works. His actual position places him as much at variance

with a labor union as it does with bourgeois success. He would reject the socialist commonwealth as emphatically as he rejects capitalist society. Both offer a life too complicated for him. Both offer goals that he repudiates. Both worship false gods.

The true gods that Thoreau follows consist of an utter simplicity, of an economic self-sufficiency that goes far beyond anarchy. In his hatred of crowds (he found the Concord of 1840 too crowded and said that a population of more than one person per square mile was too dense) he resembles Daniel Boone, but also the Buddhist recluse. Any effort to turn his notions into a categorical imperative would result, not in social revolution, and not even in village anarchism, but in the violent disruption of human society and in its cataclysmic disappearance.

It is therefore a definite good that this collection should appear. It is important that those who vaguely remember that Thoreau said rude and radical things about capitalism should re-read these things, and many others that they have never read, and so stop dreaming about an impossible Arcadia.

The present collection contains all of Thoreau's works and extensive excerpts from his Journal. It is prefaced by a Biographical Note in which Dr. Canby says pleasant if somewhat exaggerated things about Thoreau as a scientist, philosopher and writer. "Thoreau's prose", he says, for example, "is as good as any written in his century". But in this "Note" we read, too, that Thoreau died of tuberculosis at the age of forty-four. If we place the fact of this illness in juxtaposition with his rambunctious self-sufficiency, we get in the light of modern psychology a valuable insight into the nature of Thoreau's ideas.

—DAVID P. BERENBERG.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Collective Bargaining in the Steel Industry: 1937. A Factual Summary of Recent Developments. By Frederick H. Harbison. 43 Pp., III. Price \$1.00. Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Limits of Land Settlement, prepared under the direction of Isaiah Bowman. 380 Pp., VII. Price \$3.50. Council on Foreign Relations, N. Y. C. With maps.

The History of Militarism, by Alfred Vaghts. W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., N. Y. C. IX, 509. \$4.75. Illustrated.

Socialized Medicine in the Soviet Union, by Henry E. Sigerist. W. W. Norton & Co., N. Y. C. 378 pp. Illustrated. \$3.50

The Social Security Act in Operation, by Birchard E. Wyatt, Wm. A. Wandel and Wm. L. Schurz. Graphic Arts Press, Washington, D. C. XIII, 382 Price—

This Is Our World, by Paul B. Sears. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma. XI, 292. \$2.50

Life on the English Manor, a study of peasant conditions, 1150-1400, by H. S. Bennett. The Macmillan Co. N. Y. C. XVIII, 364. Illustrated. Price \$4.50.

Plot and Counter-Plot in Central Europe, by M. W. Fodor. Houghton Mifflin Co., N. Y. C. XV, 317. Illustrated. \$3.50.

Great Leveler, The Life of Thaddeus Stevens, by Thomas Frederick Woodley. Stackpole Sons. N. Y. C. 474 Pp. Illustrated. \$3.50.

International Aspects of German Racial Policies, by Oscar Janowsky and Melvin M. Fagen. Oxford University Press. N. Y. C. XXI, 266. \$2.00

Labor's Road to Plenty, by A. W. Rucker. XXII, 205. \$2.50. L. C. Page & Co., Boston.

THE SOCIALIST CALL

[Official organ of the Socialist Party of the U.S.A.]

contains

LATEST NEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT,
written by those active in labor's struggles.
TIMELY POLITICAL NEWS, How the pro-
gram of the New Deal and its opponents
affects the workers.

Articles on the Ludlow amendment and other
activities of Congress.

News of the war in Spain and China.

Labor Party tendencies thruout the nation.

If you wish to be up to date on these
and many other matters

SUBSCRIBE TO THE SOCIALIST CALL

549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Socialist Call

official organ, Socialist Party, U.S.A.

AMERICA'S LEFT - WING PACE - SETTER TODAY !

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER: 1 YEAR FOR \$1

— USE THIS BLANK —

CALLPRESS, INC.

549 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

Enclosed find \$1. Please send me The Socialist Call for the
next 52 weeks.

