

# **SOCIALIST REVIEW**

September - October, 1939

Vol. 6 - - - - No. 12

15 cents

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

---

## **THE WAR IN EUROPE**

**STATEMENT BY THE SOCIALIST PARTY**

Articles by

**HERBERT ZAM**

**LILLIAN SYMES**

**HAROLD E. FEY**

1 1 1

### **After the Soviet Munich**

*The Significance of the Stalin-Hitler Pact*

**HERBERT ZAM**

### **The Challenge of 1940**

*Socialism and the Presidential Campaign.*

**TRAVERS CLEMENT**

### **The Need for Labor Unity**

*Must the C.I.O.-A.F.L. war go on?*

**JOEL SEIDMAN**

### **Roosevelt and Latin America**

*The "Good Neighbor" policy at work.*

**S. FANNY SIMON**

### **Progressive Mexico, Backward U. S. A.**

*A Discussion of Mexico and the Southern States.*

**CLARENCE SENIOR**

### **British Policy in Palestine**

*Imperialism, Zionism and Socialism.*

**BEZALEL SHERMAN**

### **Contradictions of Fascism**

*Can fascism be overthrown?*

**OTTO BAUER**

Next issue of the  
**SOCIALIST REVIEW**

will contain articles on  
**THE EUROPEAN CRISIS**

by  
**Devere Allen**  
NOW IN EUROPE

**AMERICAN POLITICS  
MOBILIZES**

by  
**Norman Thomas**

**THE CASE FOR  
CULTURAL FREEDOM**

by  
**Sidney Hook**

**THE SPANISH REVOLUTION  
IN RETROSPECT**

by  
**Carlos Hernandez**  
Former Member of Cortez

OTHER TIMELY AND BRILLIANT ARTICLES

To make sure you get this issue

**SUBSCRIBE NOW**

12 Issues for only \$1.50

**SOCIALIST REVIEW**

114 W. 14th Street

New York, N. Y.

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.

**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, David Clendennin, Robert Delson, Harry W. Laidler, V. Miller, David Paul, Theodore Shapiro, S. Fanny Simon, Frank Trager.

VOLUME SIX

SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER, 1939

NUMBER TWELVE

## Against the Imperialist War

The Socialist Party of the United States, through its National Executive Committee, issues the following statement on the European war and America's present duty:

**A** GAIN, for the second time in less than a generation, Europe is in the grip of a war which brings sorrow and loss to all mankind. Upon the nations involved in it will be heaped immeasurable suffering, and individual and social demoralization.

The immediate occasion of this conflict is the resort to armed force by the German dictator, fanatical leader of a cult which has proclaimed to the world its intolerance, its brutality and its glorification of bad faith. The anger of workers throughout the world and of all decent people is justifiably directed at Hitler and his fascist clique for unleashing the vast Nazi war machine.

But great as is Hitler's guilt, it does not follow that this war is a conflict between dictatorship and democracy. Still less is it true, as many voices are already proclaiming, that it is a war which springs out of some biological quality of evil inherent in the people in the fascist countries which can only be dealt with by crushing those people under the heel of the virtuous English and French.

On the contrary, all the great empires were acquired and are maintained by force and fraud. Hitler's peculiar wickedness in the minds of many, derives largely from the fact that he treats minority groups of the white race which have fallen under his power as older imperialisms have treated the colored races of Africa, Asia and America.

What we are witnessing now is a new and brutal chapter in the long conflict of rival imperialisms and opposing sets of national interest. The first World War grew out of that conflict. Allegedly—and by thousands of individuals sincerely—it was fought to end war, and make the world safe for democracy. The capitalist democracies, professing these ideals, won the war, and made the peace of Versailles which, at the time, we Socialists denounced as a peace to prepare new wars. This peace, in order to maintain the status quo and British and French imperial supremacy, increased the

disorganization of Eastern Europe and created the resentment which was exploited by Hitler to develop his empire. The nature of his fascist imperialism and German acceptance of it were determined by the pressure of rival imperialisms upon the German people and by the internal failure of capitalist democracy to provide jobs and security.

The Powers now at war with German fascism contributed to its rise. They shared the guilt of the fascist dictators in the rape of Ethiopia; the conquest of democratic Spain, and the destruction of Czechoslovakia. A year ago Poland, now the symbol of resistance to forcible aggression, played jackal to the Nazi lion, and by aggression, not agreement, took her share of booty at the partitioning of Czechoslovakia. What finally brought Chamberlain and Daladier to their present stand was the necessity of defending their empires. Under these circumstances, regardless of our relative sympathy for the belligerents, truth compels us to insist that the victory of one set rather than the other will no more solve Europe's problem or the problem of Colonial peoples in 1939 than in 1918.

It is perhaps the most lamentable part of the present tragedy that the international working class movement was neither able to prevent the crisis nor can it now confront a war-mad Europe with a positive and powerful program of peace and justice. Its failure does not imply a betrayal or abandonment of Socialism. It is the result of the various weak or inadequate policies followed by a divided international working class movement since the first World War.

The Third International developed in Russia under a totalitarian government, a state capitalism which ultimately became enough like the Nazi system to permit an alliance of mutual convenience between two unscrupulous dictators.

Certain of the parties connected with the Second



International put too much hope for peace in a capitalist League of Nations, organized to protect the status quo. They failed effectively to fight the imperialism of their own countries or to advance to the extent of their ability the freedom to Colonial peoples. In certain cases they took office in the capitalist democracies without sufficient power or adequate program to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment. Failures and mistakes such as these contributed to the present situation in which many European Socialists feel that they have no choice except the lesser of the two evils. It is not for us to denounce the immediate choices of our European Comrades in their present terrible dilemma, but it is our duty to insist that international Socialism will have perished in the house of its friends unless it can present to the masses of Europe a basis for peace not to be found in the military triumph of any imperialist nations.

