

SOCIALIST REVIEW •

Vol. 6 - - - No. 10

March - April, 1939

15 cents

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

NORMAN THOMAS

Dangerous Illusions About the Next War

1 1 1

U. S., Latin America and Fascism

Democracy or Trade?

S. FANNY SIMON

Bourgeois and Revolutionary Morals

The Relation of Ends and Means

LISTON M. OAK

The Essence of Fascism

Its Rise and Character

OTTO BAUER

Imperialism In Europe

Is it different from Imperialism Elsewhere?

J. F. HORRABIN

Hitler vs. Western Civilization

A Book Review

DAVID P. BERENBERG

Mussolini's Past and Present

A Book Review

ANGELICA BALABANOFF

SOCIALIST REVIEW,

New Address

Phone CH. 2-9266

114 W. 14th St.

New York, N. Y.

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.

SEND
MAY DAY GREETINGS
to the
SOCIALIST REVIEW
and help make it a MONTHLY.

All greetings received up to April 25 will be printed in the
MAY DAY ISSUE

Send in Greetings

Order a Bundle

- S u b s c r i b e -

SOCIALIST REVIEW

114 WEST 14th STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y.

SOCIALIST REVIEW: Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.
Published Bi-Monthly at 114 West 14th 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.

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

MARCH-APRIL, 1939

NUMBER TEN

Dangerous Illusions About the Next War

by Norman Thomas

SOCIALISM, as a movement, by its very nature has been opposed to international war. Its theory of the state as largely the tool of the dominant class; its analysis of the economic reasons behind imperialism and imperialist war; its faith, backed by historic proof, that it is always the workers who pay most and get least out of war—these things are too familiar to readers of the *Review* to need repetition.

Nevertheless, not only among workers generally, but among the majority of Socialists, nationalism in emergencies has proved stronger than any effective faith in the international solidarity of the working class. With whatever compunction, most European Socialists supported their governments in the First World War; today many Socialist Parties and the entire Stalinist movement appear virtually as pioneers for war, propagandists for its coming.

In the case of the Communists we have the answer. Stalin, and hence the Third International, believes that American participation in world war would necessarily be on terms helpful to the U.S.S.R. Hence the profound departure from the Leninist position on war. The Communist Party will remain among the chief war mongers unless or until Hitler and Stalin should come to such an agreement as might logically serve the interests of both of these practitioners of the art of *real politik*. (Such an understanding between the dictators for personal and psychological reasons seems to me to be possible rather than probable. Stalin's speech to the Russian Communist Party Congress looked a little like a bid for an understanding, but Hitler's occupation of Czechoslovakia makes it seem less likely.)

In the case of many Socialists it is easy to understand their position as supporters of one more necessary war, and even to sympathize with it emotionally. Their stand is not to be explained in terms of "betrayal" or of wickedness of leaders. It arises from the objective situation. Workers may have "nothing to lose but their chains,"

but there is an enormous difference in chains. French, British, Scandinavian and American workers have much reason to prefer what they have to the yoke their Italian and German brethren wear.

Besides, workers have more than chains. They have an interest in the security of their homes against foreign attack. They have, moreover, an emotion of patriotism, hitherto, except in moments of complete despair arising from defeat in war, stronger than any aggressive revolutionary ardor.

International Socialism broke down, as a barrier against war, in 1914, when there was a strong German movement. Today, that movement has been crushed, and the appeal to the masses of German workers for common action against war is so much the harder. But men who over-emphasize the difference between 1939 and 1914 forget that, while the present situation is unquestionably worse than at the beginning of the World War, it is the direct consequence of the complete military victory of those democratic powers which we are again urged to support. These powers defeated the Kaiser in Germany, and the world got Hitler! They may defeat Hitler in a new war, and then what devil from a deeper pit of hell than Dante ever explored, may we expect to curse mankind?

One has only to read the recent statements on war and democracy issued by European Socialist Parties to realize how generally they are trying to give as orthodox a Socialist dress as possible to a body of opinion based on what is essentially a national interest—for example, the desire of the Scandinavian countries to protect themselves by neutrality; of the French and English to avoid war, but still to present a bold front against Hitler and Mussolini, not for democracy, but for the preservation of their own territories.

Under these circumstances, in this kind of world, American Socialists are under no moral or Marxian compulsion to ask their countrymen to forego the ad-

vantages which this nation's historical and geographical position give it, and to seek to use its capitalist government in a vain attempt to win out of totalitarian war, not totalitarianism, but democracy.

It is true that a purely negative or literally isolationist point of view concerning America's duty is not Socialism. We must seek to make it abundantly clear that if we reject the possibility of a collective security of capitalist nations for democracy, we all the more eagerly embrace the necessity of developing the kind of collective security which only the growth of genuine international solidarity of the workers can create. We must be on the alert to find every opportunity to aid our friends in other lands who seek peace and democracy, whether by legal or underground activity. At home we must use whatever influence we can exert to restore America's glory as a land of asylum for the oppressed, and to plan for a decent treatment of those refugees who may be received. We must exert all possible political pressure on the government to make it ready for that conference or those conferences which will deal with disarmament and the redress of those international economic grievances, the exploitation of which has so greatly helped the dictators in winning support from their people. To do this is something very different from bribing the dictators with colonies or other people's territory.

These things can only be done successfully if America is kept out of war. American participation in war would aid in the defeat of particular dictatorships: the Japanese militarists, Hitler and Mussolini, just as American participation in the first World War aided in the defeat of Prussian imperialism. But just as the victory of 1918 accentuated, rather than removed, the basic causes of imperialism and dictatorships, so would victory in a new world war. The participants would be capitalist states. The division would be between the nations of the House of Have and the nations of the House of Have-Not. The method would be the terrible method of war. The result, if it were not merely chaos and dark night, would be the triumph of powers which would no more make a good peace than they made a good peace in 1918. Imagine the kind of Americans who would come to the top in war settling the age-old problems of the Far East! What they would do, unless our nation was too exhausted, would be to substitute Western for Japanese imperialism. Better far that the masses in China, with the ultimate help of their brothers in Japan, should work out their own problems!

We are not indifferent to the fate of Europe when we say that Europe cannot be saved by the American government's participation in war. War is no cure for the desperate disorganization of Europe; its division into crowded countries, most of them lacking an adequate economic basis for any vigorous life, and many of them beset by the existence within them of irreconcilable

groups whose affections lie outside the border of the lands in which they live. This disorganization of Europe has been perpetuated from generation to generation by an unalterable British policy. That policy has not been changed until today, and no war fought in alliance with the imperial British government will change it. Only the people themselves concerned, the European workers with hand and brain, in town and country, who at last recognize the necessity for a United States of Europe can save that continent.* The creation of such a United States of Europe will require the action of a brotherhood of workers across national lines in a struggle for emancipation, not from the exploitation of one particular nation, but from the exploitation of an owning class and the tyranny of rival military states. I do not deny that internal conditions in Great Britain and France are greatly to be preferred to the conditions in the fascist countries, but Great Britain and France are empires whose victory will be the victory of their imperialism and not of democracy. Not through their triumph will Europe be saved.

This position of ours will become clearer if we consider some of the illusions which have captured the imaginations of many whose emotional hatred of fascism and whose ultimate hope of Socialism we share.

The illusion of a comparatively easy and orderly war, provided the United States will back up the anti-fascist nations. The theory seems to be that although, of course, such a war will involve great suffering, in a comparatively short time there will be revolutions in Germany and Italy—a consummation devoutly to be hoped for! That there will probably be a revolution arising out of the defeat of Germany and Italy is a reasonable prediction. It will not be a nice tidy revolution easily acceptable by the British, American and French bourgeoisie. Just as American boys were sent after the Armistice to fight the Russians in Archangel, so may American boys be sent, not to aid the workers in Berlin or Rome, but "to restore order" in the old familiar pattern.

Before that happens, American boys may be sent to police rebellious territories of the British and French Empire. It is a foregone conclusion that in any protracted war, not only Irish extremists, who are already active, but Indian Nationalists, the Arabs and others, will take advantage of British and French preoccupation in war. American boys who enlist for democracy may find themselves used to preserve the empires of our allies.

Neither is it by any means certain that the only or the first revolts will be in Germany or Italy. No one knows what the civilian population around Paris and London would do under the horrible strain of an aerial

* Such a European union should be part of a general federation of Cooperative Commonwealths of the world.

warfare which might not, indeed, settle the conflict, but which certainly would be far more terrible than the prophets of an easy war will admit. Spain's was a poor man's war, and aerial bombardments only gave the faintest hint of the havoc both sides can create with the enormous air forces the Germans already have, and the British and French are building up. It is far more likely that the next war will ruin Europe than that it will restore democracy!

Curiously enough, many of the same people who minimize the havoc, destruction and misery the next war will bring, greatly magnify the present dangers to the United States arising from the ambitions of the dictators. Theirs is the illusion of terror. It appears that we must arm frantically now because maybe Hitler will take Denmark and Greenland or, having conquered part of Africa, will come over to South America, subsidize a revolution, set up heavy industry and use some South American country as a base for successful attack on the Mississippi valley of the United States. Literally I have heard these arguments advanced as reasons for building an immense fleet of air planes, most of which would be obsolete before the event.

I have also heard otherwise sensible people say that already Berlin has bombers which could work destruction in South America. This is odd, in view of the testimony of Admiral Leahy, that the United States has now no bombers, and can, as yet, build no bombers which could make a successful attack on Japanese cities from Guam as a base. Yet Guam is only 1400 miles from Japan.

This whole hysteria overlooks the fact that it will be a long while before Hitler and Mussolini can turn their attention from Europe and possibly Africa, to this hemisphere. Until his march into Czechoslovakia, Hitler has been annexing only territory predominantly inhabited by German speaking people and his annexations have not brought him economic strength, but for the present, have weakened the German economic structure. Let the trade figures bear witness. It remains to be seen whether eight million implacable Czechs will be a strength or weakness to the Nazis in war or peace.

There is a great tendency to exaggerate the permanence of the Rome-Berlin axis or the Rome-Berlin-Tokio triangle. A union of gangsters is more secure. Why, for example, should Mussolini trust Hitler while German soldiers stand at the Brenner Pass? Has it not been the immemorial policy of the rulers of Italy to be on guard against German invasion?

In view of all the facts it is absurd, as even admirals and generals have admitted in their testimony, to expect an invasion of the United States in the near future. Meanwhile, obviously, the immense military forces that we are building up constitute a step toward armament economics and a definite threat to the world of American aggression under an ambitious President. Major

Simmonds, with whom I once debated over the radio, was quite frank in saying that the presence of a larger army was "to preserve order" at home; that is, of course, to put down strikes.

The third illusion is that America will enter the war for democracy and will not, in the process, lose its democracy. Or, as one labor leader put it to me, "If we will fight while Roosevelt is still President, we will get back any democracy that we lose as soon as the war is over." America will not fight for democracy any more than other capitalist nations will fight for democracy. Individuals may think they are fighting for democracy; the Government may use democracy for propaganda; but America will fight out of fear; out of hysteria; out of blundering statesmanship inspired by dreams of glory and desires of profits to be derived from war trade or imperialism. The America which it is expected will go to war for democracy is the America in which disregard for an imperfect Neutrality Law has permitted profiteers to supply Japan with 54 per cent of what she needs for war. It is the America whose government has backed the Anglo-American boycott of Mexican oil with the result that Cardenas has been thrown into the arms of Hitler.

