

SOCIALIST REVIEW •

Vol. 6 - - - No. 8

September - October, 1938

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

ANGELICA BALABANOFF

Anti-Semitism in Italy

Luis Araquistain

Trade Unions and Social Revolution

* *

Spain

SAM ROMER: Personal Notes from Spain

SAM BARON: An Open Letter to Louis Fischer

*

France

JAMES LOEB: French Socialism, 1938

*

HERBERT ZAM: Munich - and After

FRANK N. TRAGER: Political Stew, 1938

JUDAH DROB: The World Youth Congress

DAVID P. BERENBERG: Review of Balabanoff Book

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.

Reentered as second class matter January 21, 1938 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Should workers ever support "their own" capitalist government in a war?
Can we expect the "good" capitalist nations to unite to hold the "bad" nations in check?

Will Collective Security banish war?

Will Isolationism keep us out of war?

Read the Answers to these and other questions in

SMASH THE WAR SYSTEM

Resolution unanimously adopted by the Socialist Party National Convention
in Kenosha, Wisc., April 23, 1938.

Order from
Socialist Party of the U. S. A.
549 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

Five cents per copy.
50c. per dozen.
\$3.50 per 100 copies.
Plus postage.

SOCIALIST CALL

Official Organ, Socialist Party, U.S.A.

— contains —

"AT THE FRONT"

A weekly review of national and
world events by

NORMAN THOMAS

"Little Essays in Socialism"

by

JOHN M. WORK

Articles by

McALISTER COLEMAN	LILLIAN SYMES
HARRY W. LAIDLER	TRAVERS CLEMENT
DEVERE ALLEN	GUS TYLER

JOHN MILL

and others

THE SOCIALIST CALL

is a

WORKERS' AND FARMERS' NEWSPAPER

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

\$1.00 a year

Special "Depression" sub—10 weeks 25c.

SOCIALIST CALL

549 Randolph Street
Chicago, Ill.

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 bi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1938.

State of New York, County of New York, 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 U. S., 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois; 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.; Editor, Herbert Zam, 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, V. Miller, 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses 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, 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois; 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.; Editor, Herbert Zam, 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, V. Miller, 301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.

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 and security holders 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 13th day of October, 1938. (Seal.) Robert D. Bloom, Notary Public, Bronx Co. Clk's No. 170, Reg. No. 164-B-40, Cert. filed in N. Y. Co. No. 802, Reg. No. O-B-517, Cert. filed in Kings Co. No. 267, Reg. No. 442, Cert. filed in Queens Co. No. 553, Reg. No. 2520, Expires March 30th, 1940.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

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

HERBERT ZAM, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jack Altman, Robert Delson, Harry W. Laidler, James Loeb, David Paul, Frank Trager.

VOLUME SIX

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1938

NUMBER EIGHT

Munich—and After

by Herbert Zam

THE partition of Czechoslovakia is only one, and perhaps a minor, outcome of the Munich agreement, which saw the two great "democracies," France and Great Britain, reach an amicable understanding with their supposedly "irreconcilable" enemies, the totalitarian fascist states. People who were only mildly excited over Japan's seizure of Manchuria, and later of all of China, over Italy's annexation of Ethiopia, over Hitler's forcible "anschluss" of Austria to the Reich, became violent at the Czechoslovakian developments. This is a tribute to the power of the propaganda machine in the hands of the imperialists, which in a few days was able to create a pro-war hysteria, and then reverse it into a "peace relief." It must stand as a warning at the ease with which countries can be whipped into psychological acceptance of war and the necessity for intensifying all anti-war work.

The Munich settlement finally and irrevocably scrapped the Versailles treaty, which ruled post-war Europe for two decades. In its place has risen a new Versailles. Just as Versailles was an attempt to distribute world influence among the main victors of the last world war, Munich is an attempt to include in the select circle those who were excluded from a major share in that influence. Just like Versailles, Munich was necessary to halt the stirrings of an awakening working class, threatening the stability and very existence of the capitalist order. Just like Versailles, Munich represents a banding of the imperialists to present a united front should the colonies dare to make a real effort at independence. Munich is in keeping with the essential nature of imperialism, even if specific arrangements are different than heretofore.

The Munich pact further represents the fulfillment of one of Hitler's dreams—the isolation of Soviet

Russia and the beginning of the formation of a united front of "western" powers against it. This is the child of all these years of "brilliant" foreign diplomacy of the Stalin-Litvinoff school, which was supposed to isolate Hitler. Thus ends the Stalinist creation according to which cleverness is to replace class interests and imperialist solidarity—cleverness so great as to induce imperialists to unite, in the form of a Peoples Front and collective security, with their workers against other imperialists to protect the interests—of the workers. No matter how vehemently Litvinoff now disavows Munich, the Soviet Union, having joined the League of Nations and participated in all the forms of imperialist diplomacy connected with the League, must necessarily assume some of the burden of responsibility for Munich.

Finally, it is clear that the Munich pact relegates France to the rear as a power on the continent. Its system of puppet states has collapsed. Its main military ally, Czechoslovakia, with a million well trained troops and a dual Maginot line, is now on the other side. The Franco-Soviet pact is now actually, and will soon be formally, a scrap of paper. Isolated in the West, as Russia is in the East, France is now more dependent upon England than it has been since the end of the Franco-Prussian war. Thus in reality, two main powers hold the scene in Europe and the world influenced by Europe—England and Germany. To a very large extent, the fate of the world will be determined by the future relations between these two powers. And neither the history of Nazi Germany, nor of Tory England leaves much room for any belief that Anglo-German relations will benefit the masses of toilers throughout the world.

But Munich has also buried something else; it has

buried the policy which the majority of the politically organized workers in Europe has been following in the last few years—collective security and Peoples Front coalitionism. This twin illusion of a capitalist class sufficiently devoted to democracy as to be willing 1) to wage an international war against non-democratic countries and 2) to unite with the democratic workers in a more or less permanent alliance against the non-democratic capitalists in each country now evaporates before the reality of the class solidarity of the capitalists and the international solidarity of the imperialists. The Communists may try to blow new life into this policy by the spurious argument that they meant "collective security of the people" and now want a "broad peoples front", but this policy cannot be maintained or revived. Even the Soviet Union will be compelled to seek new tactics of diplomacy to pursue in its relations with the capitalist world. How can the working class hold on to the old and lifeless and never useful coalitionism. Already the Soviet-Czech mutual assistance treaty has been abrogated. Already Daladier ordered his supporters to vote against the other Peoples Front parties in the senatorial elections. Collective security is dead. The Peoples Front is dead.

Whether or not the powers were prepared to go to war over Czechoslovakia cannot be speculated upon. True it is, however, that if a war breaks out, it will be over such an issue as Czechoslovakia and in such a manner as the one recently rehearsed. The Munich agreement did not prevent an eventual war. It only postponed one. In that respect, we may be said to be living in the modern 1912. How far away is 1914? The years between will witness the break-up of old and the formation of new alliances; the jockeying for position; the attempt to bring the small countries into line. There cannot be a war until all the pieces are properly placed on the military board. That there will be a war can best be seen from the military preparations of all the chief countries of the world. Chamberlain comes back with the "peace" of Munich and plunges England into an unprecedented armament race; France abrogates the 40-hour week, one of the most important and significant gains of the workers in the post war period, in order that war industries may work in accordance with the needs of the military program. The United States, presumably out of the European war picture, redoubles an already record armament program. By these actions, the leaders of the world tell us that they expect not peace, but war, as a result of the Munich agreement.

It is perhaps easier to view the possible consequences of a war over the Czechoslovakian issue in retrospect. Many intelligent people will be glad of the opportunity to look back, and in the light of what has happened

since the crisis, weigh what they were about to do during the crisis. For Czechoslovakia will be repeated in the future—with a different country, with somewhat different issues, but with the same basic appearance. The imperialist war-makers are too adroit to present us with an open-and-shut imperialist war. It will have to be sugar-coated with some attractive issues and appealing slogans. Such a case was already being worked up for Czechoslovakia, and millions of workers, especially those who have been taken in by the peoples front propaganda, were ready to support a war on behalf of Czechoslovakian independence and democracy. What are the lessons to be drawn? First, the democracies did not go to war over Czechoslovakia because democracy, as contrasted to fascism, and the independence of a small nation, are not war issues for them. Secondly, it is not the form of internal organization of a country which concerns them in determining their relations to it, but its foreign, that is, imperialist interests. Finally, no ruling class in any country will resist fascism to the death merely on the issue of democracy. The Czech capitalists, now falling over themselves to be on good terms with Hitler, are merely acting in accordance with the nature of capitalists—make the best deal for the purpose of preserving capitalism, no matter with whom. This bourgeoisie which was ruling Czechoslovakia, which was oppressing national minorities, thus laying the basis for Hitler's entry on the scene, now goes over to Hitler, lock, stock and barrel. Can anyone still speak in terms of a war for the purpose of preserving the independence of this bourgeoisie?

Undoubtedly the workers of Czechoslovakia were opposed to fascism and wanted to fight it, and this fight would have deserved the support of workers everywhere. But Spain has already demonstrated that a real fight against fascism can be conducted only over the opposition of the bourgeoisie. Thus, in Czechoslovakia, for the workers to be in a position to really fight against Hitler's invasion meant that they first had to take power in their own hands, or at least do that simultaneously with organizing resistance to Hitler. In the face of the lack of either material or ideological preparations for such action, all resistance to Hitler naturally collapsed when England and France decided to abandon Czechoslovakia. Once again we are brought face to face with the conclusion that today the capitalists are no longer willing to defend democracy. This task devolves upon the working class, which cannot, however, preserve democracy over the opposition of the entire capitalist order without entirely destroying that order. The fight for democracy assumes real meaning only when it is part of the fight for a system in which true democracy can be a reality—Socialism.

Czechoslovakia further raises the question: is it possible to fight for democracy and at the same time continue to oppress millions of people in the national mi-

norities and the colonies? Can England be a true fighter for democracy so long as it oppresses India? Can people in England be true fighters for democracy and refuse to fight for the freedom and independence of India? Will a capitalist England liberate India? Once again it is seen that democracy and Socialism are inter-related in the modern world. Czechoslovakia was in no position to resist the inroads of fascism because within its own boundaries almost half of the population lived as subject peoples, whose every striving for autonomy was met with brutal repression. When Hitler became the false champion of some of them, when it was already too late, the Czech government was willing to grant a measure of autonomy to the Sudetens and other minorities. A Sudeten people who felt themselves free in a democracy would never have gone over to Hitler. But can this problem be solved by the capitalists, who want to extract the last bit of profit out of the populations living within their borders? Autonomy for the national minorities, independence for the colonial people, democracy for the masses—these today can only be realized through a workers' democracy, through Socialism. Czechoslovakia once more proves that the issue is not between bourgeois democracy and fascism, but between fascism (that is capitalism without democracy) and socialism (that is, the working class and democracy).

During the height of the Czech crisis, many advanced workers were prepared to support and participate in a war of the democracies against Hitler and Mussolini. Even many who scoffed at the idea of a democratic war against fascism shared this view—and for "revolutionary" reasons. A war, they reasoned, in which Hitler was defeated, would give the German workers an opportunity to overthrow Hitler, just as it gave the Russian workers an opportunity to overthrow the Czar. Furthermore, revolution in Germany and Italy resulting from war might rapidly spread to England and France. So that world revolution might very well be the outcome of the next world war. Still others believed that a war against the fascist nations is a good thing, provided it is conducted by those who really oppose fascism. Therefore support to such a war should be given, but in the course of it, the workers should endeavor to take hold of and direct it, so as to convert the imperialist war into a "revolutionary war".