**The men and forces responsible for this war must not make the peace. The peace must not be written by the Hitlers, Stalins, Mussolinis, Chamberlains or Daladiers, and the varied interests for which they are spokesmen, but rather by the people of Europe. The peace to be lasting must establish a United States of Europe in which exploitation, whether by the private capitalism of the western democracies or the collective capitalism of the totalitarian states, shall be abolished.**

This great end will not be won by putting the United States into the war. Roosevelt's war would not cure what Wilson's war did so much to cause. The American Government, under Wilson, tried to play God to Europe by means of war, and failed. Neither then nor in this crisis has the American Government the wisdom or the power to deal with the bewildering power politics of Europe. The extraordinary duplicity of Stalin's deal with Hitler has had, and is likely to have, its counterparts in other shifts of purpose and alliance which America will not prevent.

Yet there are men and forces already at work to put America into war. We applaud the President's statement of his purpose and desire to keep America out of war. To accomplish it requires, of course, more than words in praise of peace. We must wage peace. If we want to keep out of war we must keep out of the roads that lead to war. Those roads are an American imperialism; a resort to armament economics; a pursuit of a dangerous temporary prosperity out of the profits of war trade instead of organizing to conquer our own poverty at home. If we would keep out of war we must build a resistance to foreign propaganda and to our own emotionalism. Our justified anger at Hitler's crimes must not render us incapable of analyzing the relation of the means of international war and its cost to the end

we wish to achieve.

Never was it more important than now to struggle to maintain and increase civil liberties and the rights of workers; to promote racial fraternity at home; and to prevent the militarization of our own youth in CCC camps or elsewhere. We look with apprehension on such developments as Jesse Jones' announcement that despite the Johnson Law our RFC can find ways to loan money to aid the war trade of the allies. We view with even greater apprehension the War Department's blueprints for the regimentation of America in new war, and the powerful place given to Wall Street, particularly to Morgan men in the various commissions which are making plans for the organization of industry in war.

The American people can keep out of war, but only if they assert their power to control their own destiny; to vote on their own wars; to find their prosperity in production of peace and not in war trade.

**It is a dangerous error which may contribute to the coming of war to believe that American participation in war can be limited. This is impossible. Our entry into war would probably take our boys under conscription by the millions to Europe and even Asia. It would immediately bring us military fascism. Our liberties had a narrow escape in the first World War and they will fare even less well in the second. Our first duty to the ideal of democracy, as well as to the interests of 130,000,000 men, women, and children, is to keep America out of war. To this task the Socialist Party summons the American people.**

It is a task consistent with our best service to mankind. Only in an America at peace can the masses make democracy work so well that it can inspire our brethren in the rest of the world to new faith in it. Only in an America at peace can we offer the maximum possible succor to the victims of Europe's madness. It is an America at peace which can best offer to the world help in those conferences which will lead to peace, disarmament, economic readjustment, justice to minorities and to exploited Colonial peoples the world around. It is from an America at peace that citizens can best give their aid to underground movements of the workers for democracy and peace. It is to those movements, weak as they may be in the first days of war, but which war of itself will nurture, that we must look for the triumph of the peoples of Europe over the forces which would destroy them.

**To the great task of keeping America out of war and of cooperating with those constructive forces which eventually will put war out of the world that the Socialist Party pledges itself and its members. In that task it seeks the support of all men and women of good will.**



# The New Imperialist War

by Herbert Zam

SUPPOSE in 1918, it was not the German workers who overthrew the Kaiser. Suppose it was a clique of reactionary militarists, big industrialists and political demagogues who then established a military totalitarian dictatorship, destroyed whatever remnants of democracy and labor organization were still in existence, reorganized the entire economy of the country for war purposes and compelled the entire populace to make new, unmatched sacrifices to carry on the war. Suppose, under this organization, Germany then began to score military successes: it marched into the Austrian Empire, which had disintegrated and annexed it to Germany; won back those portions of Austria which had been conquered by the allies and even marched deep into enemy territory; reconquered those portions of German territory which in the previous years had been taken by the allies. Suppose at this point, a person who had heretofore opposed the war on the grounds that it was an imperialist war on both sides, now insisted that the changes which had taken place in Germany changed the character of the war—it continued an imperialist war on the part of Germany, but on the part of the allies, it had become a democratic, a progressive, even a revolutionary war, and that success for the allies was desirable because an allied victory would result in overthrowing the new Germany dictatorship. Would any intelligent person take such arguments seriously?

And yet, these exactly are the arguments made by many people, who concede that the world war of 1914-18 was an imperialist war, but the new world war of 1939—? is something different, because Hitler is not the Kaiser!

The world war which apparently ended in 1918, almost re-commenced on at least three occasions. It almost began again when the militarist elements, dissatisfied with the Versailles peace, staged the famous Kapp putsch in Berlin. It was unsuccessful. It threatened again when Hitler staged his beer-hall putsch in Munich. It almost began again when the French occupied the Ruhr. In fact, on the occasion of the French occupation of the Ruhr, there were some revolutionists who declared that Germany should be supported if war should break out, because the French invasion was an act of aggression, and Germany was in the role of an invaded country losing its independence. However, at that time, even the Communist International decided that the occupation of the Ruhr was a *continuation of the world war*, that if war resulted, it would be merely another chapter in the war, and no change of policy was needed!

In essence, the war which has just broken out is a continuation of the world war, is an imperialist war

just as the one in 1914-18 was. The lapse of twenty years between the end of the last one and the beginning of the present one has not changed their essential character. This is the essential feature of the present European war. There are other factors of course; the totalitarian regime in Germany is a factor; the invasion of Poland is a factor. But these are all subsidiary, incidental factors, which by themselves would never bring about a world war.