In a totalitarian war, America will become totalitarian. The M. day plans of the War Department and the blue print of dictatorship implicit in the May bill are faint evidences of what we may expect. It is absurd to think that we can get into the war, but send no men to Europe or to Asia. It may be hard to get them there but we will succeed. The other nations which expect us to save them will expect us to send them armies; not merely to send them supplies at great profit to our ammunition makers and others. In the next war the notion that we can get half way in, a notion very popular in the last war, will prove even more untrue.

Neither is it true, no matter who is President, that the liberties necessarily completely surrendered during the war to a military state, will be easily recovered. American democracy had a close call in and after the last war. Since then we, together with the rest of the world, have gone a long way in learning the arts of regimentation and in becoming callous to cruelty, and desperately intolerant of opposition. The democracy we have is a thousand times worth keeping. The best way to keep it is to increase it. It is not so secure that it will stand the strain of a totalitarian war which will never be popular with the masses of the people and which will become increasingly unpopular as it drags on. Long before the unpopularity of the war will produce constructive revolution in America, it will supply a reason for the persecution of minorities, for the intensification of propaganda, and all the things which turn the people into just such a great beast as Hitler and Mussolini lead. The fascist mobs will not return to democracy in the victor lands as soon

as the cannon are stilled.

At this point it will be objected by many readers that the United States may avoid war by following what now seems to be Roosevelt's policy. That is the policy of great armament and the threat to use every means "short of war" against the dictatorships: To all of which there is an answer. Bluffing in a poker game where some of the participants are pretty nearly paranoiac and where the stakes are life or death is dangerous business. Nobody should start to bluff who isn't prepared to go through with the game, no matter what happens. Great armaments mean a steady approach to armament economics and armament economics lead either to war or to a disastrous financial collapse, in preference to which the rulers of the nations may take war. Indeed now, here in America, a standing army of eleven million people and our inability to solve economic problems is a predisposing cause of war. It makes it peculiarly dangerous to play with war emotions and to start the process of militarization which prepares for war, not for peace.

There are, I think, means short of war by which the American people, and, to a limited extent the American Government, can give some effect to their dislike for fascist cruelty and aggression. We can afford to plan for a deliberate increase of trade with peaceful and decent peoples far better than with the nations organized strictly on a fascist economy. But to say that is one thing, and to talk about imposing official embargoes on one group of nations and not another, is a different thing. The latter may tend to drive the peoples into the arms of the dictators rather than to wean them away.

When Senator Pittman, who unfortunately is Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, remarked concerning international policy, "Why shoot a man when you can starve him to death?" he said a cruel and a dangerous thing. No strong nation at war will allow itself to be literally starved to death while its enemy is abundantly supplied with food without fighting the nation which starves it. It is probable that the United States could impose some economic sanctions against certain nations without their imposition leading to war, provided, those sanctions were not too severe, and the opportunities for retaliation were few and difficult. But there is no reason to think that in another war, any more than in the last World War, a great trade with one group of belligerents and not with the other, will be consistent with the peace of America. War trade leads to war and those who are profiting by that trade will use every argument that it be continued no matter what are the risks of war.

That is why the safe rule for America is a genuine neutrality. At the very least, if we are going to use means "short of war," it should not be left to the

discretion of this President or any President to make the final decision. Already his dictatorial power over foreign affairs is too great. The pressures upon the man in the White House are many; some of them are secret; and the greatest of them, the Messianic complex, is within himself. To these pressures, Congress is less susceptible and the open debate of a Congress would give time for the people to make their influence felt. Hence, our opposition to discretionary neutrality for the President. Hence, also, our keen suspicion of the whole idea of "steps short of war" in a capitalist society.

It is not unfair to add that many of those who for public consumption talk about "steps short of war" really believe in nothing of the sort. I have heard some of them admit privately that they thought nothing short of war would avail. Communist leaders want nothing but war which they believe will help Stalin, no matter what motive may induce America to enter the struggle. Talk to the contrary is simply to win the approval of men who would recoil in horror if they thought that war was being openly advocated.

No sober man who has considered the causes of war and the nature of the capitalist state will expect a popular referendum on peace or war to be a panacea. Nevertheless, the very opposition of the potential war makers to such a referendum is significant of its usefulness. Today civilian populations are reluctant to enter war. In part, they remember how futile was the last war; in part they are keenly aware that in the next war there will be no noncombatants, and that, especially in Europe, women and children will be the chief victims. For these and other reasons, it will be harder to stampede peoples than legislative bodies into war. If we can keep fair control of the radio for discussion, there will be plenty of time to vote on any war—except possibly in the event of invasion. Hence, the value of agitation for such a referendum. It will act as a check on Presidential dictatorship.

In talking about keeping America out of war, we are talking about a difficult, but not an impossible thing. Peace must be waged; it can be waged by a fight against imperialism, against war trade, and against capitalist alliances in the name of democracy or anything else. It is very desirable that active steps be taken to obtain certain raw materials trade in which may be interrupted by war, and to keep those raw materials in reserve. Laws should be passed to prevent the too rapid liquidation of foreign holdings in American markets. Every effort must be made to put people to work at constructive tasks, rather than at producing more and more armaments.

It is, of course, impossible to believe that the American people, who have developed no collective substitute for war, will go in for unilateral disarmament. They

(Continued on Page 12)

U. S., Latin America and Fascism

by S. Fanny Simon

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and Earl Browder are trying to convince the American people that the fascist nations, especially Germany, will any minute now sail up the River Plate, gobble up all of Latin America, and convert it into one great concentration camp. Mr. Browder must be by now in a state of utter collapse because of the fear he has been in for more than a year over the danger to beautiful California from the Japanese peril. Any day now will see the Japanese navy in the Bay of San Francisco from whence the Japanese can conquer California and having done so, what is to prevent them from coming to New York and destroying 13th Street from whence Mr. Browder issues exhortations to the Pope and American Catholics? Both Mr. Roosevelt and the Communists have vowed that neither event shall come to pass and to their mind they will not if the great "democracies" of North, Central and South America will stand together against the fascist aggressors. Once that is done, such alien philosophies as force, racial intolerance, and dictatorships, will automatically vanish from the western hemisphere. But, if someone has the temerity to point out to the Communist brethren that neither force, nor racial inequality, nor dictatorship was absent from this hemisphere before Hitler and fascism, then the Communists have a name for him—fascist or at the very least Trotskyite.

When the smoke and the verbiage is cleared, it becomes evident that the hue and cry is directed chiefly against the very real threat of the fascist nations to U. S. commercial and economic supremacy in Latin America; that it is primarily a new stage in the imperialist rivalries of capitalism in decline, which, in its international aspect, has spawned fascism as a challenge to the colonial empires and private preserves of the so-called democratic states. These new imperialist struggles have features different from the old but the basic conflict is the same. They involve markets for goods, the exploitation of natural resources, capital exports, and as a concomitant of them, political and cultural influence.

For more than one hundred years Latin America has been considered by U. S. interests as their private preserve. In the first part of the 19th century our aggression took the form of territorial expansion by annexing the lands that belonged to our neighbor to the south of us, Mexico. After the Civil War, when we became in due course an industrial nation in need of raw materials and markets for our manufactured products and later markets for surplus capital, we turned to Latin America with its area of 8,660,000 sq. miles and its large population as a great undeveloped region and the largest potential market for goods. There we found Britain ahead of us

and it became a tug of war as to who was to control. After the Spanish American War the United States definitely obtained a pre-eminent position in the Caribbean and in Mexico. We came out of the World War a creditor nation and the second largest exporter of capital. During the same period we obtained the trade supremacy over South America as well. Outside of Canada, Central and South America became the field of the greatest American investments. The imperialist stake of the United States increased by 345% between 1913 and 1929. Only in Argentina did England have a larger investment than the United States. In 1930 out of total direct foreign investments in factories, mines, railroads, agricultural lands, etc. of \$7,866,000,000 approximately 50% or \$3,633,900,000 were in the 20 republics of Latin America.

Other imperialist nations did not view U. S. supremacy, buttressed as it was by the Monroe Doctrine, any too kindly; the Latin Americans feared and detested the Yankee menace. Until the rise of Hitler, the rivalry in Latin America was, for the most part, between Great Britain and the United States. As Germany matured industrially, it, too, wanted a share of the Latin American trade. She was helped by the large numbers of Germans and those of German descent in Latin America. The Germans had good retail outlets owned by their nationals which made the sale of their goods easier. Moreover, they had developed effective banking connections. German influence in Latin America was reflected in the attitude assumed by many countries during the World War; in spite of the request to take up arms against Germany, made by Wilson, they remained neutral. Because of American intervention Mexico was decidedly friendly to Germany. After the World War, Germany needed trade even more badly. Germany continued to spread propaganda begun in the War and to strengthen trade relations by increasing the cultural ties with Latin America. Latin Americans were encouraged to study in Germany; Germans paid much attention to the study of Latin American history, literature and culture. The best library on Hispanic-America is to be found in Germany.

During the 1920's Italy and Japan joined in the scramble for Latin American trade. Both of them, like Germany, possess large numbers of immigrants in these countries. Italians number one million in Brazil alone. The Japanese are numerous in Peru and Brazil. Japan has been able to drive the more expensive textiles of Great Britain and the United States almost completely out of the South American markets. Nevertheless, the total value of Japanese and Italian trade in Latin America is today still insignificant.

The world depression which began in 1930 brought these rivalries to the boiling point. As world markets shrank and unemployment and misery spread, fascism was given a chance to increase its power. When it comes to economic rivalries, totalitarianism has decided advantages over laissez-faire capitalism. It can more easily introduce foreign exchange controls, order its nationals to sell or not to sell to certain countries, make bi-lateral agreements, introduce a special type of foreign currency, as Germany has in the form of Askis marks, and in general, grant concessions which make it possible for the totalitarian country to outbid and outsell the so-called democracies. By the use of these trade methods, Nazi Germany has forced Britain into third place in all Latin American countries with the exception of Argentina where British investments reach the tremendous total of \$2,000,000,000

Although the United States has been able to maintain and even to improve its position in the Latin American countries as a whole, it has found competition from Germany rigorous, particularly in Brazil and Chile. In 1929 the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Italy and Japan controlled 65% of the total trade of Latin America. Of this share the United States and Britain had 83%. By 1936 the Anglo-American share had fallen to 72% and that of Germany, Italy and Japan had increased to 28%. Germany's increase in many cases has been most phenomenal. For example, in Peru, although Germany is far behind the United States in total value, its percentage increase since 1929 has been greater. In 1934 the United States furnished Peru with 26.9% of all her imports. In 1937 this percentage was 34.6. Germany during the same period increased her share from 9% to 19.7%. Germany's increase was made entirely at the expense of Great Britain.

In the United States, the World depression resulted in throwing the Republicans out of office and brought in Democrats under Roosevelt. Roosevelt promised the people a "New Deal". No longer did they expect a car in every garage; they wanted at least a chicken in every pot. Without jobs there are no chickens in workers' pots and jobs are precisely what Roosevelt promised. New jobs, however, depended to some degree on reviving our moribund trade with Latin America. As long as Latin Americans thought of the United States as the "Colossus of the North", as the aggressor and meddler, and as the creator of governments which ruled under the protection of our marines against the people, so long might there be difficulty in reviving trade with them. The United States needed a policy of good will in order to raise its prestige and raise its ability to sell goods to Latin Americans. Hence, the trade needs of the United States led Roosevelt to announce, soon after he took office, a new deal in Latin American relations. This new deal was the "Good Neighbor" policy. Henceforth we promised to be good neighbors and not interfere in the domestic

affairs of the Latin American countries.

Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, and militaristic Japan, also, were sorely in need of increased trade. They needed foreign exchange to maintain their war industries and warlike preparations through which they were going to force the "democratic" powers to redistribute colonial possessions and spheres of influence. Germany felt she had to increase her foreign trade, cost what may. The political and military victories which the policies of the fascist powers won for them in Asia, Africa, and Europe, coupled with intense propaganda raised considerably their prestige in most Latin American countries whose picayune Hitlers and Mussolinis and semi-feudal regimes have ever so much more in common with totalitarianism than with democracy. Furthermore, the intense courting both by the democratic and the fascist states led some of the Latin American countries to show their independence of American influence. In Mexico a real attempt was made to free the resources from foreign exploitation. Most of the countries saw in the antagonism between the fascist and democratic states at least an opportunity of playing one set of powers against the other to the advantage of themselves.

Official Washington's hysteria over fascist penetration in Latin America stems from its knowledge that where fascism spreads its tentacles there trade and investment possibilities for other nations disappear. That is why Roosevelt wants to "quarantine the aggressors" and demands hemispheric defense as well as changes in the neutrality legislation and aid to the "democracies" in every way short of war. At the same time we must be prepared for war, especially as the democracies might find themselves hard pressed and we might again be called upon to make the world safe for democracy. Of course, the fact that hemispheric defense and aid furnished the democracies for their own defense may bring prosperity at home, a prosperity for which our business men have hungered these ten years, is also not to be overlooked. Increased military preparedness might succeed in doing what the "New Deal" measures failed to do hitherto, namely, cut down unemployment. That is quite likely, since the present measures have the virtue of doing business at the old capitalistic stand with profits guaranteed. Scotchng fascist influence in Latin America is, therefore, good business in more respects than one.

The "Good Neighbor" policy has been caught in the net of capitalistic - imperialistic contradictions. The "Good Neighbor" policy has as its basic objective to help our exporters sell more goods in Latin America. Exporters, however, are not the only capitalist group interested in Latin America. There are bondholders and those who have direct investments. Their interests are frequently diametrically opposed to those of the exporters. It may be to the interest of the bondholders to have

(Continued on Page 17)

Bourgeois and Revolutionary Morals

by Liston M. Oak

THE recent trend, particularly of ex-Stalinist intellectuals, toward repudiation of Marxism, takes the form usually of a sort of "moral revolt." On ethical grounds these left intellectuals object to Stalinism, and Trotskyism and even Leninism, as identical, and some of them think Bolshevism is red fascism. They ignore the historical, materialistic causation of the failure of the Russian Revolution, and the degeneration of the Comintern, forgetting that the Second International also degenerated and the German Social Democracy failed far more miserably than the CPSU in its great tasks. They either retire from the struggle altogether, or discover a new faith in liberalism and hope to continue to enjoy the liberties and opportunities which relatively prosperous if declining American capitalist democracy can still offer them.

Leading left intellectuals in Europe and America have rejected dialectical materialism along with the idea of a one-party dictatorship, and discover that Leninism sowed the seeds of Stalinism, without discovering that capitalist democracy bears within it the seeds of capitalist totalitarianism, imperialist war, and moral decay. Indisputably, a bit of Hegelian mysticism can be detected in Marx's formulation of the thesis, antithesis, and synthesis and his faith in the inevitability of Socialism as the only possible outcome of the class struggle. The one-party dictatorship worked out to ends opposite to those planned by Lenin and Trotsky, and any totalitarian dictatorship carries with it the danger of degeneration and demoralization, for tyrannical power does corrupt those who wield it. Likewise, Stalinism did not grow in a vacuum, hence it can be logically stated that the seeds of Stalinism were planted under the dictatorship headed by Lenin and were watered and fertilized by historical conditions. Granting all that—there is no sociological theory superior in general outlines to dialectical materialism; a dictatorship, of some sort, is unavoidable if there is to be a successful revolution; and bourgeois democracy is perishing. Furthermore, if there is a half-truth in the statement that Bolshevism was the father of Stalinism, there is more than a half-truth in the equally familiar argument of third-period Stalinism that "bourgeois democracy is the mother of fascism" (Browder), or "social democracy and fascism are twins" (Stalin), and that social democracy paved the way for the triumph of Hitler. All such over-simplifications are dangerous.

From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Revolution, from 1848 to 1939, the main reason for the defeats suffered by the revolutionary movement is the still enormous vitality and overpowering strength of capitalism.

The mistakes of Communists, Socialists and Anarchists, while serious, have been secondary; the primary fact is that the capitalist class is still far more powerful internationally than is the working class. Even today, when capitalism is in rapid decline, capitalists possess the resources, the machine-guns and bombing planes, the courts and police forces, the power to crush the revolution even in the countries where capitalism is weakest, such as Spain. They are greatly aided of course by those "socialist" and "communist" leaders who do not have the courage, the clarity and the determination to lead the masses along the only path which *might* have a chance of success—the path of revolutionary Socialism. While the foremost cause of the fall of Catalonia was the overwhelming material superiority of Franco's army, the People's Front policies (liberalism-Stalinism-Social-Democracy) certainly were a contributing cause, leading to a catastrophic collapse of morale.

Many left intellectuals these dark days vaguely believe in the sort of mixture of socialism, pacifism and anarchist hatred of the centralized State, best formulated by Aldous Huxley. His book, "Ends and Means", is permeated with idealistic assumptions, inconsistencies, and unrealistic proposals; his thesis is that good ends can never be attained by evil means, and that violence is always an evil to be shunned by socialists. He advances the Hegelian doctrine in new dress, that moral ideas have some mystical power to transform the world. In his naive proposal to settle international conflict peacefully, Huxley makes the familiar proposal that the "have-not" fascist powers be placated and appeased by transferring to them colonies owned by the dominant imperialist powers, ignoring the fact that the British imperialists may give away the Sudetenland, but not one of their own possessions, that a Munich pact is an atrocious betrayal, and that anyway, the possession of colonies involves the exploitation of its inhabitants, who ought to be consulted before they are handed over to Japan, Germany or Italy. Huxley's other proposals are quite as unrealistic. His blue-print of Utopia does not tell us the "good" ways and means by which evils can be abolished and Socialism achieved.

Huxley and all the others now attacking Marxism are mistaken when they assume blithely that good and evil can thus be arbitrarily separated, that good is not inextricably mixed with evil, that good results *never* come from evil means. The fact remains solid as Gibraltar after all the winds of their oratory have died away, that the only way to judge any act, any means, is by its results, that *the actual—not intended—end achieved is the sole criterion of the means*. Nevertheless, the

Huxley school of thought is correct in arguing that bad means which can achieve only bad ends are often justified by Bolsheviks (Stalinists and Trotskyists alike). Further, that the evil effects of using certain bad means however sincere the good intentions, sometimes enter into and become part of the end and transform or defeat this ideal purpose. In addition, the dogmatized, ill-applied truth that the end justifies the means can be used by demagogues like Stalin to justify *any* means he chooses to use for the immediate ends of the Russian bureaucracy and its Comintern; in this case both means and ends are abominable, and both are concealed by pseudo-Marxist verbiage. Likewise the imperialists of democratic powers can conceal the evil of both ends and means—imperialist conquest (or defense of profits)—by idealistic bombast about a holy crusade of democracy against fascism. And Social Democrats are also skilled in similar demagogy.

No one except a pure pacifist can logically argue that ends do not justify means, and pacifists who take social problems seriously are constantly proposing means of solution which are more immoral or amoral than those of revolutionists—e.g., peace by appeasement; class collaboration; passive capitulation before fascist forces.

The impotence of pacifists, reformists, bourgeois moralists, in the face of class and national conflicts pressing clamorously for programmatic action, rejecting the only means by which an alternative to triumphant reaction can be reached, are surely not morally superior to revolutionary Socialists who do not flinch at the prospect of violence, made unavoidable by the capitalist class which everywhere resorts to fascism to prevent progress and preserve profits. The end—fascism—to which liberalism, reformism, pacifism, Stalinism, must all lead, certainly cannot justify these contemptible, futile means. *The end—Socialism—justifies whatever means are necessary, effective, and in harmony with that end.* Totalitarian terror wielded by a tiny clique leading a one-party dictatorship is neither necessary, effective, nor in harmony with any socialist end.

The only conceivable reason for the position of Lyons, Huxley, Eastman, et al, is that they despair of achieving a socialist revolution in our time and hang desperately on to what remains of bourgeois democracy, liberalism, civil liberties, and moral values. They hope against all the evidence of the daily newspaper that capitalist decay can be checked and bourgeois democracy be made to work, despite the collapse of the French and Spanish People's Fronts and the failure of the American New Deal, and the lessons implicit in the experiences of German and Austrian Social Democracy. The sole place on earth where possibly Social Democracy can be made to work for any length of time is Scandinavia. Even the peculiar Mexican brand of Social Democracy, under a one-party "People's Front" dictatorship is moving toward the alternatives of im-

perialist intervention, a State Capitalism economy and semi-fascist government, a socialist revolution, or bankruptcy.

The entire history of the past two decades proves quite conclusively that all reformist governments are capitalist coalition governments which must fail to reform capitalism and make it work, to ward off fascism by preserving liberal democratic capitalism. For the liberal-Stalinist-Social-Democratic program offers no alternative that is effective, no basic solution to the problems of capitalism in decay, with its declining production paralleling expanding productive capacity, its idle capital and idle workers and idle factories, its shrinking markets and sharpening class and international antagonisms, and inescapable recurrent economic crises. The final capitalist answer is fascism, war, totalitarian tyranny, State capitalism; the workers' answer is democratic Socialism, peace and prosperity. Take your choice—there is no "moral" middle road. Certainly those who rejecting Stalinism embrace Social Democracy, or militant liberalism, indulging in a nostalgic day-dream of an escape from the harsh realities of class struggle, forget that Social Democracy has also a black record of failures, mistakes, crimes, treachery, and cowardly capitulation before fascism.

The socialist who, forgetting all his Marxism, judges any social phenomena such as the betrayal of the Russian Revolution by some abstract universal moral principle, disqualifies himself as a political commentator. Triumphant reaction should not drive us into the camp of the liberal moralists, who recognize no class basis, no materialistic origin, of morals. We cannot retreat to the position of Kant and Shaftesbury, who rejected the religious basis of morality and found its source in an unchanging supra-class conscience, quite self-sufficient and eternal. Neither should we forget that Marxism serves an ideal, a moral purpose; to so direct and guide the progressive social forces generated under capitalism that the class conflict will be resolved in unity on a higher social level—a classless socialist society. It was precisely the high moral qualities of Lenin that won him wider influence and almost universal admiration; his unswerving devotion to the revolutionary cause, his courage, his insistence upon the truth as he saw it in a welter of lies (and particularly lies about the war) his incorruptibility, his flaming hatred of social injustice, his intransigent loyalty to socialist ideals, his self-sacrifice for these ideals. This is true of every great socialist leader, whether or not he is correct or incorrect on any specific question.

The real question, obscured alike by liberal moralists and Trotskyists, is this: what means are both *necessary and effective* in reaching our socialist goal? What means are in harmony with the end desired? What methods tend to defeat our purpose? What mistakes in tactics were made by the Bolsheviks, by the Austrian, Italian

and German Social Democrats, and the Spanish Anarchists, Socialists, and the POUM Communists, which contributed to their defeat? More specifically it is necessary to examine the question: was a one-party totalitarian dictatorship upheld by the Chekha really necessary to protect the revolution and win the civil war in Russia? Was it actually wise for the Bolsheviks to destroy democracy in the Soviets and trade unions? How was Leninism transformed into Stalinism? Will it be necessary in a revolutionary crisis elsewhere to impose a rigid one-party dictatorship or can the conception of other revolutionists such as Rosa Luxemburg, of a dictatorship of the whole working class, be realized, with democracy preserved for all workers, all socialist organizations of every tendency? And finally, can the best of bourgeois culture, including its highest moral ideas which now inspire socialists, be preserved and extended, even in the midst of revolution and civil war?