Both these views are equally erroneous. They overlook the first and most obvious deduction, that even should the democratic powers conduct a war against Hitler with such success as to lead to revolution in Germany, these very same powers, profiting from their Russian lesson, would immediately unite with Hitler to put down revolution in Germany. Certainly, all the imperialists prefer a fascist to a Socialist Germany or Italy. They forget that an uprising against Hitler would be very remote indeed unless the German workers saw prospects of similar uprisings and therefore of support from the

workers in the "victorious" countries. They forget that the next war is likely to see large scale revolts in all the important colonies, owned precisely by the "democratic" powers. To conduct the war, England will have to put down the revolution in India. Those who want England to conduct a successful war will have to help her strangle the Indian revolution. Finally, revolutions are not self-created. Mutinies, revolts, yes. But a revolution must have direction, leadership, perspective, program. Who will provide these? Only those who have been opposed to the war from the beginning are in a position to assume leadership of the revolt against war and transform blind revolt into social revolution. Thus revolutionary strategy, as well as revolutionary principle, demand firm and uncompromising opposition to war, which in the modern world, dominated by imperialism, must of necessity be imperialist war.

Benjamin Franklin once said "There has never been a good war or a bad peace." That is how millions of people undoubtedly feel about the Munich agreement. There is no doubt however, that aside from relief that there is no war, most people will agree that the Munich agreement was reactionary and represents a victory for reaction. This is not because Munich is by nature different from previous settlements. It is reactionary because it is an imperialist agreement, and imperialist agreements cannot be anything else but reactionary, just as imperialist wars cannot be progressive. Capitalist rule appears at its worst in international affairs. The foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration is a splendid example. In Spain, it resulted in the cutting off of help from Republican Spain and extending it to the rebels. In China, it resulted in letting Japan secure all the supplies it could while placing them beyond the reach of the Chinese government; in Mexico, it resulted in a united front with Great Britain in support of the oil imperialists and against the efforts of the Cardenas government to take the most important natural resources of the country out of the hands of foreign exploiters. Now the rearmament program has been made more extensive than ever. The policies of the United States toward the Spanish, Chinese and Mexican situations are but straws in the wind. They are heralds of the role of this country in a future war. It would not be progressive, but reactionary, imperialist, not liberating. It would deserve support no more than any other imperialist power.

In spite of its character, the Munich agreement does offer the international labor movement a breathing spell—an opportunity to cast off its illusions, to stop trailing after the capitalists, and to embark on a policy of independent labor action with the objective of assuming political power. If the labor movement does this, it will be able eventually to destroy the Munich agreement and its authors and build a foundation for permanent peace.

PERSONAL NOTES FROM SPAIN

by Sam Romer

IT would be ridiculous for me to put down pontifical lore, ex cathedra, on the Spanish civil war. I remained in Spain 16 months of which seven were spent in a Fascist concentration camp as a prisoner of war—obviously no place where one could learn the whole truth. The other nine months were not much more fruitful—in the front line trenches, engaged in heavy action daily, there is neither the time nor the opportunity to balance judgments and approve or reject political decisions. It is easy to understand, then, that any well-informed Socialist in America probably knows better than do I of what really happened in Spain during the past two years. What I put down here is personal and subjective; it is largely based upon intuition and speculation rather than indisputable facts.

Perhaps the most important thing I could say would be something like this: Neither I nor my wife—who served 15 months with the Republican Medical Corps as nurse—regret in any measure our stay there. We would not hesitate to return again tomorrow if the opportunity came; we know that our presence there was worthwhile and that whatever little we contributed to the fight against the Fascist foe, the Spanish people returned it a thousandfold in their gratitude and kindness. We know further that the fight in which so many of our Spanish comrades died the death of heroes—died not only in defense of their personal liberty and for a free Spain but they fought your fight and mine. Never before was so clearly demonstrated the artificiality of capitalist nationalism; never before was so great the need of international working-class solidarity. The Spanish working class today is the shock-troop force of the international proletariat.

My wife and I went to Spain because our heart and conscience as honest Socialists demanded it. In Spain we were widely known as Socialists who quite plainly declared that only among the laboring classes of the world would Spain find genuine, loyal comradeship. After Caballero fell and the Spanish revolutionaries were eliminated from the Negrin regime, we continued as revolutionary Socialists, carrying out the line and policy of Caballero within the army. This line, brought to fruition by the thousands of Spanish workers and peasants who remained loyal to the policies of Socialism, might be expressed as follows: The primary task of Socialists, within and without Spain, military and political, is to win the war. Within the army, then, Socialists will serve as examples of discipline, courage and loyalty to the cause of the Re-

public. Although they will distinguish their politics from those of reformism, anarchism and communism, Socialists recognize the absurdity of forming in any sense a political opposition within a military unit. They will obey without question or hesitation the military command; in its execution, they will demand of themselves the greatest sacrifices.

It was in such a manner that the "Caballeristas" (followers of Caballero), serving in every branch and every unit of the military, won the respect and admiration of their fellow-soldiers. It was by such a line that today, despite 18 months of Communist calumny and slander, revolutionary Socialism and its leadership is adored by the masses and feared by its enemies. And it is such a line that we in America must follow today—this is the most effective way we can demonstrate that we too are fighting the good fight for the emancipation of labor.

In a sense, we are all members of the army. There is not one of us who would not welcome a more stringent discipline within the movement, both here and abroad. Let us then begin by applying this discipline where it will mean most, to our own persons.

Practically, this means that we devote our energies more and more to the tasks before us—to active and effective aid to the North American Committee, to the greatest sacrifices for the Food Ship and similar causes, to demand the lifting of the Roosevelt embargo and stop the impending sellout of Spain—a daring cry to be echoed and re-echoed by the labor unions and the progressive masses. The Spanish Socialists know full well how fruitless are the diplomatic maneuvers in the chancelleries of Europe and America; they depend upon us to bring into life the glorious spirit of independent, working-class action. In this task we cannot fail them; unless the embargo is lifted and material aid in the form of food and war materials flows into Spain, we will have on our conscience the slavery of the Spanish people. When I was captured, although there was a hideous lack of artillery, anti-aircraft and other heavy war material, the food situation was not critical. Today, men who have just returned, tell me starvation has replaced hunger and the Spanish soldier with his wife and child must fight the gaunt skeleton of starvation as well as the Fascist foe. It is a hopeless task to try to stop the motorized, mechanized German and Italian forces with rifles and machine guns; it becomes even more terrible if you do so with a gnawing pit in your stomach and your muscles atrophied from lack of nutrition.

(Continued on Page 6)

POLITICAL STEW—1938

by Frank N. Trager

THE annual elections are here once again. All representatives, some senators, governors and numerous state and local candidates are lollypopping for voters' choice. Supposedly an off-year election, several factors combine to make this November more than usually important:

1. The European scene and the danger of war demand a new foreign policy from the Administration. Quarantine for aggressors and "parallel or concerted action" with "Democracies" (F. D. R.'s form of collective security) have to be thrust aside under the impact of *realpolitik* and the Munich Agreement.

2. Domestically the indices of production and employment are still wobbling from the sharp downward spiral which began in August, 1937 and hit a pre-1934 low in June - July 1938.

3. The monopoly investigation will attempt *not* a trust-busting game dear to the hearts of muckrakers and populists *but* a contradictory program of administered lower prices with full production. This is to encourage large scale industry (i.e. the "trusts") *and* at the same time to stimulate competition.

4. The Wallace Farm Program is seriously bogging down precisely on those grounds predicted here last spring. "Surplus" or bumper crops emerge from limited extra-fertilized acreages to knock into a cocked hat any notion of controlled (scarcity) production. Not only are "reactionary" farm leaders (Cotton Ed Smith or the State Agricultural Commissioner of Texas, J. E. McDonald) gunning for the A.A.A. but New Deal supporters such as John Vesecky, president of the National Farmers Union, find the present program unworkable. (Watch the coming national convention of the National Farmers Union at Madison, Wisconsin, November 15 - 17, for a new farm program).

5. The signs for the new capitalist-liberal party apparently collapsed in the ineptly planned and executed "Primary Purge." The catharsis left the patient somewhat constipated. This, however, does not prevent the Communists and liberals, (and Mayor Hague's man, Ely) from tagging on to the New Deal, hastily proclaiming with John Chamberlain: Farewell to Revolution.

6. Organized labor is giving a "splendid" version of the Gompers' philosophy. It is rewarding friends and punishing enemies up and down the line. President Green and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. join hands figuratively with the presumably "progressive" American Labor Party in picking out "good" Republicans and "good" Democrats. Sometimes they

agree on the same individuals, sometimes they don't—but that is relatively a small matter in view of such agreement in principle. If, for example, the A.L.P. can make a deal with the N. Y. Republican Leader Simpson why shouldn't the A. F. of L. support one of the two main proteges of Simpson, Congressman Bruce Barton of "The Man Nobody Knows" fame?

These then are the main factors contributing to the importance of the present elections. A new foreign policy with increased armaments, no real industrial recovery, search for a new farm program to replace the rapidly disintegrating A. A. A., and the same old two-party system buttressed by the Communists and labor bureaucracy still playing the rewards and punishment game.

For Socialists this picture, filled in all its contours, represents both a challenge and an opportunity. Ours is the task of finding the way to the minds and hearts of workers everywhere with the only all-round program capable of sustaining peace and providing economic security based on a full analysis of the class nature of society and social action. No short cut has yet been found for Socialism. This is still true however sorely tempted Socialists may be to search out a simpler route.

Perhaps the outstanding lesson to be learned by Socialists will come from the campaigns in Michigan, Pennsylvania and New York. This is said not to minimize the importance of Socialist campaigning in the other states but to paint up the analysis of forces and programs which combine to test the Socialist position in these states. For Michigan has an alive labor movement led by the auto workers. In the building of the Auto Union, Socialists have played a key role since the days of the South Bend Convention (1936) and the General Motor's Strike (1937). The union's politics came close to independent action in the Detroit Municipal campaign of 1937. But today every section of the political leadership of the union—with honorable exception of the Socialists—is plumping for the Democrat Murphy. Murphy has the support of Homer Martin and the Stalinists. The Lovestonites go along. But our Party in Michigan has nominated a full socialist slate despite the pull to go along with Murphy! This action may come hard to many trade unionists including perhaps some individual Socialists but *the outcome for Socialism in our or any time precisely depends upon the ability of the Party to distinguish between class collaboration and independent class action.*

Any tendency which might capitulate to a Murphy boom no matter how strong the latter may be *within* the labor movement means in effect to surrender socialist politics for peoples front or liberal, good man politics.

Pennsylvania offers another splendid example of the danger to labor of playing politics with capitalist parties. The Earle-Guffey wing of the Democratic party was looked upon as the best representative of labor and received unstinting support from the entire labor movement, especially the United Mine Workers. Earle was even heralded as the "heir apparent" To F.D.R. But suddenly two events changed this idyll. First, the break-up of this machine and the refusal of the majority elements to give even a single place to labor on the State ticket. Almost on the heels of that, startling charges of graft and corruption against the Earle administration. In an endeavor to take control of the Party, the labor forces ran a ticket in the primaries, of necessity allying themselves with a host of unsavory elements (Mayor Wilson, of Philadelphia, sections of the Guffey machine, and the corrupt Allegheny County machine). The Earle-Jones slate won and the labor elements of the Kennedy ticket have now come out for the official ticket. However, in Luzerne County and in Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) the majority of the Kennedy organization has gone over to the Republicans. Had Kennedy been the victor, would these elements be the base for a state government in the interests of labor? Kennedy would have been the prisoner of the Guffeys, the Wilsons and the smaller politicians in the counties and wards. The Socialists of Pennsylvania, realizing that labor had nothing to gain from being in or supporting a party controlled by the Lawrences, McCloskeys and Company, is running a full State ticket, with expectations for a good vote.