It is the clash of rival imperialisms, of the Anglo-French empires on one side and the new German empire on the other which has caused the present outbreak of the European war. It is not the defense of the independence of Poland which brought France and England into the war. Had they decided to stand by their pledges to Czechoslovakia last year, the war might have broken out then. But at that time Poland would have been on the other side, since it was one of the countries which fell upon Czechoslovakia and helped Hitler dismember it. Last year Poland was an ally of Hitler. Today it is an ally of the "enemies" of Hitler. Germany is of course *immediately* responsible for the outbreak of the war as a result of the invasion of Poland, made possible in turn by the Stalin-Hitler alliance. For twenty years the German capitalists have been preparing for a big effort to regain their place in the imperialist world scheme. A considerable part of this preparation was the suppression of the working class, the labor movement and the consolidation of the totalitarian dictatorship, and in this they received the support of the capitalists of England, and also of France. But when the effort turned from inner consolidation and suppression of the working class to activities in the world market, to imperialist activities which could only be carried out at the expense of other imperialists, then the capitalist governments of England and France began to fight back. But the fight for a "place in the sun" begun by Junker imperialism in 1914 is precisely the same as the one begun today by fascist imperialism. Superficially, Germany is the aggressor, because it is the "dissatisfied" imperialist. France and England are satisfied with the maintenance of the status quo, because in it they have the lion's share of the booty. But in a world where the struggle for the division and re-division of the imperialist booty is constantly going on, there must always be satisfied and dissatisfied powers, because there can never be enough to go around. Therefore while Nazi Germany is immediately responsible for the outbreak of the war, basically, the imperialist world system is responsible. So long as an England can "own" an India, so long as France can "own" an Algeria, so



long as Belgium can "own" a Congo, so long will other imperialist powers covet them and therefore so long will there be war.

The present struggle is an imperialist struggle, as was the one of 1914-18. It is a struggle to determine which imperialist empire, or combination shall dominate the entire world. The Versailles treaty gave Anglo-French imperialism hegemony for twenty years. It tried

to stifle German imperialist ambitions, but it tried even more to stifle the working class anti-imperialist movements. Now the entire Versailles system has collapsed, as it was bound to collapse, and as all future imperialist treaties collapse. Imperialism will continue to operate in a vicious cycle of wars, treaties, new alliances, new wars. The only solution is the overthrow of the system of imperialism, not the defeat of one imperialist power.

## The War and the Communists

by Lillian Symes

**D**IFFICULT indeed is the life of a Communist fellow-traveller these days as he tries to adjust himself to the mad gyrations of the official party line. The Stalin-Hitler pact was bad enough, but the outbreak of the war has complicated things a thousand times over. For the three days after the signing of the pact, all the Communists had to do was close their eyes and shout loudly: "It is a move for peace." This was the official line of the party and of those fellow travellers who were not struck completely dumb. The American *Daily Worker* explained that the pact was aimed at the "Munichmen of Fascism" and was a blow at the axis powers. The *Tribune*, a London stooge weekly and ardent pro-peoples front advocate, headlined the pact as "*Soviet Peace Move*," blamed Chamberlain for its consummation (if it's a step to peace, why should anyone be blamed?) and continued:

"A pact of non-aggression between Russia and Germany . . . will be a great reinforcement for peace in Eastern Europe. At the same time it is a lie to suggest that it leaves Germany a free hand against Poland or anyone else."

Even as late as September 5 Earl Browder, testifying before the Dies Committee, declared that he "was quite happy" over the Stalin-Hitler pact.

But when the war actually broke out, when Hitler began the offensive against Poland, when the bombing of Polish cities got under way, when England and France, finally lived up to their treaty obligations as the communist leaders and the Soviet regime had been demanding for many months could the communists continue characterizing the pact as a "peace pact"?

An examination of the time-table of the week preceding the actual outbreak of the war throws some light on the relationship between the Stalin-Hitler alliance and the outbreak of the war. Immediately upon the announcement in Berlin of the signing of the pact, the Hitler campaign against Poland took on that peculiar vehemence which precedes all aggressive activities of the Nazis. However, no overt action was taken.

What was Hitler waiting for? The pact had not yet been ratified by the Soviet Congress. Finally, this "most democratic" of all bodies, *without discussion*, unanimously ratified the pact. *This was Thursday, August 31, at 12:45 p.m.* Exactly twelve hours later, *Friday, September 1, at 12:45 a.m.* the Nazi troops began the march into Poland. Is it possible to miss the connection?

Now that the war is on, what are the Communists doing about it? The Communist International (may it rest in peace) is silent. The British communists are supporting the Chamberlain government in the war. The French communists are supporting their Daladier government and the press is full of jingoist articles. The Polish communists? Their blood is crying out against Stalin's treachery, for it was just a year ago that Stalin executed or imprisoned the entire leadership of the Polish Communist party and dissolved the party. Did Stalin do this because he was already planning the alliance with Hitler and didn't want to be embarrassed by Polish communists asking why they had been sold out?

The American party, after combatting the "Keep America Out of War" movement as a "fascist scheme," has suddenly made an apparent about-face and is urging that "America stay out of war," even organizing demonstrations around this slogan. It is collecting money for the good cause, and the *Daily Worker* howls: "The need now is for the greatest possible activity to mobilize the entire American people to keep this country out of war." How long will this remain the policy? They are vehement against "the plotters of a new Munich and their Trotzkyite and Lovestonite agents" but continue to endorse the Soviet Munich which insured Czechoslovakia's fate for Poland. At the same time, they want "United States and Latin American initiative, *in collaboration with the Soviet Union*, for a world peace conference." But, in a total of 26 slogans issued by the Party Central Committee, there is *not one* calling for the *defeat* of Germany. There is only a general phrase about the defeat of fascist aggression



through an "embargo upon Japan and Germany". This coupling of Japan with Germany at a time when Germany is *actually* at war while Japan is still "neutral" is very significant, and even more significant is the listing of Japan *first*, ahead of Germany, in this slogan. But there is no slogan calling for an embargo upon Germany by *all* "democratic" countries, *including the Soviet Union*, which has just concluded an extensive trade agreement with Germany, and which is prepared to sell Germany (for cash?) unlimited food and other raw materials.