It must be stated emphatically that the means used by Social Democrats and liberal reformists can never be any more effective than they have been in Germany, Austria, and lately Spain. If we criticize Bolshevik methods, Marxists must condemn Social Democratic methods as resulting, at best, in preserving for a time democratic liberal capitalism and improving the lot of labor within the capitalist structure; but with capitalism in decline, these policies can lead nowhere but to the gradual weakening of working class resistance, loss of democratic rights, and the eventual victory of fascism. Social Democracy means social patriotism, support of "our own" imperialism, "collective security" and all the other rotten opportunism taken over by the Comintern. Recent history gives added content to Lenin's charge that the Social Democrats are agents of imperialism within the ranks of the working class. If the Bolsheviks made mistakes, *they also made a revolution*, which Social Democracy can never do. If Stalin has a bloodier record than any Social Democrat, it is explained by historical materialism, not by any superiority of the methods or morals of the leaders of the Second International. They have not had the clarity, courage, and the serious determination to overthrow capitalism by the only means it can ever be overthrown—revolution. Lenin remains, in my opinion, incomparably superior morally as well as in Marxist theory and leadership, to Abramovitch, Dan, Plekhanov, Martov and Kerensky. If the Bolshevik party was not the repository of final universal wisdom, it was the only revolutionary party capable of giving effective leadership to the Russian masses. This does not, however, justify the suppression by terror of the democratic rights of other socialist parties, even if confused and misled, even if some Mensheviks did go over to the White Guard camp. (After all, plenty of German and Italian Communists and Socialists went over to the fascist camp

Every party has its renegades.)

It remains true that without a disciplined revolutionary socialist party, similar but not identical with the Bolshevik party, there will never be a successful socialist revolution. But if that party after its victory finds it necessary to impose a one-party absolutism which crushes opposition, it will be transformed into a brake upon the revolution, a conservative force, defending not democratic Socialism but National Socialism or State Capitalism, as in Russia—defending its own interests as a new bureaucratic caste.

Neither Jesuits nor Bolsheviks justified *any* means whatever; they both carried certain reprehensible methods further than their opponents only because they had more energy, faith, and power. Luther also called for extermination of revolting peasants as mad dogs; Scheidemann, Noske and Ebert shot down revolutionary German workers to protect capitalist democracy as mercilessly as did Trotsky at Kronstadt to protect Bolshevik supremacy; the Protestants and Social Democrats deserve no commendation on moral grounds. The Social Democrats had fewer victims only because they had less power, less opposition, and less desperate necessity. Their task was an easier one—the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution, while the Bolshevik task was the overthrow of capitalism.

Azana, Companys, Negrin, Prieto, et al, share guilt in Spain for the jailing of POUM leaders, the suppression of workers' democracy, the collapse of morale, the Loyalist defeats, with their Stalinist comrades who were more militant than they were. Blum is not less responsible than Thorez for the crushing of colonial revolts against French imperialism, the disarming of the workers in the face of advancing fascism, teaching them collaboration with and reliance upon the liberal section of the capitalist class, preaching collective security and support of Anglo-French imperialism against fascist imperialism, dependence upon democratic capitalist governments, social patriotism and opportunism. The Second and Third Internationals share blame for a series of catastrophic defeats of the European working class; no honest observer can find any moral superiority of Social Democracy over Stalinism. The difference is one of degree; a difference flowing from the great Stalinist militancy, determination, opportunity, etc.—analogous to the differences between Jesuit and Protestant in religious persecution. This difference is less than that between fascist and "democratic" imperialism; although the fascist nations will probably never surpass, quantitatively, the bloody record of British and French imperialism, fascism enjoys no moral superiority thereby; just so no Social Democratic Government has ever rivaled the Stalinist dictatorship in number of victims. It is as unjust to judge Bolshevism by the acts of Stalin as it is to judge Social Democracy (or the German

(Continued on Page 17)

The Essence of Fascism

by Otto Bauer

(During the last weeks of his life Otto Bauer worked on a pamphlet devoted to the analysis of Fascism, its state and social order, its inner contradictions and the problems of the anti-fascist revolution. Otto Bauer was occupied with this work until the day before his death. A cruel fate prevented him from saying all he wanted to on the spiritual (Geistige-intellectual) platform of the movement that is arising anew under Fascism. EDITOR.)

IN 1919 the victors of the World War, Great Britain and France, revised the map of Europe in accordance with the requirements of French domination, and redistributed economic and political world power in accordance with the needs of British and French imperialism. Italy had entered the World War only after violent internal conflicts; her state power and army had proved themselves inadequate during the course of the war, and she was saved from defeat only by the victories of her allies. Italy now felt injured by the distribution of world power, imposed by the western powers in 1919, and considered herself cheated out of her share of the spoils of victory. Germany was defeated in the World War; the redistribution of world power was at her expense.

Powerful mass movements followed the World War in all the belligerent countries. In Great Britain and France, where the authority of the ruling bourgeoisie over the popular masses had been strengthened by its victory in the World War and by the size of the spoils, the mass movements of the 1918-1920 period were not able to weaken the traditional bourgeois democracy of the prewar period. In Germany and Italy, on the other hand, the World War was followed by revolutionary processes, which proved, to be sure, unable to destroy the capitalist social order, but for that very reason greatly intensified class antagonisms. Bourgeois democracy, much younger in these countries, succumbed to the succession of revolution and counter-revolution.

British and French imperialism, with the new distribution of power through the 1919 treaties, attained their war aims. Since that time they have defended their position of power gained in the World War. The imperialism of Great Britain and France is the imperialism of the satisfied, the satiated. It is therefore conservative and peaceful. In Germany and Italy, on the contrary, there has developed an aggressive warlike imperialism, that seeks to revise the distribution of political and economic power in the world. The rivalry between the conservative imperialism of Great Britain and France

on the one hand and the aggressive imperialism of Germany and Italy on the other is the rivalry between the capitalist classes, those who *actually exploit* the worker and peasant masses of the colonial countries and those who would *like to exploit them*. Wherein, then, does the antagonism exist between the authoritarian states and the western democracies? On the one hand, it is the rivalry between the states where the World War released great revolutionary processes and thereby caused the succession of revolutions and counter-revolutions and the other states where the organic development of old democracies, strengthened by victory in the World War, was not interrupted by revolution and, therefore, also not by counter-revolution. On the other hand, it is the rivalry between the satisfied imperialist powers, who themselves dictated the distribution of world power after the World War and now have to defend it, and the aggressive imperialism of the unsatisfied powers, who rebel against this distribution of power.

Fascism conquered in Italy and Germany first. Fascism is, on the one hand, the result of class antagonisms, extremely intensified by the revolutionary processes of the post-war period in these countries,—the counter-revolution that followed the 1918-1919 revolutions. On the other hand, it is the means by which the aggressive imperialism of these states brings together under a single command the entire economic and spiritual (*geistige*) forces of the nation for the struggle for a new distribution of economic and political world power.

But wherever Fascism wins, it establishes not only an essentially new state order, but also an essentially new form of economic and labor organization. (*Verfassung*.) It is necessary to understand its new form of economic and labor organization as a new phase of the whole development of capitalism.

THE FASCIST STATE

With the development of capitalist production, the feudal state, based on barter and feudal tenure, was replaced by the capitalist state, based on trade on a monetary basis, taxes in money, public debts, and on the bureaucracy and mercenary army. The monarchy based upon the bureaucracy and mercenary army, replaced the feudal state. The development of the capitalist bourgeoisie was originally the basis for the development of absolutism.

But under absolutism, strengthened by wealth, power, and self-confidence, the bourgeoisie ultimately overthrew absolutism through the bourgeois revolutions. It was replaced by the liberal state. "Human and civil rights" assured every citizen of a sphere of freedom

SOCIALIST REVIEW

against encroachment by the state. The feudal regime and the feudal nobility had to share state power with the rising bourgeoisie. As the power of the feudal regime was curtailed through the parliaments, the franchise privileges assured the bourgeoisie of power in the parliaments.

The popular masses utilized the antagonisms between the princes (Fürsten), the nobility and the bourgeoisie; they made use of the "human and civil rights" gained in the bourgeois revolutions to break the political monopoly of the bourgeoisie, and to win universal and equal suffrage. Thus bourgeois democracy took the place of the liberal state. In it, also, the capitalist bourgeoisie rules. But it no longer rules by monopolizing the franchise to parliament. It rules the state through bourgeois mass parties, for which the popular masses vote in general elections. Its class rule is sanctioned at every election by the majority of the whole people. It is the capitalist bourgeoisie's greatest triumph, that it can allow its rule to be endorsed every four or six years by the majority of the entire people, that is by the petty bourgeoisie, farmers and workers that it rules and exploits.

The severe economic crises that followed the World War have disturbed this mechanism of bourgeois democracy in the countries most affected by these crises. The impoverished masses rebelled against the bourgeois democracy that could not abolish capitalism and, therefore, could not protect them from poverty. The capitalist bourgeoisie, no longer sure of being able to rule through the democratic means, turned against democracy. It promoted, subsidized, and armed the fascist rebellion. It availed itself of the fascist rebellion of the petty bourgeoisie to smash democracy and to set up the fascist dictatorship in its place. If the bourgeoisie can no longer rule through the will of the majority of the people, it hands state power over to dictatorship, which suppresses the majority of the people with terroristic force.

As the development of the capitalist bourgeoisie was in its beginnings the basis of the development of absolutism, so, in its senility, the capitalist bourgeoisie, no longer trusting its power to lead the mass of the people by spiritual means, turns back to totalitarian absolutism.

Just as the bourgeoisie, having won "human and civil rights" during the bourgeois revolution, guaranteed to every citizen a degree of legal security against the arbitrary state, and guaranteed everyone spiritual freedom to argue and agitate for his convictions in free conflict of opinion, so it now destroys all individual legal security (Rechtssicherheit) and all freedom of thought by seeking refuge in fascist dictatorship. Just as the bourgeoisie at the time of the bourgeois revolutions gained the right of self-government of the people against the absolutism of the Princes, it now destroys all right of self-government of the people and revives absolutism

in the form of totalitarian authority (Befehlsgewalt) of the Duce and the Führer. Although the bourgeoisie abolished the torture rack, shackles, and corporal punishment at the time of the bourgeois revolutions, it now, with its Gestapo cellars and concentration camps, destroys the results of the very humanitarian victories for which it had fought. All the demands for legal security (Rechtssicherheit), freedom, humanity and the dignity of man—weapons of the bourgeoisie against absolutism during the bourgeois revolutions, are now transformed into weapons of the popular masses, suppressed by Fascism; they are weapons, not only against the Fascist state, but also against the capitalist bourgeoisie which seeks refuge in Fascism as soon as it thinks it can no longer safeguard its class rule, its property monopoly and its profits, with the means and within the forms of democracy.

THE FASCIST FORM OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

Fascism has not only revolutionized the state, but has also changed the relations of the state to the national economy.

In the period of mercantilism when the state was growing stronger with the development of capitalist commodity production, it promoted its development by state regulation of all branches of the national economy.

In the period of liberalism the capitalist bourgeoisie, having become rich, powerful and self-confident under state encouragement, shattered the mercantile regulation of economic life, which had become fetters to its further development. It restricted the state to the problem of protecting the security of person and property. Economic life being freed from state regulation, the form of production, the distribution of income, the movement of prices, wages and rates of interest were delivered over to the "free play of forces," to free competition between the individual capitalists, and to the law of supply and demand in the markets.