In New York, the American Labor Party disgusted even its best friends by an unprincipled deal with the Republicans in two counties in New York City, with a section of Tammany in a third, and is supporting the bulk of the Democratic State ticket without a deal. The unprincipled character of the "deal" made by the A.L.P. with the Republicans and Democrats has convinced even the most uncritical optimists that this campaign, like that of 1936, is one of Socialism versus Capitalism, of the Socialist Party versus every aspect of political compromise. The A.L.P. is now a Stalinist, Old Guard Socialist, New Deal labor, Republican-Democrat combination that must inevitably disintegrate into a third, Progressive, or Bull Moose Party and thus die—or break with capitalist Politics, shake off the old party hangers-on and chart the road of independent labor action!

These states, among many others, are outstanding

SAM ROMER

(Continued from Page 4)

But there is hope for Spain—in the glorious courage of the Spanish people who died on the outskirts of Madrid by the thousands and tens of thousands that the Fascist advance might be retarded by the wall of dead bodies and fortifications built against time. The hope lies in the people of the North, now living under the Fascist whip who answer their oppressors with the clenched fist of the Republic. Yes, even in the ranks of the Spanish Fascist army—among the many who close their fists as they march along in formation. These men and women will never be defeated—they will first be destroyed. But—and let us say this plainly—they will be destroyed unless we come to their aid, unless we can demonstrate that the international working class upon which they place their faith will not fail them. This is our task today; to leave it unfulfilled means suicide for us and death to our ideals.

One more word. As I write, the Spanish sub-committee of the N.E.C. is meeting to discuss the endorsement of the Rehabilitation Campaign now being conducted by the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. This campaign has as its goal the return home and rehabilitation of the thousands of American boys now withdrawn from the front. It is a job in which I personally am deeply interested and to which I hope to devote my energies in the next few months. Included in this general campaign will be a drive to free the 74 American fighters still in the Fascist concentration camps. I need not tell Socialists about life there, of a bread-and-bean diet, of sadistic beatings. Let me say only this: that if these boys are forced to spend the winter where they are now, far less than 74 will be there in the spring. It is on the basis of a personal plea that I ask every comrade, every friend, to throw themselves with religious fervor in the work of the Rehabilitation Campaign and to spare no effort to make sure that the buddies we left behind in prison will be freed. I hope to say more about this later.

The sentiments I have expressed above I prepared in a "May Day" letter to the Party which I wrote on March 10 from the front lines of Azuera. The letter was destroyed by a shell which landed foursquare on the mail bag. This article then may not have the romantic appeal of being riddled with bullets; but the call to action for which it pleads must not remain unanswered.

tests in 1938 of the future role of the working class in America. The job of Socialists, with a program of Socialism and of independent labor action is to hold its ranks, to profit by the clarity of its program, by its ability to present the only clear issue to an increasingly alert electorate.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN ITALY

by Angelica Balabanoff

N EITHER the social background of the country nor its historical and mental traditions are compatible with any kind of discrimination against the Jewish population of Italy. Like everything else in fascist Italy, it has been imposed by decree.

That the proportion of Jews in Italy is negligible (a total of 47,825) is demonstrated most emphatically by a province like Calabria, where, in a population of one and three-quarters million there are only eleven Jews. In the province of Sardinia, out of a population of about 900,000 only fourteen are Jews. In Umbria there are only 112 Jews in a population of 700,000 or less than two-tenths of a percent. About the same proportion prevails in the province of Abruzzi, where there are in all only 81 Jews. But even in provinces where the Jewish population is greater, their proportion to the preponderant Italian population is likewise negligible. Besides, the Italians as a people are utterly devoid of racial or religious prejudices. As a psychological current of public opinion, let alone as a sentiment or instinct of hostility, anti-Semitism is utterly incompatible with the character and mentality of the Italian people. In no country of Europe did the Dreyfus Affair or the Russian pogroms arouse as much passion, as much indignation and as much solidarity for the victims, as in Italy.

Nor is anti-Semitism compatible with all the previous pronouncements of the Fascisti themselves. As recently as February 16, 1938, a mere five months before the first Fascist Anti-Semitic Manifesto of July 14, the world was officially informed:

The Fascist Government has never thought and is not now thinking of adopting political, economic or moral measures against Jews except, of course, in case of elements hostile to the Fascist regime.

Shortly after the Fascists consolidated their power, they published a new encyclopedia which was designed to eradicate all vestiges of democratic liberal ideology and was to become the one and only source of authentic Fascist information for all Italians on all questions of life. For that encyclopedia the article on Fascism was written by Il Duce himself. The article on anti-Semitism was entrusted to the pen of Signor Pincherle, a full-blooded Jew. That in itself was measure enough of the Fascist attitude toward anti-Semitism. Here is what the highest authority of Fascism, the Fascist Encyclopedia, not yet revised, states about the Jewish problem:

There is no Jewish race or Jewish type. There are no physical characteristics exclusively Jewish.

The various groups of Jews represent a mixture of races and elements which have been instrumental in forming other ethnic groups as well, both European and non-European.

As for anti-Semitism in Italy, the Fascist Encyclopedia states:

The spread of anti-Semitism among us has been made impossible because of the traditions of our Risorgimento, contrary to what has been the case in Germany, in Italy the emancipation of the Jews and their incorporation into the State does not run counter to our national interests. Italy moreover does not have the economic and social motives which might, if not justify, at least explain in part the development of anti-Semitism, as in other countries. There are very few Jews in Italy, nearly all of them have been established in the country for centuries and have become completely Italianized. The tradition of peaceful relationship between Jews and Christians is a long one . . . and there is no specifically Jewish financial oligarchy.

As recently as May 29, 1932, Mussolini wrote about mixed marriages between Jews and Catholics, as follows:

Those statistics are of real interest, and are at the same time proof and reason for the non-existence of an anti-Semitic movement in Italy. The frequency of mixed marriages in Italy will be welcomed by all those who truly are good, sincere, reliable Italians, because it demonstrates the absolute social, political and especially moral equality of all Italians, whatever their remote descent might be.

Further Mussolini wrote:

The high percentage of mixed marriages in Italy shows that the number of Jews who, having left the physical ghetto, do not want to lock themselves in a moral ghetto, is on the increase . . . They want to be more intimately fused with the nation to which they have belonged for centuries and in whose history they are destined to live on.

Who does not recall Mussolini's sarcasm in dealing with Hitler's race theory and with race discrimination in general on the very eve of the consummation of the Italo-German axis? Was not this attitude of the chief-tain of Italian Fascism exalted by his Jewish and liberal admirers? And was it not triumphantly proclaimed to a startled world by Mussolini's eulogist and bio-

grapher, Emil Ludwig, himself a Jew? Consider these oracular declarations of Mussolini's:

There are no pure races left; not even Jews have kept their blood unmingled. Successful crossings have often promoted the energy and beauty of a nation. Race! It is a feeling, not a reality; 95% at least is a feeling. Nothing will ever make me believe that biologically pure races can be shown to exist today. Anti-Semitism does not exist in Italy. Italians of Jewish birth have shown themselves good citizens and they fought bravely in the war. Many of them occupy leading positions in the universities, in the army, and in the banks.

Such statements by Il Duce himself over a period of years and almost from the very inception of Fascism might seem to be sufficient guarantee of the utter impossibility of anti-Semitism in Italy. The fact that even anti-Semitism has not only become possible but is actually today one of the leading policies of Fascist Italy is added proof that the very essence of Fascism is its utter unreliability. Fascism is, first of all, thoroughly adventuristic and opportunistic in character. It adapts itself to various emergencies without any regard for consistency.

Anti-democratism, clericalism, militarism, totalitarianism, imperialism, cruelty and terrorism are as alien to the Italians as anti-Semitism. They all seem inconceivable in Italy. Yet here they are. In a country where it is possible with impunity to impose currents of thoughts and sentiments upon an entire population, without any possibility for it to express disapproval, anything is possible, no matter how reprehensible. The first rule of Fascism is expediency. That must be thoroughly understood if one is not to be caught unawares by the next turn of events in Fascist Italy and in the world in general as far as war and peace are concerned.

One of the reasons why the race problem suddenly arose in Italy is to be found in the Fascist attitude toward Palestine and its responsibility for the tragic events there. Signor Orano, turbulent spirit and a typical Fascist, who once pretended to be the most revolutionary of syndicalists, the most violent of atheists, the most intransigent of revolutionary Marxists, and who now emphasizes his being a strong Catholic and Fascist, in 1937 wrote the following about the Italian Zionist movement:

The Italian Zionist movement must be considered from the viewpoint of the Empire's political interests. Have our Zionists asked themselves whether Italy can afford to favor the formation of another State in the oriental part of the Mediterranean basin which is so full of complications and dangers? Born and consolidated under the sponsorship of Great Britain, this State

of Israel consolidated even more the Mediterranean position of England, which has to have its way barred by Fascist Imperial Italy . . . Besides, have the Italian Zionists asked themselves whether it is convenient for Italy, with her imperial colonial position in Africa to be hostile to Arabs and Mussulmen generally?

That should have been warning enough, more warning than Fascists usually give, of the possibility of a new turn in Italy.

Apart from that there is the critical situation of the country, due to the adventuristic policies of the Fascist Government in general and particularly due to the additional strain put upon the Italian economic structure by the adventures in Abyssinia and Spain and by the feverish preparations for the forthcoming "Great War." Always an extortionist, Il Duce thinks that this intimation of anti-Semitism may help him to obtain financial support from well-to-do Jews in Italy and beyond its borders. Blackmail has always been an authentic Fascist method and a very efficient one. Further loans to Italy having been proven by experience to be utterly unfeasible, Mussolini hopes to get the needed money by extortion from the Jews.

The number of Italians who disapprove of the "conquest" of Abyssinia grows from day to day as the economic conditions of the country become increasingly worse. The number of workers and soldiers dying in Abyssinia grows constantly because of the devastating climate and the unbearable conditions of life. Italians are seriously balking against sacrificing their lives for the sake of building an empire in Ethiopia. Yet that empire must be built, to save Il Duce's prestige. Why not use the Jews? Are they not a defenseless minority? Will anyone seriously object if the road to the prosperity of the future generations in Ethiopia is paved with Jewish corpses? Somebody must pay for Mussolini's very serious blunder in launching the Ethiopian adventure. Why not the Jews? They are an exceptionally enterprising people, excellent businessmen, and far abler organizers than the general run of Italians. Have they not converted the old land of Palestine into fruitful gardens? If they can rear a Tel-Aviv for Zionism, why not for Fascism? They cannot be induced to try it voluntarily. But Fascism has its own chosen means — compulsion. Baited in Italy, unwelcome elsewhere, the Jews of Italy may be only too glad to seek refuge in Ethiopia and there begin life anew. That may seem ruthless and cruel to sentimental humanitarians; but from the Fascist viewpoint, it is brilliant statesmanship.

But over and above all that is the bargain with Hitler. Mussolini has been deeply humiliated by Hitler's supremacy. Hitler achieved his aim, in swallowing Austria and in coming dangerously close to the Italian frontier. A typical coward, arrogantly violent with

(Continued on Page 18)

FRENCH SOCIALISM, 1938

by James Loeb

I.