That the Stalin-Hitler pact is an agreement for *peace with fascism*—not merely for peace between Russia and Germany—is indicated in the slogans adopted by the Young Communists of Russia for International Youth Day. There is not a single *anti-fascist* slogan among them. There is not a single *anti-German* slogan. There is not even a demand for the liberation of Communists

from the Nazi concentration camps! Even last year's simple greeting to the German Communists has been dropped. That this is not an accident is indicated by the slogans of the American communist central committee. In 26 slogans, occupying two-thirds of a double column in the *Daily Worker*, September 5, page 1, *the words fascism and Nazism are not mentioned. Hitler is not mentioned. Mussolini is not mentioned!*

This sudden dropping of the fight against fascism coincides with the Nazi dropping of the fight against Bolshevism. In fact, Hitler speaks in almost loving terms of his "friend" the Soviet Union, with whom he is at "complete peace". Thus, the Stalin-Hitler pact has already resulted in a Nazi-Communist peace. The Nazi-Communist war was a sham battle for many years, anyway. Now that they have an armistice, perhaps the workers will be able to see who is really fighting the fascists.

---

## A Sit-Down Strike Against War

The Pacifist Point of View

by Harold E. Fey

(Executive Secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation)

THE destructiveness of mechanized general war will almost certainly destroy the economic and social basis for any decent world society. The organization of nations on totalitarian lines, which the laws of military science require for efficiency in modern war, will complete the annihilation of world community as such by destroying the world spirit, the international mind. War such as that seen overseas brings chaos, revolution, anarchy. As whole continents revert again to warring tribal groups dominated by the primitive dictator-leader who always appears in eras of political and social decadence, the only faith which will remain outside the catacombs will be the worship of the tribe, the pagan religion of nationalism. Pacifists have more than adequate reason to make common cause with all others who oppose the suicide of civilization in war and the destruction of democracy in totalitarianism.

These reasons receive powerful support in the death within the past fortnight of the last semblance of democracy in Europe. The imperialist purposes of the fascist powers, made effective by their preparedness for total war, first undermined French democracy, which abandoned freedom in order to perfect the protection of its empire. The Paris correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* months ago wrote that the events leading to a self-perpetuating government by decree in France would have attracted the attention of the whole world

had this period not been one of unparalleled crises, but that the fact that democracy was dead in France could no longer be disputed. Today the government of Great Britain also rules by edict, democratic rights of freedom of speech, press and assembly are gone, the Home Secretary can arrest and imprison with the same impunity as Hitler or Stalin, the Government has set up and financed an official dope factory like other ministries of propaganda and universal conscription from 18 to 45 gives it unlimited power over the lives of its citizens. Its control over trade, education and religion is absolute.

We must not permit ourselves to be deceived into believing that powers acquired during this war by the Tory rulers of Britain will be automatically surrendered when war is over, or that denials of freedom are meaningless simply because they are not immediately exercised. The larger nations of Europe are *without exception* totalitarian today because each has chosen either to acquire or to maintain empire by means of force or threat of force. So long as these objectives and these methods prevail, American religionists will together face the problem of saving not only peace but religion and freedom in a world whose religion is the pagan nationalism of caesar worship.

We pacifists of America know that our work is cut out for us. The white war of nerves, conducted in an effort to win the objectives of power politics by threats,



has overreached itself and become the red war of bombs. Mass armies are on the march. Mass propagandas are on the wing. The neuroses of nations have become the contagious madness of collective murder.

Every effort will of course be made by belligerents to involve other countries. These efforts will focus on our own nation, whose powerful intervention will again be expected to be decisive. But pacifists know how wars begin and end. We know the long history of disillusionment which marks attempts to achieve good and overcome evil by wholesale slaughter, destruction and lying. We therefore have a mission to proclaim to our nation that its high destiny is to maintain ironclad neutrality, uprooting war by attacking injustices and insecurities at home, extending democracy by letting the people decide by the war referendum on the question on which the future of democracy depends, saving civilization by keeping one island of peace and sanity in a world gone mad.

To other countries it is our responsibility continu-

ously to declare that both victor and vanquished lose in modern war, that even when nations win they are defeated, that peace without victory is the only hope of preventing a universal reversion to barbarism. We also owe it to them to organize the neutral states into an agency for continuous mediation, letting world organization grow out of the process of actually making peace instead of another dictated Versailles.

We pacifists call upon the church to reaffirm in this hour its often repeated declarations that war is sin against the God of love, that hatred and slaughter is impossible between brothers. If our own country becomes involved, pacifists must be prepared to live up, through refusal to sanction or participate in war, to the religious faith that evil can be overcome only by good, that brotherhood involves penitence for wrongs done, forgiveness for wrongs received, good will toward enemy and friend alike. Such a sit-down strike against war we hope will convince rulers they must discover peaceful means of settling disputes.

---

## After The Soviet Munich

by Herbert Zam

IF ONE is to believe the writers in the Communist press and the leaders of the Communist movement in this country, Stalin has discovered a new method of fighting fascism—uniting with it! In giving an official interpretation of the Hitler-Stalin “non-aggression” pact to the representatives of the bourgeois press, Earl Browder declared that the pact would result in a “great weakening of the Axis Powers.” The pact is further a “wonderful contribution to peace” and a “victory for the enemies of fascism.” On the previous day, the foreign “expert” of the Daily Worker, explaining the Russo-German trade agreement, which preceded the “non-aggression” pact by a few hours, declared that it was a blow to the “Anglo-French and the Rome-Berlin Munichmen.” If this interpretation is true, then, of course, it follows that Hitler has made a united front with Stalin to fight—Hitler! Maybe the rumor will even circulate that Hitler is an agent of the G.P.U.—thus will be explained the mystery how it was possible for Stalin to ferret out all the agents of fascism in Soviet ranks and forestall their nefarious schemes!

Of course, this interpretation involves considerable explaining. For example, some time earlier the Daily Worker had insisted:

“The whispered lies that the Soviet Union will enter into a treaty with Nazi Germany is nothing but poison spread by the enemies of peace and democracy, the appeasement mongers, the Munich men of fascism.”