Since the last quarter of the nineteenth century this liberal phase of development has been overwhelmed step by step by the development of monopoly capitalism. With the concentration of capital, free competition turned into the monopoly of cartels and trusts. Protective tariffs, lowered during the period of liberalism, were raised again. Commodity prices were dictated by the cartels and trusts in accordance with state tariff legislation. Though free competition was done away with at home by the capitalist private monopolies, competition between the national industries in the world market was thereby intensified all the more. Imperialism sought to capture monopolistic domination of more extended outlet markets, investment markets (Anlagesphären), and sources of raw materials for the capitalists of every land. The trade unions, the peasant organizations, the middle-class organizations

(Continued from Page 4)

and social legislation developed simultaneously with democracy. The trade unions confronted (traten gegenüber) the employers' organizations. Wages and working conditions were agreed upon by the trade unions and employers' organizations within the limits drawn by the social legislation of the state. Though production and distribution of income continued to be determined by the "free play of forces," by the decisions and agreements of the individual capitalists, and by supply and demand in markets, nevertheless the effective forces within the growing masses were organized, and they could operate only within the limits drawn by the state.

At the time of the World War the state was obliged to subordinate economic life completely to its military command, in order to insure the supply of war materials to the fighting armies and ensure the provisioning of the armies and food for the starving civilian population. No longer the decisions and agreements of the capitalists, but the command of the state, no longer the mechanism of supply and demand in the markets, but state price fixing and state regulation of consumption rule economic life. This system of capitalist state control (Etatismus*) has been characterized as "War Socialism." In reality this Etatistische (state-ist) organization of the economy was nothing but a requisition apparatus for the fighting armies. It did not abolish the capitalist system of property and capitalist distribution of income; on the contrary, it greatly intensified capitalist exploitation. But this "War Socialism" is the antecedant of National Socialism as it is developing today in the Fascist countries.

After the World War the capitalist classes, in their struggle for "Free Trade," at first broke the rule of the state over economy. But very soon new tendencies towards state taxation of the economy developed. On

* *Etatismus. Etatistische.* Translator's note.

Etatiste. Etatism.

"... for this word as for "étatisme" there is no exact English equivalent, for State Socialism is not an accurate translation. "Etatisme" need not necessarily be socialist in any sense of the term. Statism would be a literal translation but it is an ugly word and it would be impossible to translate "Etatiste" by statist which has already another meaning. The nearest English equivalent of Etatisme is State Capitalism, but again it is impossible to use the term State Capitalist for Etatiste. On the whole it seems better to use French words: . . ."

Robert Dell. *My Second Country.* Footnote 1) p. 74.

"During the war, and especially during the experiments in fascist economy, the term "State Capitalism" has often been understood to mean a system of state interference and regulation. The French employ a much more suitable term for this—étatisme. There are undoubtedly points of contact between state capitalism and "state-ism," but taken as a system they are opposite rather than identical. State capitalism means the substitution of state property for private property, and for that reason remains partial in character. State-ism no matter where—In Italy, Mussolini, in Germany, Hitler, in America, Roosevelt, or in France, Leon Blum—means state intervention on the basis of private property and with the goal of preserving it."

Leon Trotsky. *The Revolution Betrayed.* p. 246.

are too concerned about defense, but the good fortune of America's geographic position makes the problem of defense relatively simple—unless defense be extended to a defense of American trade wherever it may be, and of American citizens wherever they are—except in Jersey City!

In conclusion let me repeat once more: This program of keeping America out of war is no more unfraternal than refusal to join a suicide pact. It is a condition, not merely of the maintenance of the democracy which we have, but of making that democracy more attractive to the nations. The peoples of South America, for example, will not be won to democracy by our overweening military power. Indeed, their local dictators may be driven to counter-balance that power by deals with European dictators. It is the attractive power of a democracy which is made to work, as democracy today is not working, on which we must depend for the final victory of democracy over fascism. That kind of democracy is synonymous with socialism. We who work for it are working for the one thing which will finally put war out of the world.

the one hand, the severe economic crisis of 1929, the international credit crisis of 1931, forced the states to ever deeper encroachment on economic life. On the other hand, the development of modern war technique compels every state to strengthen its economic war machine by state regulation of the economy. The tendency towards ever more complete domination of the national economy by the state grows stronger in all countries. But while in the democratic countries the opposition of the conflicting special interests tend to limit state taxation of economy, Fascism subordinates all classes to totalitarian domination through the state and thus breaks all resistance of the special interests against state taxation of the national economy. For that reason capitalist state control attains its fullest development in the Fascist state.

Fascist state control characterizes itself as "National Socialism." It pretends to have vanquished capitalism. In reality it does not touch the essence of the capitalist economic order. The means of production and distribution remain private property of the capitalists. The propertyless masses are still obliged to sell their labor to the owners of the means of production and distribution. The division of society into exploiting owners and exploited non-owners remains unchanged. Fascist state control does not abolish capitalism; it represents only a new phase of capitalist development.

Imperialism in Europe

by J. F. Horrabin

(Author of *An Outline of Economic Geography*, etc.)

THE MAIN cause of a great deal of confusion in socialist thinking about current events can be traced to the failure to recognize the workings of capitalist imperialism for what they are when they take place on European territory. When Mussolini invades Abyssinia his policy is clearly recognizable as a characteristic piece of imperialist aggression against a weak people. But when Hitler invades Austria or Czechoslovakia, or Mussolini sends army corps to Spain, the talk at once is of rival ideologies, of fascism and democracy; and many socialists fail to see in the actions of the dictators further proof of the rightness of the socialist analysis of capitalist imperialism.

The fact that—quite naturally—the earlier manifestations of imperialist aggrandizement showed themselves in other continents—in Asia, Africa and America—seems to have given rise to the notion that imperialism is only imperialism when it operates outside Europe; and, conversely, that its workings in Europe must be the result of something new and sinister, something which necessitates a reconsideration of the socialist analysis—something specifically “fascist” in fact.

This confused thinking enables a surprising number of socialists to draw a distinction between British and French imperialism on the one hand, and German and Italian on the other. The latter, it appears, is wholly indefensible, whereas socialists may defend the former not merely with arguments but with arms.

Surely it is clear that, whatever the “superstructure” of racial or ideological slogans, the aggressive and expansionist aims of the newer States, Germany and Italy, are fundamentally the same as those which led the older Powers, Britain and France, to build up extensive overseas empires, particularly in the 19th century. During that century, consolidation of their respective strategic and economic positions in the Mediterranean led France to annex large areas of the North African coast, and Britain to lay hands on Cyprus and Egypt. Is Mussolini doing anything fundamentally different when he attempts to win control of the Balearics or the eastern coast of Spain? Or does the fact that the northern side of the Mediterranean is European and the southern merely African entirely alter the case?

Mussolini's imperialist aims, by reason of the geographical situation of Italy, are in part concerned with European and in part with non-European territories. German expansion, again for obvious geographical reasons, must be on European soil. In a recently published book, *Danubian Destiny*, Mr. Graham Hutton dis-

cusses, with a mass of detail, that central and south-eastern area of Europe which the German Reich, by its seizure of Austria and its undermining of Czechoslovakia, has already begun to dominate.

That area—the whole stretch of territory between Memel and Danzig in the north and the southern coasts of the Balkan peninsula on the Black and Mediterranean Seas—is now cut off from Western Europe by the German-Italian bloc. The greater part of it, during the decade following the War, was under the domination of France. Poland and the countries of the Little Entente formed part of the French plan for the permanent encirclement of Germany. The German renaissance, followed by the acquisition of Austria and the pact with Italy, broke the ring and cut off the smaller eastern states from direct communication with the Western Powers.

Mr. Hutton discusses the probable future of the whole Danubian area in relation to the German-Italian alliance and the Munich settlements. His main conclusion is that Germany “has reserved no place in Eastern, Central, and South-Eastern Europe for Italy save that of a poor relation.” The entire tract of territory lying between the two fascist Powers to the west and Soviet Russia to the east is to be the new European empire of the Third Reich. Italian penetration of the Balkans from her base in Albania is to be turned southward to the Mediterranean zone; and Germany will support Italian claims against France and Britain “in Spain, the Balearics, North Africa, Corsica, Djibouti, the Suez Canal board, and anywhere else outside Germany's new domain.”

It was, of course, the elimination of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1919 which altered the whole political map of South-Eastern Europe and, by the setting up of a network of smaller states, provided the new Germany with her opportunity. Czechoslovakia, a new state created entirely out of Austria-Hungarian territory, has already been brought under effective German control. She lost after Munich 29% of her territory and 33% of her inhabitants. Her government has been changed to a regime of “authoritarian democracy” and her eastern provinces, Slovakia and Ruthenia, granted autonomy within a federal state. Germany has covered her import requirement of graphite and antimony from former Czechoslovakian territory, and as regards iron and steel “has gained control of a total output equivalent to about 15% of her own former production.”

Notes on Current Events

MORE ON SOCIALIST UNITY

At its last meeting the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, U.S.A., adopted a resolution on Socialist unity which ought to serve to clarify this matter considerably. It had before it a report from the committee which had met with a committee representing the Social Democratic Federation. These two committees, after lengthy discussion, had been able to formulate statements or resolutions representing "areas of agreement" on several points. Some of these agreements are quite important, not so much because they represent changes in the policy of either organization, but above all because they represent the clearing away of misconceptions as to the policies of these organizations.

However, "areas of agreement" can not be the basis for political unity, nor can the program of a serious political organization be made up of them. Political unity must be based upon agreement on fundamental questions, so that the united organization will then be in a position to take its program to the masses, rather than spend its time in interminable internal discussion as to where it stands on the matters which it desires to take to the masses. Therefore, the National Executive Committee, in order to speed up the process of political clarification which must precede actual unity, adopted a series of points to be presented to the Social Democratic Federation as a basis

The cession of a strip of territory across the "waist" of the new Czechoslovakia for the construction of a German motor-road strengthens German control. "The new Czechoslovakia can only exist like a paralytic in an 'iron lung.' Its vital economic forces, its heart and arteries, can only function in so far as the Reich permits."

(Since this was written, Czechoslovakia has, of course, been taken over completely. Editor.)

The absorption of Austria gave Germany two new frontiers, with Yugoslavia and with Hungary; thus bringing her into direct contact with Balkan states. Mr. Hutton points out that even now Hungary has no defenses against Germany; and the Germanization of Czechoslovakia by the probable further breaking up of that country into smaller "independent" units will weaken Hungary's position still more. Yugoslavia is important as "an ideal repository of mineral and food resources"; and her failure to solve her internal racial problems does not make for political stability. "Beyond Hungary again lies Rumania, the Mexico of the Balkans, a beautiful country, rich in fertile lands and minerals, torn asunder by revolt and reaction, and consequently backward in developing its own resources."

So capitalist imperialism, in its modern intensified form of fascism, threatens European peoples with the fate against which the natives of Asia and of Africa are even now in open or incipient revolt.

(The above article is reprinted from the March 1939 issue of "Plebs", the official magazine of the British workers education movement.)

for a minimum program for organic unity. The NEC also invited the committee of the SDF to present its proposals, so that a discussion in the press on the proposals by the two organizations might take place. Herewith are the proposals of the NEC of the SP. The proposals of the SDF will be published as soon as they are available.

The danger to democracy in the world today is inherent in the decay of capitalism. Capitalist political reaction through fascism and other dictatorial forms can be reversed only through the organized strength of the working class in a direct struggle against the capitalist class, its parties and its state machinery.