THE development of any movement, Socialist or otherwise, depends upon its internal structure, philosophy and leadership and upon the objective nature of the social conditions in which it finds itself. It is the task of any Socialist party to develop the maximum strength and militancy possible within the limitations of a given situation. It is always easy for those on the outside to cry "Betrayal" at the first signs of defeat or failure, to shout down the leaders with angry taunts and intellectual arguments, to explain how it might have been otherwise. It is likewise easy for those same leaders to retort that "objective conditions" made other courses impossible. In analyzing the state of French Socialism and its recent history, the critic, even if he has had the advantage of several months of assiduous study on the spot, must be wary of falling into one of these two traps.

During the first ten months of the year 1938, French Socialism experienced a series of events which must necessarily have vast repercussions on the future of the movement both in France and throughout the world. It would not be too much to say that 1938 has been the most hectic year in the post-war history of the Socialist Party of France, not forgetting the splits of 1920 and 1933, the formation of the Popular Front after February 6, 1934, the rise to power of the first Socialist government after the electoral victories of 1936. Consider the following developments: the unsuccessful and short-lived second Blum government, the beginning of a tendency toward "union sacrée" within the Socialist Party, a split in the party which, whatever its numerical effect and its ideological implications, weakened the Paris section of the Socialist movement, the complete collapse of the People's Front to which the Party had given parliamentary leadership since its inception, and a similar collapse of the Party's foreign policy, followed by the Party's parliamentary support of the Munich agreement which was the nullification of that policy. As these lines are being written, the future of French Socialism, in terms of political orientation and organization, is one large question mark. An analysis of the events of the current year should provide some basis for an intelligent understanding of whatever lies ahead.

The French Socialist Party, at the end of 1937, had an enrolled, dues-paying membership of 286,604. The rapid advance of the Party can be seen by comparing this figure with the enrollment of 72,000 in 1924. Even in 1914, before the split which gave birth to the Communist Party, the Party had only 93,000 members. The present huge membership includes masses of workers, many intellectuals, considerable numbers from the lower

middle class, and an increasingly strong support from the peasantry. With 155 members in the Chamber of Deputies, it is the most powerful parliamentary force in French politics, having passed the Radical Socialist Party in the elections of 1936. A further indication of its strength and influence is the extent of the official Party press. Throughout France and the French colonies, the Socialist Party has six daily papers, seventy-six weeklies, and fourteen periodicals appearing at various intervals. In addition, there are twenty-seven publications edited and directed by members of the Party.

For some years the most considerable influence of the French Socialists has been in the provincial centers where Socialists are in power in many municipalities. In conversations this past summer, leaders of the Party were most enthusiastic about the progress being made in rural sections where Socialists are beginning to attract a following traditionally in the ranks of the Radical Socialist Party. This development is extremely significant in view of the heretofore backward political orientation of the small landholding French farmer. It must, however, be considered against the background of the general class development of political parties in France. It will be recalled that in the years before the war, when the left-wing Jules Guesde was the intellectual and agitational leader of the Party, along with Jaures, the Party included only the most progressive and even revolutionary sections of the French proletariat, while the Radical Socialists were the mass liberal and progressive party of labor. With the passage of years the Radicals became increasingly conservative until they were considered the official party of the lower middle class and the small farmers. Labor then turned to the Socialist Party as representative of its masses. Recent months have seemed to indicate a further shift in this class relationship. As the party of Daladier and Bonnet comes to represent more openly the interests of capital and the big trusts (witness the Munich "peace", and the campaign against the 40-hour week); the Socialist Party seems to be gaining among the lower middle class and the farmers.

How about the industrial proletariat? This brings up the question of the French Communist Party. No discussion of French Socialism can be complete without the realization of the fact that the only mass, working-class Communist Party in the world today, with the exception of the Soviet Union and Mexico, exists in France. In England the Communist Party is of no significance except among intellectuals and certain sections of the youth. In the United States there is little more, outside of New York City and a limited bureau-

cratic control of some unions. Even in Spain the large Communist Party is made up to a considerable extent, of functionaries and the lower middle class. But in France, since 1936, the Communists have been successful, for reasons that do not come within the scope of this article, in winning at least the temporary allegiance of huge sections of the industrial population. Especially has this been true in Paris. I met no socialist this summer who was not ready to admit that the Communist Party was the stronger in the Paris region. In this connection there have been some indications of a changing development, but these indications are not as yet sharp enough to warrant definite conclusions or even prognostications. It should be mentioned in passing that one organizational reason for the Communist success in the industrial field was Socialist trade union policy, namely that Socialist trade unionists were trade unionists before they were Socialists. This meant that Socialists did not form political power groups within the unions while the Communists placed much emphasis on the organization of their own party cells. Recently, by way of self-defense, the Socialist Party has organized what are called "Amicales" or sympathizing groups inside of the large unions.

What has been said should by no means be understood to mean that the French Socialist Party is a party of the middle class, with no working-class following. On the contrary, perhaps the most intelligent of French workers are Socialists. However, it should not be forgotten that the Socialist Party in 1936 took the responsibility for power and made the almost fatal mistake of allowing the Communists to remain on the outside. Taking advantage of this favorable position, very cleverly and often demagogically, the Communists were able to attract huge numbers of the unemployed and the most underpaid and exploited workers. Many French Socialists are now convinced that the greatest political error of Leon Blum was to accept power without the Communists. The clearest example of the tragic position into which the French Socialists were maneuvered occurred in relation to Spain. When Blum took power for the second time, in the face of an impossible parliamentary situation, he immediately proceeded to put into effect what he called "relaxed non-intervention." In other words, the Pyrenees border was open and Spain was able to purchase what she needed, with certain limitations prescribed by an ultimatum of the French General Staff. While this condition obtained, with the full knowledge of the Communist leaders, French Communists continued to cry "Open the frontier!" This nice piece of demagoguery has been largely responsible for the strained relations between the two parties during the past year.

On the basis of the foregoing very general and very summary facts, the year's events in the French Socialist movement can be examined with some perspective.

On January 17th there took place in Paris a meeting of the National Council of the Socialist Party on the occasion of the fall of the Chautemps Cabinet in which Socialists had participated. The results of these deliberations have had a continued effect on the French Socialist movement since that time. For the first time since the war the possibility of Socialist participation in a cabinet of national unity was suggested. The Council regretted that it had been impossible to form a Cabinet "in the image of the People's Front," but declared that it "authorized its deputies to participate in a government which will depend upon a majority based on the program and discipline of the Popular Front." This resolution has been interpreted by its chief sponsors, Leon Blum and Paul Faure, as a different kind of national unity, one which would include all political elements "from Marin to Thorez" but whose parliamentary majority would be mostly from the left. In the Council of January 17, the Blum-Faure resolution was passed by the significant vote: 4035 mandates for the resolution, 1496 mandates for a Pivert resolution refusing participation in any government not exclusively of the Popular Front or purely Socialist, and 2659 mandates for a Zyromski resolution refusing participation and support to "any government which, from the point of view of its composition, the application of its program and its supporting parliamentary majority, would not be a reflection of the Popular Front." Thus, for the first time in recent years, the official leadership of the Party failed to receive an absolute majority and had to be content with a mere plurality. Paul Faure immediately resigned as general secretary of the Party, only to reconsider after considerable coaxing from his supporters. It may be stated in passing that abrupt resignations and equally abrupt reconsiderations are not unusual in the life of a French political party.

The significance of the January 17th vote can only be understood in the light of the history of the various tendencies within the Socialist Party. It is essential to remember that Marceau Pivert and Jean Zyromski were at one time, and not many years ago, colleagues in the Revolutionary left of French Socialism. With the growing menace of Fascism a split developed, unfortunate but inevitably, within the left wing. On the one hand, Pivert, an intransigent pacifist who had taken part in the World War and vowed never again to take up arms, followed the line of increased opposition to all forms of international warfare and sharper agitation for immediate revolutionary struggle at home. On the other hand, Zyromski, in keeping with the Bauer-Dan-Zyromski thesis, urged the prosecution of the anti-Fascist fight and the combination of independent working-class action with pressure on democratic governments, along the lines of the Franco-Soviet Pact. But, and this is the significant point, both tendencies remained revolu-

(Continued on Page 19)

OPEN LETTER TO LOUIS FISHER

My dear Louis Fischer:

For some time I was of the opinion that you were the slickest peddler of Moscow wares in that overcrowded profession.

I speak in the past tense as it seems from your latest dispatches (The Nation, September 3rd, 1938) for example you expose yourself as an undiluted Communist propagandist. Not that I blame you personally. Machiavelli himself could not have guided the Communists in Spain better, with their cross and double cross line. That would explain your contradictory reports, don't you think, Louis?

We will start with your September 3rd, 1938, article: "But the *phenomenon* which haunts the European proletarian movement—the mounting bitterness between Socialists and Communists—has not spared war-torn Spain." (Italics mine—SB)

To you, the fellow travellers and the rest of the Stalinist stooges it must be a "phenomenon." How else can you justify your statements of over a year ago—the purpose of which was to discredit Francisco Largo Caballero and his supporters—that organic unity was just a matter of days or weeks at best. Yes, you did your utmost, following Caballero's forced resignation, to get this idea across. Even though it was plain as the nose on your face and that beret on your head that it was an impossibility, as the entire Socialist rank and file would have revolted and probably united with the Anarchists. Too bad you have to eat your words at this late date.

But you have an explanation for the "phenomenon"—"There are Socialists who accuse the Communists of wishing to monopolize jobs and propaganda." Nothing more than that, Louis? Just jobs and propaganda? Couldn't any of the following have something to do with it? — Communist deal with Prieto to force Caballero out; Communist deal with Negrin and del Vayo to force Prieto out; the extermination of the P.O.U.M.; forcing the Anarchists out of the Catalonia and Central governments; the reign of terror against Proumists, Anarchists and Caballero followers; the terror by the Cheka, the Political Police and the S. I. M. (Military Intelligence Service); smashing of collectives by the Communists; forcing down the throats of the Spanish leadership, policies dictated by the Kremlin more suitable to their own foreign policy than to the needs of the Spanish masses. Just as an afterthought, how is it that you have never once written of the terror, which other correspondents have thought important enough to warrant many dispatches? Just jobs and propaganda?

I see where Prieto is now openly hunting for the Communists. You write "Without Prieto the left republicans would be isolated and reduced in influence." You

remember when the Communists rewarded Prieto for helping remove Caballero by making him the dominant force in the government, Minister of War and Minister of Air and Marine. At that time trumpets and hosannahs hailed the new "Peoples Army," the "offensive Army," in short, "a new deal" under a "Victory Government." The glory was all Prieto's, paralleled with a world-wide campaign — in which you did your part — to slander Caballero and his followers in the Socialist Party, in the U. G. T., and among the anarchists. Now you infer Prieto is an exponent of truce and compromise. Another "phenomenon," Louis?

Your inspired barbs are not restricted to the Republicans and Socialists. "The Anarchists are fighting more ardently at the front and less so in the rear." The meanness of that crack is obvious, but what is fascinating is your nonchalance in saying to one of the most powerful movements of Spain: You do the fighting and dying, boys, just leave the government, the police, the army administration, in our (Communist) hands.