Thus, out of their own mouths they condemn them-

selves. If the mere statement of a possible treaty was a “lie,” was “poison,” if only “appeasement mongers,” “enemies of peace and democracy” and “Munich men of fascism” could even think of such a treaty, then it follows that such a treaty could only be imagined as a product of the “Munich men of fascism;” therefore that such a treaty, becoming an actuality, could only *help* fascism. The words of yesterday condemn the deeds of today. By their own estimates, the Communists have condemned the Stalin-Hitler pact as a disgraceful, treacherous move directed not against fascism, but calculated to strengthen it. After having called down the wrath of the heavens upon the Chamberlains and Daladiers because of their Munich agreement, the Communists now praise to the skies a similar Munich engineered by Stalin.

If the Communists now justify the Stalin-Hitler pact, can they continue to condemn Munich? If their claim continues to be that this pact is in the interests of peace, can not the same claim be made for Munich with as much justification? If the Munich pact resulted in the partition of Czechoslovakia, will not the Hitler-Stalin pact lead to the eventual partition of Poland, perhaps even to a devastating war? If the policy of appeasement was wrong because it constantly fed the appetite of fascism while giving the fascists additional strength for the satisfaction of that appetite, then how much more appetite and how much greater strength does the Stalin-



Hitler pact give fascism!

The present pact was forecast by Stalin last March, when he declared that the "democratic" powers were trying to egg Nazi Germany on to a war against the Soviet Union. As if by prearrangement, the newspapers carried the information that when von Ribbentrop flew to Moscow to conclude the pact he had with him transcriptions and records of meetings between Nazi officials and "democratic" diplomats in which the latter were supposed to have urged Germany to make war on the Soviet Union. There is no reason to question these charges. On more than one occasion we have pointed out that not their opposition to fascism, but their own imperialist interests would determine the attitudes of the leading imperialist powers toward Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union, and that it was therefore fallacious to believe that the Soviet Union could protect itself or promote peace by an alliance with one imperialist power or group of imperialists against another. But if the Soviet Union has no reason to trust the "democratic" imperialist countries, it has even less reason to trust Nazi Germany. For no electrical transcriptions or disclosures of secret meetings are required to show the open designs of the Nazis against the Soviet Union. In fact Nazi ambitions with regard to Soviet territory constituted the main stock in trade of the Communists in their campaign for "collective security" in the past. The anti-Comintern (really anti-Soviet Union) pact still is in force. Therefore, this attempt to paint England and France solid black and Germany pure white is enough to make even the proverbial cat laugh.

Of course, the Hitler-Stalin pact will come as the greatest shock to those who had sincerely believed in the propaganda for "collective security" and in the soundness of the idea that unity of the "democratic" nations and the Soviet Union would halt the advance of fascism and stop the "aggressors". How can the new policy of the Soviet Union be reconciled with its previous course and with the widespread propaganda campaigns of the Communists everywhere in the past? Such a reconciliation is not difficult if we examine not the propaganda of the Stalinists, but their deeds. Even when the Franco-Soviet mutual assistance pact was signed, did not Litvinoff invite Hitler to join it also? Trace the foreign activities of the Stalinist regime since those days: the unbroken sale of oil to Italy during the invasion of Ethiopia; participation in the infamous non-intervention pact which strangled the Spanish Republic; reactionary activities which split the workers' camp and helped the victory of the fascists; sale of oil both to Italy and Germany during the Spanish civil war which went immediately to Franco. And it must not be forgotten that Stalin's noisy protest over Munich was followed by his famous March speech in which he developed the theory that the democracies were trying to egg poor, innocent Germany on to a war

against the Soviet Union. This speech was followed almost immediately by the final seizure of what was left of Czechoslovakia by Hitler, as if by prearrangement. And the Communists' apparently bitter campaign against Hitler has never prevented Stalin from doing good business with Germany. In fact, among the first countries to conclude an extensive trade pact with Hitler upon his rise to power, at a time when it was not yet known what attitude even the capitalist countries would adopt towards his coup, was the Soviet Union.

It may be argued that ordinary diplomatic and commercial relations are possible without any ideological affinity between the countries entering into these relations. That is true. But unfortunately we also have ample proof of past efforts of the Stalintern to establish *political* peace with the fascist countries, not only in the field of international diplomacy, but also in the field of internal relations. Who does not remember the notorious programs "For the Reconciliation of the Italian People" and "For the Reconciliation of the German People?" In these programs, sponsored officially by the Communist International and by the Communist parties of these two countries, it was proposed to call off the war against the fascist regimes, to bring about a reconciliation between fascists and non-fascists and to help stabilize the fascist regimes on condition—that the fascist countries enter into friendly relations with the Soviet Union! As in the case of France, where the policy of the "people's front" was the internal counterpart of the Franco-Russian pact, the "reconciliation" policy was to be the internal counter-part of the Russo-German and Russo-Italian pact. At that time the fascists spurned the "reconciliation" policy because they had nothing to gain from a Russian alliance. Today things are otherwise. It may not be utopian to expect the release of Thaelmann from prison and perhaps even his elevation to an important position!

But proof of Stalin's duplicity, his complete lack of principle, his willingness to unite with anybody, does not explain the significance of the Hitler-Stalin pact. What does Germany gain from this pact? The Nazi gains are both political and economic. In international affairs, the Hitler regime has been marked by unbroken expansion since its inception, expansion based entirely on the policy of "appeasement" followed by British imperialism. This period began with the permission granted Hitler by the MacDonald government to rearm and culminated with the Munich pact. Munich seems to have marked the zenith of the British appeasement policy. It appeared that the policy of appeasement was about to be scrapped. Hitler could gain nothing further in this direction. To continue his gains, Hitler had to find a new appeaser, to take the place of Chamberlain. He found him in Stalin, who had already indicated his willingness to play this role. Just as the Munich pact



made possible the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia and Hitler's absorption of the major portion of it, so the Stalin-Hitler pact may be the means for a similar fate of Poland.