In line with its purpose of defending and extending democracy in the political and industrial life of the nation, the Socialist Party proposes:

1. The creation of an independent party of labor, rejecting support of any and all capitalist parties and capitalist political groups.
 - a. Socialists may affiliate themselves under party direction with labor parties or other labor political groupings;
 - b. In such bodies, Socialists shall consistently put forward a program to run independent candidates in every post in opposition to all the capitalist party candidates;
 - c. Socialists shall indicate that the policy of coalescing with so-called democratic capitalist parties or political groups against Fascism can not thwart or defeat Fascism.
 2. Consistent opposition to all capitalist wars, including those fought by capitalist democracies against capitalist totalitarian states.

This means specifically,

 - a. Non-support of and organized opposition to any war fought by the U. S., including such a war against the Fascist powers;
 - b. Opposition to all military alliances or simple diplomatic alliances of capitalist nations to apply sanctions against other capitalist powers;
 - c. Opposition to all increased armaments and militarization in the capitalist countries;
 - d. A campaign to win for the American people the right to decide by referendum the question of a war declaration;
 - e. Opposition to governmental preparations for war-time economic regimentation;
 - f. Propaganda to prepare unions to resist the danger of Fascism attendant upon war through militant strike opposition to compulsory arbitration.
 3. In the light of these political tasks, a Socialist Party must orient itself in the direction of organized mass work. The party cannot consider itself solely an electoral or educational organization; it must initiate proposals of action and programs for mass organizations (unions, labor parties, farm organizations, youth organizations, etc.) through organized and disciplined groups of Socialists in these organizations, operating under the guidance and direction of the party.
- To advance effectively the Party line before the masses, party institutions (press, school, etc.) shall be under direct party control.

THE CRISIS IN THE AUTO UNION

As this is being written the official convention of the United Auto Workers Union has not yet ended. An extensive analysis of this, as well as of the Martin convention, will appear in the next issue of the *SOCIALIST REVIEW*. Regardless of the outcome of this convention, however, some things have already become clear. The first is that a split has taken place in the ranks of the organized automobile workers which bodes no good to their future existence, and which certainly will make very difficult, if not impossible, the task of organizing the as yet unorganized workers, above all in Ford's and in aircraft.

Technically and immediately, the responsibility for the split lies with Martin, who refused to operate in accordance with the constitution of his union and in defiance both of his own Board (on which, last year, he had named sixteen out of the twenty-five members) and of the C.I.O. to which the U.A.W. was affiliated. It will be pretty difficult to explain how differences over the date of a convention can become serious enough to warrant a split and possible destruction of such an important labor organization. Nor can Martin's efforts to act as a one-man dictatorship in the union meet with approval from the progressive section of labor. Martin's charges against Lewis may be one hundred per cent justified, but that is all the less reason why Martin should do in his own union exactly what he condemns Lewis for doing in the C.I.O. Undoubtedly, by taking the step he did, Martin also confessed that he had no majority in the union, as he had always claimed, and was afraid that a convention would strip him of leadership.

The proceedings at the Martin convention tended to substantiate the reports that he has the backing of the extreme reactionaries, Black Legion elements and company stooges, who appear to have dominated the convention. Undoubtedly there were also present genuine progressive elements who were forced into the Martin camp by their fear of the Communists. But it is hard to see how the Martin organization as at present set up can play a really progressive role.

At the same time, the other factors which contributed to the split cannot be overlooked. The intrigues of the Communists, whose sole objective seems to be to seize control either directly or through one of their stooges, and which resulted in an attempt at a coup d'état just prior to the split, created the atmosphere in which a split seemed preferable to continued wrangling. The inept handling of the situation by the C.I.O. committee, which reinstated (and properly) the suspended officers without any punishment (which they deserved) tended to create the impression that the C.I.O. was lined up with one faction against the other. When the C.I.O. could have called a convention of the union and rallied the rank and file auto workers to a policy of peace, it contented itself with behind-the-scenes maneuvering, throwing its support first here and then there, with apparently no consistency or policy. Instead of acting with firmness and dispatch, it permitted the play to be taken out of its hands.

The situation in auto shows that the time is past when the mere name of the C.I.O. is sufficient to keep its adherents in line. A conscious policy for inner union democracy, rank and file control, autonomy for national unions, is necessary if the C.I.O. is to avoid becoming a second A.F. of L. in its methods of operation. The C.I.O. cannot be satisfied with having defeated Martin and permit two auto workers' unions to continue in existence. It must move for the reestablishment of a united powerful industrial union of the auto workers.

STILL NO LABOR UNITY

Once more the mountain labored and gave birth to a mouse.

MARCH-APRIL, 1939

After a lot of fanfare and general ballyhoo, the committees of the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. met and agreed to disagree. It was all done very politely—except for the two valedictory speeches by Green and Lewis, delivered within a few days of each other in different parts of the country. But the net result is—there is no labor unity.

The result must be a keen disappointment to those who were quite certain (they had an inside "tip") that this time there would really be unity, because—Roosevelt wants it. This in itself is a sad commentary on the state of affairs in the labor movement. Its leaders do not listen to each other. They do not listen to the rank and file membership, but they do listen to the titular head of an anti-labor political party and the head of the capitalist government. Even that might be a good thing if the result were in the interests of the workers. But it isn't.

The plain fact is that the leaders of the A.F. of L. and of the C.I.O. do not want unity, and all these meetings, negotiations, speeches, resolutions, press releases, are merely maneuvers to put the responsibility for the split on the other side. The leaders of the C.I.O. are convinced that they can proceed organizing the unorganized until the C.I.O. far outnumbers the A.F. of L. and in the process perhaps take over or neutralize a few more international unions, in this way reducing the A.F. of L. to the building trades. The leaders of the A.F. of L., encouraged by some rebellions inside C.I.O. unions, caused largely by Communist totalitarian regimes, such as Sharecroppers and Office Workers, think that the process of disintegration has already begun in the C.I.O. and that, like the I.W.O., it will disappear from the scene, leaving only a few stable internationals which will then be reabsorbed into the A.F. of L., something like the old Western Federation of Miners.

And in the meanwhile, neither is preparing for the onslaught upon the labor movement which will surely begin as soon as the next depression-recession-crisis hits us. In fact, this onslaught has already begun, as a glance at the recent court decisions dealing with labor will show. Not only are sections of the Labor Relations Act and its administration being interpreted against labor, but everywhere in the lower courts labor is taking a decisive lambasting. In no small degree this is due to the illusion which has gained ground since the passage of the Labor Relations Act that legal action can be a substitute for economic organization and action, that court suits can replace strikes.

But if a crisis sets in, even the limited legal protection of labor will tend to disappear. Already the attack on the Labor Relations Act is so broad that its early amendment in terms favorable to the employers appears a certainty. This attack can be expected to gain in impetus. Unless labor prepares, there is a serious danger that all the gains since 1933 will be wiped out. And unity must be the first step in preparedness.

THE END OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

The Spanish Civil War is over. It ended with a decisive defeat for the workers and progressive forces. Fascism triumphed in Spain not because of its internal strength, but because of the strength of its allies, and the treachery of the "democratic" friends of Spain.

We cannot agree with the absolute pacifists who now cry "They should not have fought." Such voices are heard after every defeat, and they are not always the voices of the sincere pacifists who adhere firmly to their belief in non-violent methods. To believe that without having fought, the working

class and democratic elements could have conserved their organizations and strength for a future struggle (this is the opinion of one prominent pacifist) is to believe that fascism is by nature democratic and conciliatory. Germany, where the workers did not fight, gives the answer to that.

The Spanish workers fought heroically so long as it appeared to them that a war was going on. But when all of Catalonia fell without a struggle, when it became obvious to them that no war was going on, that the government of Negrin and the Communists was engaged in a series of "strategic retreats" without any advances, they felt that the end had come and that further resistance would mean only more brutal revenge on the part of the fascists. The Communists will undoubtedly shout about the "betrayal" by which Madrid gave up without a fight. They will conveniently forget all the cities which they gave up without a fight, above all Barcelona, which really laid the basis for the later surrender of Madrid. Miaja is now the leader of the Fifth Column, but when he was jailing members of the P.O.U.M., helping the Communists take over the offices of the C.G.T., acting as the agent of the Communists in suppressing and confiscating the left Socialist press, and even arresting Largo Caballero, he was the hero of the civil war. The Communists might at the same time explain the sudden loss of interest in the outcome of the Spanish struggle in Russia after the Munich agreement, which also had its material results.

The final chapters of the Spanish struggle are not yet too clear. Whom did the Defense Council represent in its seizure of power? Was England the instigator? Is this part of Britain's plan to maneuver Italy and Germany out of Spain? One thing is certain however. The Negrin-Communist government had so little real support in Spain, that overnight the new group was able to seize power. And instead of the masses resenting this coup, they gave it their passive, if not active, support. And for the same reasons that this government lost the support of the masses, it also was unable to conduct the war. It was interested above all in the promotion of the factional interests of its constituent political groups. It was interested above all in a war against its opponents in the labor movement. And it waged that war to the exclusion of all else.

The Spanish civil war has ended and the workers the world over have suffered a terrific defeat. But if they profit by the lessons of this struggle, they will be able to turn defeat into victory in the not too distant future.

THE LAST SWALLOW

"In spite of the temporary relief of the masses that war did not immediately break out, the Socialist Party warns against any illusion that the Munich pact will for any length of time prevent war. The Munich pact, by strengthening the hands of the main imperialist war-mongers, by subjecting the small to the large nations and weakening their independent existence, by setting the yoke of exploitation more firmly on the shoulders of the masses and therefore giving the imperialist rulers a freer hand, makes war more likely."

This is what the Socialist Party National Executive Committee, meeting in Baltimore immediately following the Munich crisis, declared. Everything that has happened in the six months since Munich bear out the correctness of this statement, and above all the recent further advances of fascism in central Europe, marked by the complete seizure of what was left of Czechoslovakia.

In taking the last swallow of Czechoslovakia, Hitler was merely following the natural road of imperialist expansion, which far from being satisfied by "appeasement" becomes

hungrier. Imperialist expansion stops only when compelled to do so by a stronger force, and even then it continues by more indirect means. The "democratic" imperialist powers have up to now been "appeasing" fascism because they were more afraid of the social consequences inside their own and the fascist countries than they were of their imperialist rivalry. But now they are confronted with their product, which they must destroy or which will destroy them. So a war appears inevitable, but this time a war on a more equal basis. (Some well-informed people insist that a war between England-France and Germany-Italy might give the latter a victory, because the small countries have become so distrustful of the "democracies" that they might remain neutral or even help the fascists. Only the participation of Russia on the side of England and France would give the latter genuine preponderance, and this participation, they claim, is not at all a certainty.) But a policy of non-concessions would not have had any other results. Just as fascism inevitably sprang from the loins of the Versailles treaty in an effort by German imperialism to "find its place in the sun," so a war between a resurgent German imperialism and Anglo-French imperialism is also inevitable. Imperialist rivalries must lead to war. There is no other outlet, in the long run. That is why, in rejecting the Munich pact, the Socialist Party at the same time rejected the idea of a "democratic" war against fascism:

"Not by imperialist alliances, open or secret; not by concessions (usually at the expense of the small and weak nations and colonial people); not by support of the imperialist governments, democratic or fascist, can war be averted. Only by a vigorous and uncompromising fight against the capitalist system, the breeder of war, and for the cooperative commonwealth, can war and the threat of war be abolished."

BOUND VOLUMES

American Socialist Quarterly

American Socialist Monthly

Contain invaluable material on Socialist theory
and philosophy.

Articles by H. Kantorovitch not found elsewhere.

Resolutions and Discussions of
Socialist Conventions and Conferences.

No serious student of the labor movement
can afford to be without these books.

Only a few still available
Order at once from

SOCIALIST REVIEW

114 W. 14th STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

REVOLUTIONARY MORALS

(Continued from Page 9)

people) by the acts of Hitler.