One thing I can't quite understand: Why you are most vicious towards Caballero and his followers? Haven't you told us repeatedly, for almost a year and a half now, that they were through; that they were discredited; that they were without influence. Why then do you devote so much space to them? Why do you use every shoddy trick known to journalism against this "bankrupt group?" You say, "But some of the vocally most militant Socialists are defeatist and therefore forfeit popular support, for whatever past leaders may think, the people and above all the Army, insist on a new, anti-fascist Spain, which alone can guarantee Spanish independence. That is why, today, Negrin and del Vayo are the Republic's natural spokesmen. *They reject compromise.*" Here I must confess that I don't understand you (not much!) Are you trying to say that Caballero, Araquistain, Pasqual Thomas, Baraibar, Carrillo, Carlos Hernandez and the others are for an old, fascist Spain? And when you speak of "Spanish Independence," does that mean independence of Soviet Russia also, as the militant Socialists insist!

However, you reach the height of scurrility when you leave the thought that Caballero and the others are for compromise. When you say that you lie, and all their acts and statements will bear me out.

Haven't you any shame at all? You with your swank apartment in the Mayflower Hotel on Central Park West in New York and your sumptuous place in Moscow. You, slandering Francisco Largo Caballero one of the greatest labor leaders in Spain — six times in prison for his ideals — an only son still a prisoner of the fascists because he wouldn't permit the government to grant the exorbitant demands for his ex-

change, — this man with over fifty years of service, to the working class. Is it any wonder that Luis Aragon — member of the permanent committee of the Cortez and former Ambassador to France, wrote that you "had little respect for the truth when it conflicted with your party interests."

You criticize Caballero and the others, saying they are "defeatists." How short your memory is. Can't you recall that over a year ago Caballero warned that if policies urged by the Communists were pursued "the revolution would be shipwrecked and victory endangered." Take a look at the map of Spain as of May 1937 — when Caballero resigned — and at the present time. The divisive, double-crossing, terrorist policy of your Communist movement is responsible, and not those you slander as "defeatists."

Your campaign to discredit Caballero is not new. When the Communists found he wouldn't take orders they forced his resignation and from that moment on you have used that "impartial" pen of yours to discredit him.

Let us go back along the road you travelled as an "earnest liberal" reporting for the NATION.

After the Anarchist inclusion in the Cabinet in October, 1936, Madrid girded itself, though limited in military equipment, for the siege. Whereas the war up until Caballero's advent into the government had been a succession of defeats in engagements with the rebels, the Loyalists now began to score victories. The stopping of Franco at Madrid, the rout of the Italians in Guadalajara, the long thrusts into Badajoz and Pozoblanco were achieved. Reorganization of the army proceeded and preparations for a protracted war got under way. To be sure, there were some military defeats, for it was during Caballero's regime that Germany and Italy made their heaviest contributions of men and arms to Franco.

Caballero became Premier in September 1936 and was ousted by the Communists in May, 1937. Louis Fischer in a dispatch dated June 25th, 1937, explaining why "the Communists overthrew Caballero," reports as bland statements of fact that "Caballero began to lose his hold on the people when he allowed the enemy to approach a Madrid unprepared for defense. The government's hasty departure to Valencia further lowered his prestige." It is unfortunate that Mr. Fischer cannot erase his own writings, for his dispatch from Madrid dated October 25th, about a month after Caballero began to serve, reads: "Immediate help from the outside can prevent a debacle. Meanwhile, this city is preparing for a siege."

It would have been the worst sort of blunder for the cabinet to risk the whole future of the war on the fate of the capital city. It will be remembered that the American government did precisely the same thing in evacuating Washington during the War of 1812. But

a long list of historical precedents is hardly necessary to rebut the Communist criticism, for since the removal of the government to Valencia, another transfer has taken place. I was in Valencia in October 1937 when Caballero's successors — obviously with less reason — packed up and moved from Valencia to Barcelona. But Louis Fischer has not yet published his comment and announced that the "government's hasty departure from an *unbesieged* city has lowered its prestige." Nevertheless, the Communists continued to denounce Caballero for the cabinet's decision to leave Madrid — despite the fact that the Communist members of the cabinet themselves participated in the decision. Geoffrey Cox, correspondent for the LONDON NEWS CHRONICLE, writes that "the Communists had urged the Government to leave a month earlier." On the other hand, "the Anarchists were for the Government staying in Madrid at all costs," even attempting to turn the officials back on the road to Valencia.

The herculean task performed by Caballero in the beginning of his premiership is impossible to describe. The government was starved for military materials, was lacking a disciplined and well-trained army and yet under Caballero's leadership, Madrid was saved. The Communists have frequently asserted that Caballero was to blame for military defeats, but I leave it to Mr. Fischer's dispatches from Madrid before "the Communists overthrew Caballero," as Mr. Fischer put it frankly, to indicate the facts. I have gathered the following statements from his articles in the NATION, dated during the first three months of Caballero's administration:

"A Madrid daily said on September 29th that 5,000 disciplined fighters could win the war for the government. Certainly they could check the enemy. The government has not got them . . . The Loyalists have been without airplane support for the last fortnight which is the chief reason for the enemy's advance . . . Airplanes bomb, circle, then bomb again with complete impunity, for the government apparently has no fighting planes to drive away these giants . . . The Loyalists suffer from an insufficiency of machine-guns, which Franco has in abundance. If this deficiency can be remedied, fear of the foe's superior armaments will disappear . . ." It was not until December 6th that Mr. Fischer gladdened the world with the news that "the government has lately had placed at its disposal a considerable number of tanks, airplanes . . ." Russia had at last come through, five months after the start of the war and two months after Mr. Fischer himself had asked the question "Will Moscow save Madrid?"

After five months of Caballero's regime, Mr. Fischer wrote: "*The Republican army is considerably improved.*" At the same time he was writing — and

(Continued on Page 18)

THE WORLD YOUTH CONGRESS

by Judah Drob

HISTORY plays funny tricks and no one can be blamed for miscalculating the strength and direction of important forces. So, the American collective securityites cannot be blamed for having chosen, last July, after the Milwaukee American Youth Congress, to invite the Second World Youth Congress to come to the United States. After all, the United States is the strategic point in the plans of those who believe that the imperialist democracies should band together to defeat the fascist powers. Although its National administration is won to the idea of imperialist "collective action" its people are not. Only a small section of its organized workers has agreed to the policy. Therefore, a careful demonstration of the universal acceptance of the idea was very much in order, so that the masses in the United States might be won to American participation in the alliance against some of the fascist powers.

In July, 1937 it seemed as though a very successful demonstration for collective security could be arranged in the United States, since the genuine anti-war elements were unorganized and appeared to be dormant. But in November of 1937 was formed the Youth Committee for the Oxford Pledge, becoming in March of 1938 the Youth Committee Against War (Youth Section of the Keep America Out of War Committee). This powerful committee contained leading student, religious, cooperative, farm and working youth and represented their determination to fight against U. S. participation in another imperialist world war.

The final calculation that was wrong was the belief that the colonial delegates to the Congress, would support collective security. This was probably based on the assumption that the Communist International, which at one time had a virtual monopoly of the leadership of the colonial struggles for national liberation still held sway. But the day of that monopoly has long since passed. Ever since Communists ceased to fight against imperialism and capitalism, the movements for the national liberation of colonial people have been developing outside their influence.

So, the nice plans for a huge, world impressing spectacle of the youth of all the countries, saying with only one voice, "We are for collective security," were voided. There was a large and powerful section of the United States delegation, made up of the organizations that have been collaborating with the Youth Committee Against War, which was unalterably opposed to support of imperialist war under any pretense. Young Socialists played a significant role in that group. There were delegates from colonial and semi-colonial countries, and from central European and Scandinavian

countries who stood firmly against the war policy that the Congress was intended to promote.

The colonial delegates came without exception from countries under the heel of the democratic powers. The dominant imperialisms in the world are the British, United States, French, Dutch and Belgian. As one delegate, from the struggling oil field workers of the island of Trinidad, said, "These imperialist nations have nothing to learn from Hitler and Mussolini." For decades the wealth, the manpower, the vitality, of the colonial peoples have been sapped in order to maintain the huge profits of the finance capitalists of the imperialist countries. To protect these profits the political domination of the imperialist nations was established over the colonials. Sometimes this domination took the form of direct rule and in other cases it was established thru buying or setting up puppet governments. No wonder the colonial people have come to hate their oppressors! No wonder they have built their movements for national liberation! No wonder they rally inspired to the banner of anti-imperialism! And certainly it is no wonder that they refuse to support and fortify the rule of their oppressors by promising support in a war against another group of imperialists. They have nothing to gain by such support and everything to hope for in the defeat of all imperialism. The strategy of struggles for national liberation has always taken into account the embarrassment of the exploiters when they go to war and the possibility of asserting independence at that time.

Representatives from India, from the British West Indian Islands of Trinidad and Barbados, from Puerto Rico, African Gold Coast, Nicaragua and Mexico; people who are carrying on a day to day struggle against imperialism and for the right to self-determination were the leaders in the fight against imperialism and its wars. The political influence of the British Independent Labor Party over delegates from the British colonies was evident.

The delegates from the capitalist nations who were opposed to collective security were convinced that the war they were being asked to support would solve none of the world's problems and would merely create new bases for the recurrence of war and fascism. Whether they were pacifists from Denmark, Norway, Japan or the U. S. or simply people who had come to a clear understanding of the basic causes and results of imperialist wars, or Socialists from the United States, they had this idea in common.

The opposition presented by these delegates at the sessions of the congress proved that the youth of the

world are not unitedly in favor of a new holy war. A ruling kept reporters out of the meetings of commissions where the interesting free-for-all discussions took place and out of the national delegation meetings to which dissension was supposed to be confined. But word soon reached the press that the dull hand-outs of the publicity staff were concealing a really dramatic clash of opinions that made much better news. By this fact the aims and purposes of the Congress were defeated. It was not a mighty and united demonstration for the policies of the League of Nations and the reformist Communists and Socialists.

The collective security forces controlled the machinery of the Congress. And so they could control the press releases. They controlled the chairs of the various sessions. After a series of anti-collective security speeches was delivered they were able to shift the speakers list and to bring all the big guns of collective security into the firing line. When word got to them that a few West Indian and several other colonial delegates were going to present a resolution against collective security they were pushed off the program.

When it became obvious that the Congress could not be unanimous the administration decided that there would be no resolutions other than organizational ones and that the only material that would come out of the Congress would be reports of discussions. This was a major victory for the anti-war forces.

With the typical venom and spleen of thwarted schoolboys the collective security leadership tried to retrieve some of its losses. The report of the discussions of the commission on the political and economic bases of peace was horribly unfair. It was not a report at all, but merely a summary of the ideas of the reporter, which gave almost no recognition to the position presented by a considerable number of delegates. Several delegates, including an Indian and Hamilton of the Y. P. S. L., attacked the report as pro-war and pro-imperialist. But the steamroller roughly shunted them aside.

Then, on the last day came the final desperate attempt to give the Congress a semblance of the tone that was anticipated for it. There had been vague talk of youth peace pacts and a proposal that one be signed at the Congress. In the presiding committee, the night before the final day of the Congress, a draft peace pact was presented and then referred to a committee for final editing. It was never brought to the floor of the Congress for discussion and a large number of the members of the committee, including those who were opposed to collective security, never saw the terms of the pact. The first time that the pact saw the light of publicity was when it was distributed to the press two minutes before it was announced. The International Secretary of the Congress, Betty Shields-Collins announced that the pact would now be signed and called upon all heads of delegations to come to the platform with their

flags. The pact was read while they were being arranged on the platform and being given their instructions on when and where to sign. Some of those who were on the platform did not hear what was read. None was given a copy of the pact. The International Secretary then read off the names of the countries represented, regardless of the views they had expressed, and told them to sign the pact. Most of them did. One delegate, who had declared five minutes before, that he could not sign any declaration for collective security was called upon several times. Yet the pact was obviously for collective security. Article IV reads:

"We agree to bring pressure to bear, whenever the circumstances arise, upon our respective authorities to take the necessary concerted action to prevent aggression and to bring it to an end, to give effective assistance to the victims of treaty violations and aggression and to refrain from participating in any aggression whether in the form of supply of essential war material or of financial assistance."