Economically, also, Germany's gains from the Stalin-Hitler pact may be very great. The impending collapse of Nazi economy, trying to carry out Hitler's slogan "export or die," is indefinitely postponed by the opening up of a new, immense market for German exports to counter-balance the loss of markets in Latin America and elsewhere due to more intense British and American competition. The dangerous shortage of foodstuffs and raw materials on the eve of a possible war will now be overcome by extensive imports of these materials from the Soviet Union. (Let the Russian worker tighten his belt and live on the glory of the three five-year plans and the great leadership of Stalin.)

But why should Stalin, just at a time when Chamberlain was camping on his doorstep and begging an alliance, have thrown over the democracies and turned to Hitler? Was this merely a whim, a caprice on Stalin's part? Or is it not rather an indication of a deep-rooted and thoroughgoing crisis in the Soviet economy which can be saved from utter collapse only by an extensive deal which will bring German economy to the aid of Soviet economy? The key to Stalin's reasons for the pact is the trade treaty which preceded the non-aggression treaty by a few hours and which, it is safe to predict, is only the forerunner for more extensive economic relations between the two countries. To obtain economic assistance from Germany, Stalin had to give diplomatic friendship and political neutrality. He had to adopt a policy which promises to strip him of whatever mass support he still has in the capitalist countries, which may drive all the liberals and fellow-travelers right out of the Communist camp. Serious indeed must be the crisis in the Soviet economy to have demanded this arrangement.

It would be childish to believe that German fascist capitalism will help rehabilitate Soviet economy on a Socialist and collectivist basis. If Soviet economy is restored with the help of the Nazis, it will be through such a penetration by fascist methods that it will cease even resembling a collectivist economy. The development of Soviet economy *away* from Socialism, which has been proceeding constantly under the Stalin regime, will now assume an accelerated tempo. The un-proletarian totalitarian regime and the un-proletarian economy certainly cannot combine to build socialism.

What now becomes of the "successes" of the first, second and third five-year plans, through which the Soviet Union was to "catch up with and outstrip" bourgeois economy? Where is the socialism, which Stalin kept on seeing, sometimes as already an established reality and sometimes as just around the corner?

The Stalin myth has now reached its end. In internal

policy it has resulted in complete economic collapse. In foreign affairs, it has led to an alliance with the deadliest enemy of the international working class. The Stalin regime has lost all basis for support. It can maintain itself temporarily by sheer brutality, by a series of new purges, by even further stifling all opposition sentiments and movements. But it is bound to lose, very rapidly, all influence inside the Soviet Union as it is losing it internationally. The passing of Stalin and with him the totalitarian regime in the Soviet Union is only a matter of time.

What will become of the Communist movement outside the Soviet Union? We have seen in the past how closely general Communist policy follows Soviet foreign policy. When the Soviet Union was trying to organize "collective security" with the democratic capitalist nations, the Communist parties tried to organize "peoples" fronts with the "democratic" capitalists in the respective countries. Now that the foreign policy is based upon a rapprochement with the fascists, it will almost inevitably follow that the Communists will accommodate their policy to this rapprochement. We may therefore expect to see united fronts between Communists and fascists and semi-fascist elements. We may expect a return to the third period theory of "social fascism," that is, of fighting, not the fascists, but other working class groups as the main enemy. This also is not new. It was practiced extensively in Germany before Hitler came to power and was one of the factors which gave Hitler his easy victory.

Thus, the Communists will climax their unenviable record of alliances with bureaucrats, reactionaries and racketeers in the labor movement by alliances with the worst elements of all—the fascists. The anti-labor activities of the Communists, hitherto covered by a blanket of "democracy" will become apparent to all.

When the Soviet Union, under Stalin, abandoned the old Leninist policy of shunning alliances with imperialist countries and embarked on a policy of joining the League of Nations, "collective security," mutual assistance pacts, and non-aggression treaties in the belief that either peace or the interests of the Soviet Union would thus be served, it took the first step toward the present debacle. The alliance with Germany differs in kind from those with Poland, France, Turkey, Italy, but not in principle. Having departed from the fundamentals of revolutionary Socialist policy in favor of one of "deals" with imperialists, *which* deal is made at any one time is purely a matter of expediency.

For American workers, the Hitler-Stalin pact should be an object lesson of the *consequences* of imperialist alliances, no matter who engages in them. More than ever we must be concerned with an *independent* working class struggle against war, which is impossible without a simultaneous struggle against capitalism and its modern phase—imperialism.



# The Challenge of 1940

by Travers Clement

AS this article is being written, international developments are crowding one another so thick and fast that even newspaper headlines and radio commentators are unable to keep up with them. The Russian-Nazi pact is signed, sealed and delivered, King George has authorized British mobilization, Chamberlain has received dictatorial powers from Parliament and Daladier, already ruling by decree, plans a National Union government as French reservists move into line.

To sit before a typewriter in such a situation and write about a political campaign which will culminate in elections more than a year off—elections which may prove a mere formality if the United States is in the grip of a war dictatorship—may seem silly to the outsider. But Socialists know that it is not. A Socialist Party does not conduct its electoral activities in a vacuum. Those activities are an expression of the national and international struggles of the working class, struggles which are constant whether the period be one in which capitalism is openly engaged in war, or in its own form of “underground struggle”—the economic and diplomatic battle by which it lays the basis for war under the misnomer of peace. The year 1940 may well be the most politically significant in the history of the American working class. Certainly that overworked cliché—“labor at the cross-roads”—takes on a new significance in the light of national and international developments at this time.

Electoral campaigns have always presented a serious challenge to American minority parties in general and to working-class minority parties in particular. The vastness of this country, which necessitates so great an outlay of energy and money for any effective campaign over such a widespread area, the difficulty of gaining or maintaining a place on the ballot in forty-eight states with widely dissimilar election laws, the gradual freezing of the traditional two-party system through anti-democratic electoral legislation—these are but a few of the many factors which have acted as a brake upon the enthusiasm of class-conscious American workers for independent political action.