The fact that Stalin executed scores of Red Army Generals who opposed his policy while Hitler only removed Reichwehr Generals who opposed him, gives the German no moral superiority over the Russian dictator. All categories of politicians in power—liberal, labor, conservative, reactionary, Social Democratic, Stalinist, and fascist—all justify their means by the professed end, and both means and ends are atrocious, and means and ends are interchangeable and interdependent. This does not prove that politics, power, or the conception that the means justifies the end, should necessarily be renounced as evil and false. Nor do similar or identical methods make Stalinism, Trotskyism, fascism, Social Democracy, and liberalism synonymous terms. Similarities, and differences, cannot be explained on moral grounds, but are illuminated by Marxism. Only a Marxist can understand the failure to date of the "Marxist" movement, and the triumph of fascism and Stalinism. Only with the guidance of the enlightening gleam of the searchlight of historical materialism can we find our way out of this miasmatic swamp.

Elementary moral precepts painfully worked out in the social evolution of mankind, which make collective cooperative life tolerable are apt to be forgotten, trampled under heel, during the bitterness of class war, imperialist war, revolution and civil war. Only in a relatively peaceful, expanding stage of any society is class conflict softened, social relations stabilized temporarily, and class collaboration, reformism, culture, and higher moral standards flourish. Like bourgeois democracy, bourgeois morals correspond to an epoch which is passing—the epoch of progressive, prosperous private capitalism. As capitalism decays, reaction, fascism, war, and economic stagnation bring an epidemic of bestiality; class antagonisms are sharpened, and fragile moral values are almost lost. Only when the proletariat triumphs will there be a renaissance of culture; a new morality will arise on the basis of the prosperity, peace, and brotherhood made possible by democratic Socialism.

Yet even in the midst of war it is the duty of the socialists to fight for democracy, and during civil war it is more than ever his duty to struggle for the preservation, insofar as conditions of war permit, of the human values which we treasure more than bread and gold. Otherwise there will emerge not Socialism but something like Stalinism or "national socialism", with workers enslaved under a State capitalism more cruel and tyrannous than private capitalism or feudalism. *In the coming struggle for power, all liberties will be lost unless revolutionists consciously fight for them.*

MARCH-APRIL, 1939

LATIN AMERICA

(Continued from Page 6)

American marines invade Latin American countries and act as bill collectors for unpaid interest and principal, but it is never to the interest of the exporter. Large debts reduce the ability of that country to buy our products. Also, a high standard of living is necessary for the growth of Latin America as a market for our goods, but high wages, low working hours, and good working conditions are opposed by those having direct investments in these countries.

The case of Mexico shows this quite clearly. The boycott carried on by American oil companies against the sale of oil from Mexico has decreased Mexico's ability to purchase goods in the United States. It has deprived American exporters of a market and has decreased the possibility of jobs for American workers. In fact, it has done even greater damage. It has increased Mexico's dependence upon the fascist powers and has thus increased fascist political and cultural influence in Mexico. While Roosevelt with a great deal of vehemence denounces totalitarianism and Hull talks against the menace of barter deals, American interests make it possible for Italy to build its powerful radio station over which fascist propaganda against the United States and against the democratic way of life is constantly broadcasted. These same American interests have increased the ability of the fascist powers to penetrate Latin American countries with free or very cheap news services to the detriment of American press services. As a result the news is heavily biased in favor of the totalitarian states. Nevertheless, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation sees nothing wrong in granting these same companies loans which they use to help fascist penetration. American cotton interests in Brazil and the fruit companies in Central America give lip service to Hull's reciprocal trade policies but blithely proceed to promote barter agreements for the sale of their products. Moreover, the United States, as has been demonstrated by competent students of the question, is helping to arm the very aggressor nations that are menacing our safety. France and Great Britain have helped the fascist powers in the same way and the fascist powers are themselves not averse to selling munitions to their enemies. Even the Soviet Union against whom the fascist powers are presumably building their Anti-Communist Front is not averse to playing this interesting game of tag.

The Latin Americans want to know why they can not participate in this great game. They are naive enough to believe that if trade with the fascist countries is good enough for the goose of the United States and the other democratic powers, it is also good for the gander of Latin America. That in no small measure explains why Roosevelt failed at Lima to build an anti-totalitarian bloc on this continent.

Hitler vs. Western Civilization

by David P. Berenberg

THERE have been countless attempts to "explain" the Nazi frame of mind, and there will be other efforts without number, even after the Nazi aberration passes into history. This is not surprising, in view of the scope of the Nazi infection, and the speed with which the disease is spreading from Germany through the rest of the world. That most of the explanations do not explain is not surprising either, since most of the expositors bring to their tasks an insufficient knowledge of the Nazi literature, too little understanding of history (and in particular of German history) and the habit of turning their own "isms" into the bed of Procrustes.

Aurel Kolnai possesses none of these disqualifications and therefore his book "The War Against the West" is far and away the most important book on the National Socialist Movement that has come into my hands. It is passionate while at the same time it remains coldly objective. It nails the Nazis to the cross of mankind's aversion and contempt with nails made from quotations from their own writing. Kolnai seems to have read everything that the Nazis have written, and everything that has been written about them. Nail after nail is chosen with a skill that amounts to genius. Here is no casual selection of phrases cut from context to pervert their meanings. Hundreds of paragraphs are given in full, until the total amounts to a resounding chorus of condemnation of the Nazis by the Nazis—provided, that is, that the reader is and remains a member of Western Civilization.

For it is Aurel Kolnai's theory that, whatever may have been the motives that actuated those who backed Hitler in his rise to power; whatever may have been in the minds and hearts of those members of the middle class and of the working class who constituted his majorities—the aim of the National Socialists is the destruction of Western Civilization, and the substitution for it of a society as Asiatic as the tyranny of the medieval oriental sultans.

The Nazis hate the West, and of course, they fear it. The West, as Kolnai defines it, is not a geographical expression. It is a world of ideas and a way of life based on these ideas. Chief among them are (1) the value of human life; (2) the worth of the individual, and as corollaries to these, (3) the importance of human happiness and (4) the importance of human freedom. All these values the Nazis reject *in toto*. Human life to them is as nothing when national and racial destinies are involved. The individual is only an item in an army, or a brick in the structure of the state. State and race are everything. To the Nazis happiness means only the victory of the state and of the race in the war of all upon all. And freedom, of which the Nazis do talk much, means to them merely the freedom of the favored state and race to fulfill its manifest destiny—which is not German world hegemony, but German *World Empire*.

Startling, and very revealing, is the proof that Kolnai furnishes, from quotation after quotation from Nazi authors, well-known and little-known (from men like Hitler, Goebbels and also from Stapel, Bluener, Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Stefan George, who in certain circles carry more weight than Hitler) that there is no such entity as the "human race". For H. S. Chamberlain the "human race" is a "senseless chaos of peoples. There are "human races", biological varieties of the *genus homo*, but no "human race". Some of these "races"

"The War Against the West", by Aurel Kolnai, New York, Viking Press, 711 pp., \$4.00.

are higher than others. They are not all of the same blood or descent. The "higher" are entitled to power over the others. "Lesser breeds without the law," to quote Kipling, who was an unconscious pre-Nazi, have no rights that the superiors are bound to observe. Even within the favored, and vastly "superior" Germanic race there are "primary" and "secondary" groups, which explain the "necessity" of the caste system.

Hence words like "equality" "democracy and "humanity" are hateful to the Nazis. They stand in the way of the victory of the "superior" race. They represent things that must be destroyed so that the chosen German race shall rule the world, and also that the German "primary" race,—the German lords and junkers, and their Nazi camp-followers, shall be able to rule over Germans at home in bright new uniforms, with rattling sabers, with brutal self-satisfaction on their faces.

For Kolnai makes it very clear that the Nazis are nothing new. Hitler, Goebbels and Goering may be "new men", but their ideas, and the classes they represent, are very old in Germany. National Socialism is not so much a reaction in favor of German Capitalism, as the German Capitalist has by this time learned, to his bitter disillusionment. It is a throw-back to the days of the Thirty Years' War, when the Junkers ruled. It is *Sturm and Drang*, but not in the sense in which Kinkel and Schurz understood that movement. It is the romantic reaction against modern thought. It is the resurrection of Kaiser Barbarossa's megalomaniac dream of European empire, now grown into the dream of World Empire. It is the violent reaction of the German aristocracy to the ideas and the ideals of the French Revolution, with its slogan of "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality." They have never been reconciled, the Junkers, to this slogan. They never will be. It is the expression of the inferiority complex engendered in the 19th century by the vision of the British and French empires. It is a synthesis of all these things into a vast wave of hatred for the West—the democratic West, the humane West, the West of "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality." It is a mad desire to destroy that West and all it stands for, and to substitute a German world.

"Am deutschen Wesen

Soll einst die ganze Welt genesen."

Freely translated this means that some day the whole world will be cured of its ills through German greatness. Schiller wrote these words long before there was thought of the Nazis, yet the seed of Nazism is in them. And back in the forties Heine, who was not for a moment fooled by the German romantic movement, warned the world that some day the Germans would break loose and would smash the Western civilization which they so completely misunderstood, and which they hated in direct proportion to their failure to grasp it.

All the unlovely manifestations of the Nazi movement spring from its central doctrine—the inequality of races, and the right of the "superior" to rule the "inferior". Persecution of the Jews, the "rescue of racial brothers" from the Czechs, the drive to the East to find "Lebensraum" (room to live in) for Germans at the expense of the inferior Slavs, the brutal campaigns of hatred against freedom of thought, the suppression of science, the enslavement of the arts, the lies spread about the West—all stem from one root.

It must not be imagined that alliances with Italy, with Japan, with Franco mean that the Nazis have here compromised with their ideal of Germanic superiority. On the contrary, these alliances are gestures of contempt. Use the "inferior" races in the

BOOKS

MUSSOLINI'S PAST AND PRESENT

"Mussolini Red and Black", by Armando Borghi, New York. Freie Arbeiter Stimme, 208 pp., 75c. Translated by Dorothy Daudley.

THE systematic eradication of historical facts by the omnipotent and unscrupulous adventurers who rule the dictatorial countries of our day is one of the most appalling of their black crimes. Yet they pursue this practice with impunity. Strangely enough, for various reasons, even the opponents of dictatorships and dictators unwittingly aid and abet in the commission of this unpardonable offense against history. It is therefore a great relief to read this book of Borghi's, for it is one of the very few authentic documents that restore the facts about Mussolini in their true light and in their true relation to the succession of events that have made him the originator of Fascism.

Because, unlike Hitler, he had to betray his past and his better self, Mussolini is more concerned than Hitler with suppressing the truth. The great psychological value of Borghi's book is that he restores these elementary truths by marshalling the facts and interpreting them in their original unbroken sequence, so that the reader is able to judge for himself every step of the way. When we consider that Italian Fascism is the key to the understanding of all other Fascisms and that even the finest of the critical studies of Fascism while helping us to understand the social trends fail dismally as far as the psychological causality is concerned, Borghi's unpretentious little book assumes real importance. Even the most scholarly books on Fascism, those with the most complete chronology of trends and events, lack a certain insight into the nature of Fascism, always contain an arbitrary causality, a kind of wild guess in the dark, which leads perforce to misinterpretation and encourages the creation

war against the immediate enemy and turn on your erstwhile allies later! The Germans, like the English, have played this game before. Honor? The superior German has no obligation of honor to lesser peoples. The inferiors are not "*satisfaktionsfaebig*". This is a convenient idea. It means that you can do with an inferior, let us say, a Jew, as you wish, and then you can refuse to meet him in a duel, or in a court of law, on the ground that he is an inferior. This idea is the finest flower of German chivalry. It will be applied in time to the Italian and Japanese allies of Germany.