The leaders of the Congress hoped that by forcing this pact upon the heads of the delegations they could achieve the planned effect. But the means they used were so raw, the pressure and coercion so obvious, that even this last subterfuge was not successful. The press recognized that the pact had been railroaded. It gave full publicity to the statements issued by delegates who attacked the pact and the method whereby it had been introduced.

The Congress was a failure. Even the final stunt had missed fire.

There were two aspects of the conflict within the Congress that were of special interest. The first of these was the conflict within the United States delegation. This delegation, numbering 60, had been selected by the continuations committee set up by the United States delegates to the first World Youth Congress. The committee was overwhelmingly collective security. Nevertheless, in choosing organizations to be represented, it was impossible to avoid certain of the most important groups in the country which were supporters of the Youth Committee Against War. As a result, one quarter of the delegation chosen was opposed to the predominant policy. Chief among them were the following:

National Council of Methodist Youth, Christian Youth Council of North America, Cooperative League, United Automobile Workers of America, The Epworth League of the Methodist church, Disciples of Christ, American Baptist Publication Society, Pilgrim Fellows of the Congregational Church, Youth Committee Against War, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Student Peace Service, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Young People's Socialist League, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of the United States.

It had been the practice at the First World Youth Congress to have a unit rule for each delegation. Thus while there might have been discussions within the delegation, the vote was cast as one vote. The members of the anti-war bloc came to the Congress determined that they would not be bound by such a rule. The discussion within the United States delegation made it clear from the beginning that there were two irreconcilable points of view represented. Before the matter could reach some climax, however, a proposal was made that representatives of each point of view meet to attempt to reach a compromise. The meeting was held with the proposal made that the seven point program of Secretary of State Hull's speech of Aug. 16 be adopted as the basis for a united program of the United States delegation. Sec'y Hull's program of collective action was decisively rejected by the peace bloc. Seven points finally were agreed on representing a program distinctly different from Hull's. Collective security was taken out of these points and what was left was a group of pious and meaningless phrases and hopes. It was made clear that this represented a unity of words but not of purpose and program. Each group then would present its own statement of application of the seven points. It was on this basis that the modified seven points were adopted unanimously.

At once the press machine of the Congress went into action. It proclaimed that the United States delegation had ironed out its differences and had united around Hull's program of collective security. The American Communists and their press began to spread the story that the anti-collective security bloc had folded up and now accepted the principle of collective government action against the fascists. It became necessary for the minority bloc in the U. S. delegation to issue a statement renouncing any such implications and reiterating its continued opposition to imperialist war, no matter what the pretext or slogan under which it might be undertaken. The statement was reprinted in full in many newspapers.

Another conflict took place within the caucus of the members of the Socialist Youth International. The United States Socialists were the only members of the International at the Congress who opposed collective security. There were long discussions in the caucus during which neither group could convince the other. Finally the majority group decided to prepare a statement to be read to the Congress explaining that despite the stand of the Young Socialists of the United States, the official position of the Labor and Socialist International was for collective security. This conflict precipitated a discussion among the members as to the nature of the International.

Like all other working class advocates of collective security these Young Socialists from Europe were so much on the defensive in the face of the fascist menace

that they were willing to drop all struggle for a better world, for a world free of the forces that make war and fascism possible, in favor of a defense of a status quo to which they cling as a lesser evil. And therefore, like all working class advocates of collective security, they are merely playing the game of the victorious Allies, who have won their support in the defense of the gains they made and empires they defended in the Great World War.

When we talked to them of the fight against war and fascism being part of the fight for Socialism they ridiculed us for our "absurd absorption in the distant ideal of Socialism." But we scored heavily when we described the role of the United States as the leading supporter of fascism in Latin America; when we pointed to the fascist plans of the government embodied in the Industrial Mobilization Plan. While asserting that the workers of Germany were simply waiting for Hitler's entrance into war for a revolutionary uprising, they insisted that Hitler could only be defeated by the military strength of the United States, France and England. Strange contradiction, indicative of their lack of faith in the working class! They refused to consider the lessons of the post-war revolutions which were, with but one exception, destroyed by the armies of occupation of the victorious powers.

Though our foreign comrades called us romantic leftists, they could not ignore the strength of the anti-war sentiment in the youth movement of the United States. And so the arguments rained back and forth.

The Congress succeeded admirably in uniting and strengthening the solidarity of the forces that are opposed to imperialism and imperialist war. Both within the U. S. delegation and outside it, there was built up realization of the significance of the fight that must be waged against imperialism and war, a determination to carry on the fight with more vigor than ever before, and a tremendous encouragement in the thought that the fight crosses all national boundaries.

The Congress made it possible for the supporters of the YOUTH COMMITTEE AGAINST WAR to begin applying in practice point 8 of their program: *"We find our internationalism not in military alliances but in basic world economic and political readjustments, paving the way toward a warless world. Realizing the culpability of all nations, we urge independent action of the world labor movement, together with all groups who oppose war, across national lines in a common opposition to war and militarism."*

For the supporters of collective security the Congress was a resounding failure. For the opponents of imperialism and war the Congress represents an impressive milestone in the world-wide unity of those forces that alone can build a world of freedom, peace and justice.

TRADE UNIONS AND REVOLUTION

by Luis Araquistain

[EDITOR'S NOTE: *At a time when the four powers of Western Europe are seeking a "settlement" of the Spanish War, as they found a "settlement" to the Czechoslovakian crisis, when the food problem of Loyalist Spain endangers the ability of the Spanish workers to continue resistance indefinitely, discussion of the basic nature of the Spanish struggle is very much in order. The REVIEW publishes this stimulating analysis by Spain's leading socialist thinker because it contains a profound lesson for all working-class movements throughout the world. It is, in essence, a challenge to all socialist parties. Comrade Araquistain prefaces his article with the following remarks:*

"This work was written more than a year ago when the CNT (anarcho-syndicalist trade union federation), after the crisis of May 1937, was not participating in the Government. Its principal purpose was to urge that the trade unions, of whom so much has been asked and is still being asked, be admitted to partake in the responsibilities and initiative of the Government, with the same rights and the same duties as other organizations. Various circumstances have caused this work to remain unpublished, and if I now publish it, notwithstanding the readmission of the C.N.T. into the Government, thus rectifying one of the motives of the crisis of May 1937, it is because the doctrines here expounded are still relevant, in spite of the appearances with which a momentary truce of silence covers them."]

WHAT is the historical mission of the trade unions? Should they be apolitical and merely economic organizations? Should they be, on the contrary, political organizations, but subordinate to the parties, or politically independent institutions, having the right to participate through their own representatives in the direction of the organs of the state?

It is not a question, at this time in Spain, of an abstract problem, but rather one of the most concrete problems which the war and the revolution have placed before us and which, according to its solution one way or another, will augment or diminish the possibilities of winning the war and safeguarding the revolution.

The positions of existing groups are as follows: the Republican parties, faithful to the conception of a traditional parliamentary regime, oppose in principle participation in the government of the country by trade union organizations which are not directly represented in Parliament. Nevertheless, it has not been rare that men who did not represent any party, who did not even have parliamentary rank, participated in the government in their capacity as technicians. If this was possible in cases of individuals, how can the same right be denied to the largest trade union organizations in the country? Rather, it is a question, it appears, of a class prejudice opposing the growth of the political power of another class, or of a constitutional prejudice opposing change in the form of government.

Some Socialists are opposed to the participation of the two large central trade unions, the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. in the government. (Circumstances obliged them to accept the collaboration of the C.N.T. in the Caballero Government, September 1936, and in the present government. But their ideas remained unchanged. One has but to read the official press on these matters.) The basis of this attitude is that the function of the trade unions is to produce, not to govern, because they lack the specific ability for it. The U.G.T., it is argued, is already represented in the government by the Socialist Party. In the case of the C.N.T., those who might enter the government in its name, as those who did so in November 1936, presumably would not fully represent the C.N.T. because of the non-political character and indiscipline of its masses. We leave aside for the moment the specious and legalistic argument of some socialists and republicans that the presence of anarcho-syndicalists in the government diminishes international sympathies.

In the meeting of Parliament after the crisis of May, the communists declared themselves in favor of allowing the C. N. T. entrance into the government, but not the U. G. T., which, it seems, considers itself represented in Parliament by the Socialist and Communist Parties. This attitude of the communists is, however, no more than a momentary tactic to attract and conciliate the C. N. T. and not a matter of principle. At least it was not established on the basis of principles. In principle, the communists, like some socialists, think that the workers parties, whatever may be their ideological tendencies, should always be the political directors and representatives of the unions.

The Marxist Thesis.

Let us examine this last thesis. Should the traditional so-called workers parties *always*, in all historical circumstances, be the political directors and representatives of the unions, without the latter having the right to take part directly in the organs of the State? It is said that Marxism insists on this. Whoever does not wish to be considered an anti-Marxist has to accept this supposed dogma. Let us, then, take a look at what Marx and Engels wrote concerning the matter. We shall find it compiled in an innocent book entitled "Marx and the Trade Unions," by A. Losovski, 100% Marxist-Leninist when he wrote it.

Neither Marx nor Engels wrote a special treatise on the subject of the origins and the functions of unions, but their opinions concerning such organizations are scattered in many of their most important works, in various resolutions voted by the congresses of the First

International, in lectures and discussions and in much of their private correspondence. Because of this, the form of the doctrine is fragmentary and not unified, but the theory as a whole is complete. The following are the stages of trade union and political organization, according to this theory.

Unions are born with this first purpose: to prevent competition between unorganized workers and to form a united resistance to the common enemy capitalism. But the simple creation of unions bears within it the germ of an enormous revolutionary force. "The unions," says a resolution drawn up by Marx and approved by the 1866 Congress of the First International, "without being conscious of it, have been converted into organizational centers of the working class, just as the municipalities and communes of the Middle Ages were converted by the bourgeoisie."

A curious and happy comparison is this of Marx: the unions are a working class revolutionary center just as the medieval municipalities were for the rising bourgeois class. Today we would say that they are the natural organs of power of the revolutionary proletariat. Marx does not think of soviets nor of anything that approaches them, but of unions as typical organs of the proletariat. The soviets are a specific Russian phenomenon for the simple reason that the industrial backwardness of Russia and, above all, the Czarist despotism had not permitted a flourishing trade union movement as in western Europe. For this reason it has always seemed to us utopian to seek to transplant the soviet system to countries with large trade union movements. So it would have seemed to Marx himself. (When in the revolutions of the 19th century there were not yet great trade union organizations in Spain, the popular organs of power in those crises were the revolutionary juntas, the early Spanish equivalent of the Russian soviets).

Marx goes on: "If unions are indispensable for the daily struggles between capital and labor, they are even more important inasmuch as they are the organized instruments for accelerating the abolition of the wage system itself." But, what does the abolition of the wage system mean? It means, simply, the social revolution. That is to say, in the last analysis, the function of trade unions is to abolish capitalism. Marx considers this "the great historical mission" and with reason. He also considers unions "the school for socialism." How do they who under-rate the great historical role of the unions pretend to base themselves on Marx? Of course, their Marxism, in this respect — perhaps in many others — is not that of Marx.