ADDRESS.....

NAME.....

CITY.....STATE.....

ARISE

Articles on the Ludlow resolution and other
NEWS - ARTICLES - PHOTOS - STORIES - POEMS

("Life" Size — 20 pages)

official organ

Young Peoples Socialist League of America

carrying on the tradition of revolutionary socialist
youth in the fight against war

December issue now on sale contains

If Debs were alive today—Hy Bookbinder
Students against War—Alvaine Hollister
Revolt—a short story—Lewis Conn
Boycott Imperialism—Milton Friedman
Spirit of Japan—by a Young Socialist in Japan
Editorials, special features, cartoons, pictures
The most attractive working class youth magazine ever

published in this country

Subscriptions 50¢ per year —

5¢ per copy

Business and Editorial Office

11 WEST 17th STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

READ THE CURRENT MODERN MONTHLY

An independent journal of radical opinion

THE NECESSITY OF ANARCHISM

Herbert Read

ERNEST HEMINGWAY: PRIMEVALITE

V. F. Calverton

COMMUNISTS AND THE
COMING WAR

Liston M. Oak

THE CHINESE DILEMMA

Editorial

ANATOMY OF DICTATORSHIP

S. L. Solon

ROOTS AND READING

Ernest Sutherland Bates

\$1.00 for eight months

THE MODERN MONTHLY

46 Morton Street

New York City

Name.....

Address.....

COMMON SENSE

A Monthly Magazine
Advocating Peace through Plenty

... In The Current Issue

A SOCIALIST ENGLAND IN 1945
by Sydney R. Elliott

A LETTER TO MR. FORD
by Upton Sinclair

EXPOSING THE FORD MYTH
by Homer Martin

THE FARMER AND THE PIT
by Ernest MacDougall

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE MIDDLE
CLASS WORKER ?
by Bernard Balicer

VIOLENCE, FOR AND AGAINST
A Symposium

MILLIONS ARE LEARNING HOW: A Poem
by James Agee

... Coming Soon

BOMBS BURSTING IN AIR
by Leonard Carlton

MYTHOLOGY OF THE RECESSION
by Thurman W. Arnold

THE SEX TRAP
by Robert A. Halliburton

FROM MARX TO MUTTON
by Lancelot T. Hogben

LABOR RACKETEERING WHOSE RACKET?
by Harold Seidman

Read These Important Articles 7 Month Trial Offer \$1

COMMON SENSE, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York

Enclosed find \$1. Please send me COMMON
SENSE for 7 months.

Name.....

Address.....

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

in its Winter Issue presents:
THE PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM,
A Restatement

by Karl Korsch
BACKGROUND OF THE SPANISH
CIVIL WAR
by Bertram D. Wolfe

THE RAILROAD STRIKES OF 1885-86
by Harry Frumerman

CHANGING NATURE OF MONOPOLY
CAPITALISM
by G. Reimann

BETWEEN WAR AND SOCIALISM
by Bernhard Buchholz

THE SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE
by Sidney Hook

MR. HOGBEN AGAINST MATHEMATICS
by William Gruen

SYNTHESIS IN ART INVESTIGATION
by Leo Balet

METAPHYSICS FOR THE MOVIES
by Meyer Schapiro

DR. JOHNSON AND THE OLD ORDER
by Stuart G. Brown

THE CLASS NATURE OF SCIENCE
by Eliseo Vivas

Communications and reviews by Edward
Conze, Jim Cork, Meyer Schapiro, Harry
Levin, B. D. Wolfe, and others.

Free from dogma, dictation or partisan
restrictions, with no limitation of subject
or contributors save those of relevance,
expertness and illumination, the Marxist
Quarterly is the only serious journal of
independent Marxism in America. Its
first two numbers have won for it instant
recognition. The present number con-
tinues and even better the pace set by
the first two.

\$2.00 brings it for an entire year (four numbers);
Single copies 50c; a few copies of
Nos. 1 and 2 still available.

SUBSCRIBE NOW
MARXIST QUARTERLY 20 VESEY ST., N. Y. C.