And the end?

The Germans can envisage only one end: That which Stapel predicts, when the last strip of earth is conquered by the Germans, and the German victor, kneeling before his God, crowns himself ruler of the world.

Of course, the non-Nazi world sees other possibilities. The majority of Germans, who even now are *not* Nazis, may come to their senses and root out the disease. Or the Nazis may bite off more than they can chew, and launch a war they cannot finish. Or their obliging allies, Japan and Italy may not so easily yield to the idea that they are not "*satisfaktionsfaebig*", or the machine that the Nazis have built, may prove to be jerry-built, and may collapse of its own weakness.

Whatever the outcome, and in any event, until the Nazi germ spreads over the world, (if it ever does!) Kolnai's book, which is not light summer reading, is a "must" for every Socialist, and for every person who wishes to know what is happening in this strange world, which more and more comes to resemble the world that Alice strayed into when she walked through the looking glass.

MARCH-APRIL, 1939

of myths and legends. That is exactly what is wrong with most books on Fascism and the dictators, for that is the sort of thing the dictators desire.

The proponents of Fascism see Mussolini as the miraculous savior of their own privileged position in society. They therefore create him in the image of their own ideal of what their savior ought to be. That of course has nothing to do with the facts and is most unrevealing of Mussolini as he really is. That portrait of him is most flattering to him and he allows it to be circulated in his own domain. Outside of Italy the press, being controlled by the privileged strata of society, collaborates in spreading these concoctions of fancy as the only true portrayal of the prototype for the savior-to-be in their own respective countries. The legend grows. Nothing succeeds like success. Mussolini towers in the full effulgence of his legends as a colossus endowed with superhuman will, superhuman intelligence, superhuman shrewdness. And sad to relate, even the most democratic of proletarians succumb to these falsehoods, blinded by this effulgence of Mussolini decked in the tinsel of these legends. They say that after all Mussolini must have some outstanding qualities to be where he is. And subconsciously they respect him for these "some outstanding qualities" without probing too deeply into their nature, for it is part training in the capitalistic society and part of human frailty to *worship power*.

It is at this stage of the thinking process that Borghi's book performs its unique service. Borghi has known Mussolini personally since his obscure youth in Romagna. Of the same age, they began their careers as revolutionaries at the same time. Until Mussolini turned traitor on the war issue and actually sold out for so many pieces of silver, Borghi and Mussolini participated in the Italian labor movement even though their political programs varied. On the basis of this intimate knowledge of Mussolini, Borghi reveals him in the full panoply of the weaknesses and neuroses, the all-consuming ambition and voracious vindictiveness of a man plagued by an inferiority complex which form the true character of this average Italian pseudo-intellectual. The value of Borghi's book is that he presents Mussolini in the prosaic daylight of the sordid corruptions on which he grew like a mushroom, a *fungus*.

The publication of Borghi's "Mussolini Red and Black" is very timely; the book has to be read very carefully by all those who want to know what fascism and fascists are.

—ANGELICA BALABANOFF.

AN ELOQUENT PLEA FOR WAR

"Men Must Act", by Lewis Mumford, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 176 pp., \$1.50.

THOSE who know Lewis Mumford through his works of literary and artistic criticism are aware that his is a passionate nature—quick to conclude and staunch in the defense of his conclusions. Possessing as he does, impeccable artistic judgment and a facile pen, his works in that field are a distinguished contribution to American criticism.

Mr. Mumford's attention is now directed to the menace to western civilization represented by the militant fascist states. He is a lover and student of the best values of our cultural heritage and the attack upon them by Mussolini and Hitler rouses him to a heroic fury, which while it does credit to his emotions, leaves his critical faculties in pitiable state.

His little book entitled "Men Must Act" is a call to arms, (as he terms it). It is a rousing yodel to lovers of democracy in the U. S. to rally 'round the standard of "Non Intercourse with Fascist Countries" and incidentally to build up a professional army of six hundred thousand fighters. His modest

request should leave even the Army General Staff breathless. There is this to be said, however, Mr. Mumford recognizes that a policy of "Non Intercourse" entails the possibility of a fight; hence the six hundred thousand.

This book is merely the eloquent manifestation of a frame of mind shared by a number of good people. A hatred and contempt of fascism, whipped to a white heat by the Munich events, combined with a complete disregard for the ordinary political and economic realities.

It is a melancholy fact but nevertheless a true one that no amount of moral indignation will take the place of sober thought. Until this fine fervor is hitched to a pedestrian analysis of modern capitalist states and the forces working for and against the emancipation of labor, it is more likely to be a hindrance than a help.

While it is true that lip service is paid here and there to the economic compulsions which bring about wars, this is chiefly in regard to wars of the past. Mr. Mumford sees that our participation in the last war was for "shabby" imperialist ends—well, has the nature of our state changed?

There is no need to labor the point—as a program for America, no matter how loftily motivated the plan of this book if carried out in the present state of American political and economic society, would play directly into the hands of our own imperialists—not to say fascists.

—DAVID FELIX

HOW LAWS ARE MADE

"Pressures on the Legislature of New Jersey", by Dayton David McKean, New York, Columbia University Press., 251 pp., \$2.75.

THE most surprising fact about this book is that it was written by a former New Jersey assemblyman, a feat which most citizens in these parts thought surely beyond the powers of the Garden State's Monday-night legislators. Of course, nothing emanating from or about New Jersey can any longer cause more than a lifted eyebrow—even a literate politician.

Since legislative bodies do not legislate in a vacuum, conflicting trends and groups are concerned. Interested parties sponsor, oppose or seek to change legislation, cajole, pressure or pay legislators. Lobbying and pressuring have become an accepted part of political life, though certain flagrantly illegal aspects like bribery are now frowned upon even in New Jersey. Nevertheless more subtle forms of "taking care" of legislators can be used by corporations, such as retaining fees for lawyers who happen to be assemblymen. Unfortunately, Mr. McKean is not too specific on such matters, although he presents a careful study of the more public forms of pressure like the Manufacturers' Association's News Letters and the demonstrations of organized unemployment.

He describes in some detail the organization, methods and successes of leading pressure groups from the Chamber of Commerce and State Federation of Labor to the Audubon Society. A section on the sales tax which was imposed several years ago is well worth reading. It not only traces events, but also indicates how pressure groups work on a specific question, how campaign promises are made and broken and how Hague made his famous (or infamous) deal with Hoffman.

But there are no startling revelations. It is not a book which "tells all", though there are passing references to odd tidbits about which most citizens are unaware. Virtually all of the pressure groups have their counterparts in other states. The more reactionary ones are undoubtedly less influential elsewhere but then New Jersey has always been steeped in corruption. Public Service Corporation still remains a shadowy figure which

the author does nothing to clear up.

If New Jersey is worse—and it is—it is only in quantitative terms. But where else could a law, passed by the assembly at its last session, not become a law because a light-fingered assemblyman swiped it from the clerk's table? That story, Mr. McKean "has reason to believe", is not fiction.

—M. F.

WAGE-HOUR LEGISLATION

"How To Operate Under the Wage-Hour Law", by Alexander Feller and Jacob E. Hurwitz. 248 pp. N. Y. Alexander Publishing Company. \$3.50.

This is the second, more limited, hence better manual brought out by lawyers Feller and Hurwitz. Their first book advised employers on "How To Deal With Organized Labor". This book confines itself to the problem of Wage-Hour legislation and the new Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The authors have set down as clearly and as objectively as possible the legal scope and extent of the new law, its administration and its relation to interstate commerce. They venture what seems to me to be one fair prediction: the traditional notions of inter *vs.* intra state commerce, and the correlative ideas of States' rights, will gradually disappear as Congress extends the meaning of commerce to "cover all industrial activity in the fields of production, distribution and marketing".

Together with the full text of the present Act, the appendices cite sufficient legal analogy and rules of procedure to warrant the opinion that this book is a useful manual for labor lawyers and trade union officials who will have to take the maximum of care to insure to workers the little protection afforded by the Act itself.

—FRANK TRAGER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

A History of American Foreign Relations, by Louis Martin Sears. 12 mo. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. \$3.50 Third edition, revised and enlarged.

Refugees, by Sir John Hope Simpson. Paper covers. New York: Oxford University Press. \$1.25. The preliminary report of a survey for the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

The School for Dictators, by Ignazio Silone. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.50. A discussion of dictatorship. Translated from the Italian.

American Labor, by Herbert Harris. 8vo. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press. \$3.75. A history from colonial times to the present.

The Age of Reform: 1815-1870, by E. L. Woodward. 8vo. New York: Oxford University Press. \$6. A volume in the Oxford History of England.

Farm Credit in Canada, by W. T. Easterbrook. 8vo. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, United States distributors for the University of Toronto Press. \$2.50. A study in Canadian agricultural history.

A Theory of Value, by John R. Reid. 304 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.

The Stranger at the Gate, by T. J. Haarhoff. 12mo. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$5. Aspects of exclusiveness and cooperation in ancient Greece and Rome, with some reference to modern times.

The Black Man in White America, by John G. Van Deusen. 8vo. Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, 1,538 Ninth Street, N. W. \$3.25. A study of the Negro's status in the United States.

NOW FULL NEWSPAPER SIZE
BETTER THAN EVER

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

LILLIAN SYMES

TRAVERS CLEMENT

GUS TYLER

McALISTER COLEMAN

HARRY W. LAIDLER

DEVERE ALLEN

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.

DEBS LABOR SCHOOL

SPRING TERM 1939

1. The Socialist Movement and Fascism.

Instructor:
Angelica Balabanoff

Monday Evenings
9-10:30

2. Labor and the American Scene.

Instructor:
Harry W. Laidler

Friday Evenings
7-8:30

3. What Socialists Face Today.

Instructor:
Frank N. Trager

Saturday Evenings
4-5:30

4. Economics of American Industry.

Instructors: Lewis Corey, Jack Barbash, Will
Chasan, Justus Ebert and others. Monday Evenings
7:30-9

5. Practical Problems of Unionism.

Instructors: Theresa Wolfson, Sidney Hertz-
berg, Murray Gross,
Joel Seidman and others. Saturday Afternoons
4-5:30

6. Currents in Socialist Thought.

Instructor:
Herbert Zam

Monday Evenings
(Time to be announced)

7. Propaganda Analysis and Techniques.

Instructors: Joseph Atkins and Aaron Levenstein Monday Evenings
7:30-9

Classes Now Going On — Write For Catalogue

DEBS LABOR SCHOOL

114 WEST 14th STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Telephone CH 2 - 9266

LAST CHANCE!

This offer Ends April 20th

\$1⁵⁰ for a \$10⁰⁰ book

50 cents for a \$3⁵⁰ book

GOVERNMENT BY JUDICIARY

By Louis B. Boudin

2 Volumes — 1161 Pages

Originally \$10.00

OUR SPECIAL OFFER

No. 1

12 issues Socialist Review
and these two volumes

BOTH FOR \$2.00!

KARL MARX: MAN AND FIGHTER

By Boris Nicolaievsky
and Otto Maenchen-Helfen

392 Pages

Originally \$3.50

OUR SPECIAL OFFER

No. 2

12 issues Socialist Review
and this splendid book

BOTH FOR \$3.00!

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS EXCEPTIONAL OFFER AT ONCE!

SOCIALIST REVIEW,
301 WEST 29TH STREET,
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$3.00 covering my subscription for 12 issues and "Government by Judiciary";
or \$2.00 for 12 issues and "Karl Marx: Man and Fighter."

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....