But not all unions are in the beginning conscious of this great historical function, because the majority of the workers are not class conscious. Some therefore dissociate themselves disdainfully from all political action, thinking that the function of unions is merely economic, as if the economic struggle — another dis-

covery of Marx — were not converted into a political struggle. Others move as satellites in the orbit of the bourgeois parties: "appendages of the Liberal Party" as Engels says of the English trade unions after 1848. As if this were not enough, a considerable portion of the most revolutionary proletariat under the influence of the doctrines of Proudhon and Bakunin separates itself from parliamentarianism and in general from all politics of the State.

In order to counteract these effects, it is necessary that the vanguard of the proletariat, that nucleus which is most conscious of the historical process constitute itself into an independent working class party; this is the second stage. A revolutionary theory of the proletariat is necessary; which Marx and Engels had already elaborated and which required an organ of expression and propagation; for this the First International was formed in 1864. The dominant element of this doctrine is Marxism: an exhortation to abandon political neutrality, anarchist apoliticism, and the naive illusion of Lasalle that capitalism can be transformed into socialism through the economic collaboration of the State with the unions. It renounces all fanciful utopianism, petty-bourgeois or semi-religious. It affirms the historical fact of the class struggle. It condemns all policies of class collaboration. It proclaims that only by violence will the proletariat conquer political power, after constituting itself into an independent class. But it was a doctrine too advanced for the elements which composed the First International, and the latter disintegrated rapidly. The International Workingmen's Association did not succeed in creating the political parties which, according to the Marxist theory, were supposed to convert the unions into organs of the proletarian revolution, just as the communes were organs of the bourgeois revolution, and it was dissolved because, according to the laws of Marxism itself, it was premature. But historically it was not sterile, because what it taught concerning the functions of political parties and trade unions in the proletarian revolution remains for all time.

Then Socialist Parties began to be organized in every country. Almost all were Marxist in name, and almost all were also reformist and anti-Marxist in fact. They directed the trade unions; not, however, toward revolution, but toward class collaboration. It was the great epoch of European and American capitalism. Its monopoly of the world market tended to make the trade unions and the political parties bourgeois, as Engels confesses in the letters he wrote to Bernstein in 1878, to Kautsky in 1882, and to Bebel in 1883. "Here (in England)," he writes to Kautsky, "there exists no working-class party, only a conservative party and a liberal-radical party, and the workers receive their scraps thanks to the English monopoly in the world market and in the colonies.

(Continued next month)

BALABANOFF

(Continued from Page 8)

those he is in a position to threaten, Mussolini is weak in the face of a threat against himself.

A mere few weeks ago the man in the street was wont to offer as his clinching argument against the possibility of an anti-Semitic turn in Italy the fact that many of Mussolini's friends and benefactors were Jews. Among the Fascist Government's financial backers was a renegade as prominent among American Jews as the late Otto H. Kahn, banker, art patron and philanthropist. Mussolini's most trusted Minister of Finance was Count Volpi, a Jew. Another Jew in the same post was Jung.

Indeed, Jews figured prominently even among the "Fascists of the First Hour" — that is, among those who presumably took part in the early gangsterism whereby the enemies of Fascism were eliminated. Since there was no discrimination among Fascists, as among all Italians, between Jews and non-Jews, many a Fascist of the anti-Semitic era now dawning would be startled to hear that such-and-such a "founding father" of Fascism was a Jew. A member of the Government in pre-Fascist Italy, Signor Shanzer, for example, remained a Minister of State under Mussolini. And it is no secret that among Mussolini's closest collaborators and most trusted advisors is the Jew Olivetti, the originator of the so-called Corporative State and Secretary of the Fascist Confederation of Industry. 174 among the university professors are Jews. So is Signor Del Vecchio, the first Fascist Dean of the University of Rome. Many members of the Senate (appointed by the King of Italy) are Jews and so are quite a few leading figures in the Army and Navy.

One of the most intimate friends of Benito Mussolini in his pre-Fascist and early Fascist era was a certain Signora Sarfatti, author of his earliest official biography. His first foreign biographer was also a Jew, the German writer Emil Ludwig.

No less naive than the surprise of those who expected Italian Fascism to be immune from anti-Semitism, is the assumption that the Vatican and the Pope would oppose seriously these newfangled "racial theories" of Fascism in Italy which have suddenly been propounded by a group of more or less anonymous professors of Italian universities at the dictation of the Fascist-Nazi alliance. Whatever may be the Pope's reasons for disapproving the new persecution of the Jews, these reasons are secondary to the motives behind the relationship between the Vatican and the Italian State. Mussolini the atheist had attained a concordat with the Vatican, something which neither Liberal nor Catholic governments had been able to attain. That has been possible because of the identity of their purposes: the enslavement of the masses and the lack of principle on both sides. The violent and vulgar

SAM BARON

(Continued from page 12)

this, after Caballero is supposed to have lost favor because of the removal of the government to Valencia — "The government's greatest element of strength is the hearty support of the population".

Thus the reasons assigned by the Communist spokesman for the downfall of the Caballero cabinet are exploded by Louis Fischer's own statements. Only once did Mr. Fischer even hint at the truth, and that was when he wrote cryptically: "His (Caballero's) relationship to Russia wavered." The truth is that Russia's relationship to Caballero had wavered, and it was for that reason — not for any alleged incompetence — that Caballero was ousted. The premier was removed, not by the presidential palace, in Valencia, not by the will of the Spanish masses, but by the Kremlin in Moscow.

Now, you might wonder why I went to all this trouble. I will tell you. I think it is about time the NATION did one of two things. Either throw you out for your evident bias and your services to the Communists *while posing as a fair and impartial reporter* or state above your articles "*By Louis Fischer, a Communist Propagandist.*"

Sincerely,

SAM BARON.

atheist Mussolini is ready to support the one institution he had despised and abhorred most in the world, so long as it aids him in maintaining his standing stranglehold on the Italian people. On the other hand, the Pope deemed it a good bargain to add the Fascist physical terrorism to the moral spiritual oppression, by the Catholic Church. The complicity created by this, culminating in the Lateran accord, has tied the Pope and Il Duce so closely together that neither of them can seriously fight the other.

It would therefore be utterly naive to expect serious aid from the Pope on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Italy. Only those who have a very bad memory can do so. A mere seven years ago, at the very beginning of the reconciliation between the Vatican and the Italian State, a deep conflict arose between the Pope on the one side and Mussolini on the other, both of whom claimed the exclusive right to educate Italy's young generation. A compromise was found. So it will be this time too. Whatever may temporarily divide the Vatican and the Fascist Government, the conservative character of both those institutions overshadows their differences. There can be no insurmountable difference between them in practical matters.

As for anti-Semitism, that will endure so long as Mussolini requires it, or until the people of Italy repudiate it along with all the other political perversions that constitute the Fascist system.

JAMES LOEB

(Continued from Page 10)

tionary in their conception of the methods of struggle to be followed. Both Pivert and Zyromski laid stress upon mass action on the part of the workers, including all forms of direct action, while the leadership of the Party fell increasingly into the rut of parliamentary and diplomatic procedures. There remained in the Socialist Party the ever-present "danger" that the two left groups would some day find a way of re-uniting their forces and overthrow the reformist leadership of the Party.

Paul Faure, who, even more than Leon Blum, is the organizational leader of the Socialist Party, saw that "danger" in very concrete terms at the time of the January 17th vote. It was the considered opinion of many socialists that Paul Faure planned and executed the split in the Socialist Party which was finally consummated at the Royan Congress in the first days of June. The events leading up to that split can be briefly summarized. When the second Blum Cabinet was about to be ousted by the reactionary Senate, Marceau Pivert, as leader of the Paris Federation of the Party, called a demonstration before the Palais du Luxembourg where the Senate sits. In doing so, he defied the orders of the Minister of the Interior, Marx Dormoy, who represents the extreme right in the French Socialist Party. When the National Council of the Party, after the fall of the Blum Cabinet, approved Blum's proposal for a national union Cabinet, Pivert issued a manifesto entitled "Alerte au Parti," in the form of a letter to the Socialist Federations throughout France. This he did, not in his own name, but in the name of the Paris Federation. Paul Faure, forgetting for the moment that he had committed an identical breach of discipline himself in his younger revolutionary days at the outbreak of the World War, revoked the charter of the Paris Federation and set up a new organization under the leadership of Pivert's brother, Charles, who in no way shares Marceau's political convictions.

The action of Faure and of the C.A.P. (the Permanent Administrative Committee, which is the ruling committee of the Party) came up for final approval before the Royan Congress. Pivert could have remained within the Party if he had been willing to accept the suspension placed upon him by the C.A.P., a suspension which made him ineligible to hold office in the Party or speak in the name of the Party for a period of several years. At the Congress, the Revolutionary Left, led by Lucien Herard, insisted on considering the problem on a political basis. The Party, he said, must decide its position on the question of the "union sacrée", under whatever guise it might be proposed. The Party leadership, on the other hand, insisted that the problem before the Congress was one of Party discipline.

(Concluded Next Issue)

OTTO BAUER

(The speech delivered by the representative of the Revolutionary Socialists of Austria at the funeral services for Otto Bauer.)

IN the foreword of his last great work, "Between Two World Wars," Otto Bauer wrote:

"I dedicate this book to my young friends, the Revolutionary Socialists of Austria."

In their name, in the name of Otto Bauer's former pupils and closest Comrades-in-arms during the years of illegal work, in the name of the Revolutionary Socialists of Austria, I want to tell what his work has meant to Austrian and to International Socialism.

In the same book, Bauer wrote:

"It is not the duty of us, of the older generation . . . to lead the young movement; youth must decide its own goals, choose its own methods, determine its own policy and ideology . . . It is our responsibility to pass on to it the experience, the knowledge and the values that we have gained in our own time, in our work and in our battles."

These few sentences express the purpose to which Otto Bauer devoted his last four years of work. Thought and action crown the magnificent achievements of his whole life. To the accomplishments of his youth, the political and theoretical work of his ripe manhood, he added, after 1934, a new and a unique accomplishment. This last accomplishment has served to raise him above the working-class leaders of his generation. It shows the true greatness and the moral height of his personality.

This last and final chapter of Otto Bauer's life is the story of his relation to the new movement, his attitude towards the Revolutionary Socialists of Austria. It is the story of his attitude towards the cause of revolutionary Socialism, and his relation to a generation which he himself once called the generation that would succeed.

Otto Bauer's attitude toward revolutionary Socialism grew out of his historical position in the Labor Movement. His own independent theoretical work developed from the theses of Marx and Engels. With that basis, he was not satisfied, during the period when the mass Social Democratic parties were turning away from Revolutionary Socialism, merely to retain the radical Marxist phraseology. He was not content with merely paying lip service to the revolutionary content of theoretical Marxism as the fundamental force in the democratic mass movement. Otto Bauer had his own strategic conception, based on the principle of the inevitability of a revolutionary conflict with the capitalists. Otto Bauer stood between the generation of working-class leaders, who, drunk with their reformist successes, had given up the revolution and the new revolutionary Socialist forces, who after Fascism's brutal victory have become the real basis for the new movement. With his own hands he built the bridge which crossed from one generation to another, from one epoch of the Labor Movement to another, from the past to the future, from reformism to revolution, from the illusory victories of the workers, beyond their defeats, to the final victory.