No minority political party has met this challenge in a more consistent and resolute fashion than has the Socialist Party. Year after year, our party has strained every resource at its command to the end that on election day, the American workers and their allies need not be faced with the disastrous alternative of voting for this or that representative of the capitalist class.

The fact that the American workers have not availed themselves of the opportunities we have offered them for political independence, in sufficient numbers to elect

more than a few Socialists to office, is beside the point. The life and vigor of a revolutionary party is not dependent upon electoral results. Those results are very largely a reflection of objective circumstances. The Socialist vote of 1920 was many times larger than the Socialist vote of 1936, not so much because of differences in the Socialist program and approach in 1920 and 1936 as because of different objective conditions and developments in the world labor movement in general. In spite of these differences, we know that capitalism is closer to dissolution than it was twenty years ago, and we know also that the Socialist Party today has a much clearer and more realistic concept of its role and function than had the Party of 1920. To think primarily in parliamentary terms means not life but *death* to any Socialist party—as the collapse of European Social Democracy with its millions of adherents has clearly demonstrated. We are in the Socialist Party not because we expect to achieve political office under capitalism but to build an organization which can serve the working-class as an effective instrument in its final struggles for emancipation. To achieve this end, we cannot separate ourselves from the working class by operating in some ideological vacuum, but neither can we follow the working class up every political blind alley into which it stumbles.

Certainly in the present period of reaction and confusion, one of our primary jobs is to keep alive and to propagate the principle of independent working class political action; for unless our whole analysis of capitalist society is incorrect, the workers, as a class, will ultimately be forced by their own self-interest to travel this road. The fact that independent political action *by itself* (as has been demonstrated in Europe) is no safeguard against defeat, does not alter the fact that for the American working class, still bound to the chariot wheels of capitalist politics, such action would mark a tremendous step in the development of its class-consciousness. It is up to the most advanced sections of this class—the socialists—to keep this road open to them at all times. Otherwise, they will be trapped, an easy prey—as the crisis in capitalism deepens—to fascism.

I do not believe that many Socialists will seriously dispute this point. The question before the party today in connection with the 1940 campaign is not one of whether or not we shall promote labor's independent political role, but how we can best do this considering our present strength and resources, the political confusion in the labor movement—to which the Communists have made such an enormous contribution—the



present state of the election laws which have ruled us off the ballot in so many states and which make it so difficult for any new political alliance of labor to gain a place on the ballot.

It is ironic, to say the least, that under a President who poses as the St. George of American liberalism and the implacable foe of totalitarianism, the drift toward totalitarianism in our electoral system has proceeded more rapidly than in any previous period. It was a New Deal assemblyman, who had received the support of both the Communist Party and the labor unions in California, who recently introduced in that state's legislature, an electoral bill the *avowed* purpose of which is to rule *every* minority party, including the Progressives, from the ballot. The Democratic Southern states have long since reached the stage of actual, if not nominal, political totalitarianism. In most of these states, the Democratic primaries—from which large sections of the Negroes and poor whites are excluded—are the sole expression of political competition.

If ever there was an election year when labor should be prepared to function through its own political party and on its own political program, that year is 1940. While political democracy, as represented in the rights of minority groups to express themselves through peaceable channels, has been rapidly disappearing, liberal capitalism has been demonstrating its political and economic bankruptcy. Today it should be obvious to the most optimistic "labor Democrat" that the New Deal is washed up because it has demonstrated its utter inability to solve, or even to make a dent on the most tragic domestic problem of our time—the continued unemployment of 12,000,000 workers. Roosevelt's cheerful and contradictory improvisations simply haven't worked—as Socialists knew from the beginning they wouldn't work—and as they have failed, one after another, he has turned more and more toward that most desperate of all "solutions"—a foreign policy leading directly to an armament and war economy. The administration's appeasement of Right-Wing Democracy by the appointment of the Hoosier Hitler, McNutt, as head of the Social Security Administration, its drastic cut in the relief and WPA budgets long before these cuts were increased by a Republican-Democratic coalition in Congress, and most important of all, its scuttling of the WPA strikes by the dictatorial formula—"You can't strike against the Government"—surprised no one who realized that Roosevelt had already gone as far as he could go or was willing to go in playing the "liberal" game. Today the New Deal is as bankrupt as the Old Deal.

But in the face of this situation, neither the CIO, the AFL or the liberals are ready with any alternative. John L. Lewis is offering nothing better than a return to the old Sam Gompers formula of "Reward Your Friends and Punish Your Enemies," while he undoubt-

edly prays that the Republicans, at least, will nominate some kind of mildly liberal candidate to whom he can swing his support after the Democratic convention. It is obvious there will be no Labor Party or Farmer-Labor Party to which labor and the liberals can turn in 1940. It is equally obvious that we can not expect large sections of these frustrated "progressives" to turn to the Socialist Party. And yet, only some kind of political revolt, even a very limited one, on the part of the workers and farmers during the next year or two will beat down the wave of reaction which is gathering force throughout the country and which will be enormously intensified by the outbreak of war in Europe. In the face of this situation, we cannot sit back and wait for the possible rise of a labor party in 1944. By 1944, the present drift toward political totalitarianism may have reached its logical conclusion. By 1940 the more advanced elements, at least, in the workers' and farmers' organizations should have learned the folly of delivering themselves to the old party "liberals" in exchange for a few legislative concessions or steadily-diminishing relief grants. If Roosevelt or one of his New Dealers gets the Democratic nomination, many of them will continue to hope. (There is an indication that John L. Lewis and his official machine will even swallow McNutt.) But even in such a contingency, which now seems unlikely, it may be possible to rally some of the more intelligent and politically advanced elements for a labor campaign, with labor candidates, around an aggressive minimum program in 1940—a campaign in which the left-wing forces can consistently cooperate. Even a limited united front on the basis of militant resistance to political and economic reaction as well as resistance to war, would have an enormous moral effect at this time upon the labor movement itself.