During his whole life, Otto Bauer recognized that Socialist ideology had to be renewed by a new generation within the broad masses of the party and in the party leadership; that it had to be carried towards fulfillment by the youth, advancing

beyond the victories already achieved. That was why, even within the old party, he devoted his greatest attention to the training of the young people. He was not only a friendly instructor, a masterful teacher, an unequalled example in his tireless work for the cause of the proletariat. But also, with his untold human devotion and objectiveness, rare in an older generation of political leaders, he was able, in dealing with the young people, to relinquish the privilege of the last word, and to recognize the right of a new generation of leaders to make its own decisions. When the responsibility for the reconstruction and the leadership of the Austrian Socialist movement fell to the young people, in whose mental training he had had such decisive influence, Otto Bauer did not stand in their way; rather he smoothed the way for them. When we used to go over the frontier to him in exile, we found him our truest advisor, our most effective spokesman, and our most eager defender against those who were fighting for the political ideas of the past.

It was in this way that Otto Bauer, as a man and as a political leader, raised himself above his own work, and above the colleagues of his own generation. No one approximates his stature in this respect. At a time when others of his generation were decisively defeated, he was strong enough to take on a new political role. It was his unique and unfailing intelligence which made that possible. Because of it he, the theoretician of Austrian Marxism, and author of strategic and ideological theories of an entirely different period, was able once again under new circumstances to analyze and comprehend the objective conditions essential for Socialist victory. In this work Otto Bauer showed that proletarian revolution has not vanished from the order of the day, but rather that history is hastening at an unprecedented tempo towards this, the only solution of the human and social problems which have become insoluble in any other way.

But above all he understood that the new Labor Movement under Fascism needed a new leadership. For Austrian Socialists, his death is the most tragic confirmation of the correctness of his point of view. But he gained a victory, even beyond his own death, by his attitude towards the Revolutionary Socialists, through the development of the new leadership among them which he encouraged, so that even that senseless and sudden death could not completely betray our party.

Otto Bauer was our greatest and our best friend. He used the mental heritage of the past, which belonged to him more than to any other living Socialist, because of his great personal talents, in the service of the future, in the service of the Revolutionary Socialists. That was his greatest achievement. Though many of his works may be forgotten in the future, that can never be.

Because of this accomplishment, we honor our dead comrade. My words are too feeble to express the feelings, the gratitude, the admiration and the proletarian loyalty with which we are filled at this time. But perhaps those whom the terrible blow which we have suffered may cause to waver will find consolation in this thought: some day the Austrian workers, who loved Otto Bauer, will decorate their homes and their workshops in honor of the man who devoted his life to give them liberty.

The German Socialist revolution must be powerful and creative if it is to carry the people of Europe to those heights which Otto Bauer visualized.

It must be as powerful as his own accomplishments, as creative as his mind and as eloquent as his words.

Otto Bauer put his whole hope for the future, for the realization of his life's work, in us, the Revolutionary Social-

ists. That is why this day, on which we stand in the shadow of grief, must be the eve of a new day of battle tomorrow.

We, comrades, mourners and fellow fighters from all countries, we are and we must be what Otto Bauer called us, the generation that will succeed.

BOOKS

"My Life as a Rebel", by Angelica Balabanoff. 324 pages. New York, Harper & Bros. \$3.75.

There is danger that America may come to think of Angelica Balabanoff as the "woman who knew Mussolini". She is, of course, much more than that. In fact, she is so much more that the accident of her acquaintance with the little pseudo-Caesar fades into insignificance alongside the record of her service to civilization.

Comrade Balabanoff's book, "My Life as a Rebel", is not only an autobiography. It is the history of an epoch. Much that has been lost, if only for a time, let us hope, much of the *elan*, of the youthful hopefulness characteristic of the days when she was young has gone from us. Where, until 1914, she fought in the forefront of a movement that was daily advancing from victory to greater victory, we are waging a rearguard action now, trying to salvage the remnants of our strength from the oncoming wave of the counter-revolution.

Balabanoff saw revolutionary activity virtually in every country in Europe. Her book contains valuable material bearing on the movement in Belgium and in Germany; in Switzerland and in Italy. Even in her formative years she was impressed by the difference between the German pedagogic attitude, and the friendliness manifest between teacher and pupil in Belgium.

It was in Italy, which she calls her "second native land", that she really found her proper sphere of activity. Here she identified herself with the women's movement, with the movement against clerical obscurantism, with the peace movement, and with the struggle for better living conditions for the workers. She did not, however, lose sight of the need for a complete revolution. She was never one of those who saw the program of work-a-day reforms as the aim of Socialism itself. To her own surprise she developed a skill and power in speaking that brought her to the forefront of the movement. She early had developed a skill in the mastery of languages. This, with her marked literary ability, and her growing mastery of the Socialist philosophy, led her into journalism. She became one of the editors of "Avanti".

It is natural that the portion of her book that deals with her Italian experiences should also include a detailed sketch of Mussolini. This is a story many times re-told by herself, by George Seldes, by Sanders Megaro. It is not an heroic Mussolini that emerges from these pages. She portrays an hysterical, self-pitying weakling; a hypochondriac and a coward. She gives us a picture that strikes the reader as completely authentic of a man shouting to keep up his courage. In the light of her story, the myth of a strong Mussolini vanishes beyond resurrection, and what is left is a wretched, puling thing. Some will say that this cannot be possible; that no weakling could have risen to such power as the Duce has. It is entirely credible to me, as it will be to all who know how a publicity campaign works. Even a yellow dog can be made to look like a blue ribbon-winner by an expert public relations counsel.

To Comrade Balabanoff, as to many others, the present plight of the Socialist movement is the outcome of the

SOCIALIST REVIEW

betrayal of Socialism by the Socialist Parties during the war. The failure of the German Social Democracy to fight for its principles in 1914 leads logically to the victory of Hitler and of Mussolini. It may yet lead further into the abyss. The murder of Jaures and the consequent acceptance of the war by the French and English Socialists were disastrous.

Yet even in the midst of the war and betrayal Balabanoff did not give up the struggle. She was one of the prime movers in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences. Lest this mean nothing to a post-war generation of readers, let me point out that these were meetings of left wing Socialists from all the warring countries, whose purpose was to bring the war to an end by rousing working class opposition to the imperialist war. Zimmerwald and Kienthal are in Switzerland. Only in Switzerland were such meetings possible. Balabanoff's linguistic ability made her the logical choice for secretary of the conference. This made her the pivotal point of the international revolutionary movement. In a sense the Zimmerwaldists, after the almost pathetic incident of the Stockholm conference, were the transition between the Second and Third Internationals.

The Bolshevik Revolution of October, 1917, found Balabanoff in Sweden. To use her own words: "With the triumph of the second Russian Revolution the work of the Zimmerwald movement was not only changed, but enormously augmented." A hitherto negligible group of "cranks" had suddenly become a powerful factor in world affairs.

Yet the Russian Revolution, upon which she, with so many more, had built their hopes, proved an even greater disappointment than any that had so far befallen her. She had pictured the Revolution as the victory of the workers. Direct experience with the Soviet leaders, as their representative in Sweden, as secretary of the Third International, and as a citizen of the Soviet Union, soon convinced her that the workers had gained a merely formal victory. Everything in Soviet Russia was done in the name of the workers, *but not by the workers*. Her spirit rebelled at being asked to subsidize Swedish papers so that they might support the Soviets. She was horrified at the work of the *agents provocateurs* who trapped entirely well-meaning workers in their toils; and more horrified to discover that Lenin looked upon her as "soft" when she protested against these measures. She was revolted at the tactics of character assassination that Zinovieff used against Serrati. In a word she had thought of the revolution as the victory of decency and humanity. Now it was turning into a victory for chicanery and evil. And what was demanded of her was "complicity" in deeds that she looked upon as crimes against the workers.

It was difficult for her to break with the Soviets. But to Balabanoff personal integrity is far more important than party regularity. She refused to serve where she no longer had faith. She left Russia, and has since been in France and the United States, active still in defense of the victims of fascist tyranny; active still in trying to reconstruct the movement that the war and post-war developments have so badly injured.

In this brief account of her book I have refrained from detailed discussion of her opinions of Lenin, Trotsky and Zinoviev. I have not dwelt on her acquaintance with John Reed, who confided to her before his tragic death, his deep disillusionment with the course of the Russian Revolution.

This book should be read by every Socialist, especially by those who still have a hankering for united fronts with the Communist Party. It should be read by all students of our times. They will find in it correctives for many an "official version" of the events. It should be read by every person who respects integrity. This is an important book.

DAVID P. BERENBERG

GERMAN WORKERS VS. HITLER

"The Underground Struggle in Germany", by Evelyn Lend.
64 pp. New York, League for Industrial Democracy. 25c.

The pamphlet just issued by the League for Industrial Democracy dealing with the underground movement in Germany is extremely timely. It is the answer to all those who insist that the only way to fight Hitler is with England's armies. Perhaps it is for this reason that the Communists are carrying on a campaign against the pamphlet as "exposing" the underground movement. Of course the severe criticism of the Communist policies in Germany is an additional reason, but even the Communists can hardly defend their policies of the years just before and just after Hitler came to power, when not fascism, but social-democracy was considered the main enemy of the workers. Of course it is not necessary to refute the first charge. This pamphlet not only does not "expose" anything of the underground which must remain hidden, but it will serve as an inspiration to thousands who will rally to the underground movement with real material assistance.

The pamphlet describes the steady growth and development of a cohesive underground movement in Nazi Germany the last two years, stimulated by the difficulties and dangers inside the country. In addition, several pages are devoted to verbatim reports from one of the active groups which, since 1933, has worked to develop an illegal technique in order to cope with the extremely efficient and methodical procedure of the enemy. The author stresses particularly the following recent developments in the movement:

1. The traditional antagonisms inherited from pre-Hitler Germany have been largely subordinated by the common bond of suffering and persecution in five years of Hitlerian terror.

2. Organizationally, the underground groups have made headway in developing technique of communication between various localities and between the German center and the center abroad.

3. "A stricter application of more carefully considered principles in selecting the individual collaborators," is being followed.

4. Greater protection is being given to individual anti-Nazi workers. For instance, Miss Lend reports that literature is no longer distributed to all and sundry, "a policy which has proved to be so suicidal that the possible good effects could never outweigh the inevitable loss of countless valuable and irreplaceable members."

5. A growth of leadership on the part of younger men and women who in 1933 were in no way outstanding figures is marked. Miss Lend declares: "... years of Fascist oppression have been a unique school both for character and ability, developing all the qualities which distinguish a true leader—courage without foolhardiness, independent judgment, consciousness of responsibility, the power to face up to reality, energy, and initiative." (page 59.)

Aided by these hopeful developments, illegal German organization today faces a two fold task of large proportions which, according to Miss Lend, shapes up as follows:

"To coordinate the still independent work of the numerous groups as well as the spontaneous labor resistance where it arises; and,

To develop a determined and capable leadership which through this work of coordination will win the confidence of the anti-Fascist workers."

HERBERT ZAM

A poet in Five Languages
ANGELICA BALABANOFF

is not only a brilliant author, as her book "My Life As a Rebel" attests,
she is also a brilliant poet.

"TO THE AUSTRIAN WORKERS"

on the occasion of the courageous fight against
Dollfuss and fascism was written

IN FIVE LANGUAGES

ENGLISH FRENCH ITALIAN RUSSIAN GERMAN

The book containing this remarkable work cannot be bought.

It is not for sale.

BUT

The SOCIALIST REVIEW

will give one copy, absolutely free, with each full subscription
to the SOCIALIST REVIEW.

AND

each copy will be personally AUTOGRAPHED
by COMRADE BALABANOFF.

This offer good for limited time only.

ACT NOW!

Send \$1.50 for full subscription to Socialist Review and
receive this RARE GIFT free.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

301 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.