Certainly the Socialist Party can afford to explore all possibilities in this direction and even to take the lead in an effort to rally the labor and radical forces to such united action. If it is possible to develop a fairly broad base for a labor campaign in 1940, the Party can lose nothing and gain much by cooperation with it. However, such possibilities must not deter the Party from going ahead with its own campaign and its own candidates in 1940. For unless such a broader movement does develop within the next six or eight months, the Party must be prepared under any circumstances to uphold the principle of independent political action and to offer the working class their sole alternative to political capitulation. There must be a Socialist campaign in 1940, either within the scope of some broader alliance, or by the Socialist Party standing alone. In the Fascist nations, thousands of our comrades have had the courage to stand alone by voting "NO" in the so-called "elections" of those countries. No matter how few our numbers, we cannot hesitate to bear witness to our unalterable opposition to capitalism in all its forms.



# The Need For Labor Peace

by Joel Seidman

THE APPROACH of another presidential election year finds the labor movement stronger numerically than ever before, yet split into bitterly hostile factions. A wave of reaction is sweeping the country, bearing fruit in anti-picketing laws, in ruthless W.P.A. cuts, in a hostile investigation of the National Labor Relations Act, and in reactionary court decisions. Through it all the leaders of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. are carrying on their bitter and largely senseless struggle, more concerned with partisan victory than with the good of the movement as a whole.

In the fall of 1937 and again in February of 1939 President Roosevelt, with the 1940 campaign doubtless uppermost in his mind, brought pressure upon the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. to settle their conflict. The election promises to be close, and the labor split may prove a deciding factor. Should Roosevelt run again, as appears likely, both major union groups will almost certainly support him, the C.I.O. with enthusiasm and the A.F. of L. with moderation. But no other candidate, in all likelihood, can get the support of both groups. Almost any Democratic candidate running on a New Deal platform would get C.I.O. support, but that fact might influence the A.F. of L. to support his rival. As for a national farmer-labor party, that could develop on a large scale only if both old parties nominated reactionary candidates and the labor split were healed.

Evidently Roosevelt believes that most workers will vote for him in 1940 whatever he does in the meantime, and that the important tactic at the moment is to appeal to the more conservative budget-balancing groups. On any other basis it is hard to explain his recent W.P.A. actions. The proposal that all W.P.A. workers be required to work 130 hours monthly came from Colonel Harrington, Roosevelt's appointee, who would scarcely propose such an important change without White House approval. When building trades and other workers struck against longer hours for less money, the President's only contribution was a warning that "you can't strike against the government." For the rest he watched silently while Harrington and his aides dismissed workers who had been absent for five days, while they investigated some protesting groups for communist influence, and in general behaved in the time-honored traditions of anti-union private employers.

The various labor and progressive parties scattered through states and localities are none too strong at present. Defeats were suffered in the more advanced states, such as Minnesota and Wisconsin, in 1938, and in New York the vote of the American Labor Party dropped sharply. While other factors were partly re-

sponsible, in all likelihood, for the setback in New York, the tactics of the labor party in the campaign must bear a major share of the responsibility. When a labor party ignores principles to make old-fashioned deals with the Republican machine in Manhattan and Brooklyn and with a faction of the Democrats in Queens, a fall in voting strength from 482,000 to 341,000 should come as no surprise. Jurisdictional quarrels over bathrobes and mannish suits between the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the two major units of the American Labor party, will not make the path of that party any easier in the immediate future.

More hope politically rests in the C.I.O. than in the A.F. of L., though both follow the weak non-partisan policy of supporting friends and punishing enemies regardless of political affiliation. The difference is that the C.I.O. carries out this policy with much more energy and zeal, and that it makes far greater efforts to nominate labor men in old-party primaries. Even a poor policy is better when carried out vigorously rather than sluggishly. The major activities of Labor's Non-Partisan League, the political arm of the C.I.O., have been within the Democratic party, though some Republican and some independent candidates have been supported in the past. The A.F. of L. policy, as determined by its 1937 convention, has been to oppose any candidate in any way friendly to the C.I.O.; this policy helped to defeat Maury Maverick of Texas in his campaign for reelection to Congress, and to split the labor vote and elect conservatives in Seattle, Detroit, and elsewhere. Yet there has been some political cooperation between local and state units of the two major labor groups, despite pronouncements at national headquarters.

More recently Labor's Non-Partisan League has become, for all practical purposes, a faction within the Democratic party. It was curious that rank and file workers, hitherto not politically conscious but moving leftward, should reach this point along with communists, formerly left sectarians to an extreme and moving rightward. In December, 1938, John L. Lewis announced that Labor's Non-Partisan League would enter the Democratic presidential primaries in 1940, to seek the election of delegates who would nominate progressive standard-bearers in the campaign. The reply of William Green was to warn A.F. of L. units not to participate in that movement.

Until the breach between the Federation and the C.I.O. is healed, labor is likely to make little political advance. Similarly, as in the case of the National Labor Relations Act, there is grave danger that the division in the labor



movement will operate to weaken labor legislation. A united labor movement finds it difficult enough to achieve and protect labor legislation; in a divided movement, one wing may combine with employers to defeat a law that seems to help its rival. The A.F. of L. feels that the labor relations act, as at present administered, has that result. Its proposed amendments are designed to narrow the limits of discretion permitted the board, so as to insure an A. F. of L. rather than a C.I.O. victory in certain types of cases; and to enlarge the freedom of employers, in the belief that most of them will favor unionism of the A.F. of L. rather than of the C.I.O. variety. Thus the A.F. of L. seeks to prevent the nullification of contracts arrived at by collusive means, and to guarantee to the employer "free speech" to express his union preferences.

The most important amendment offered by the A.F. of L. proposes that, whenever the majority of workers of any craft so desire, the craft must be constituted a unit for purposes of collective bargaining. Until now the labor board has followed a flexible policy; it has examined the history of collective bargaining in the plant and in the industry before deciding what type of bargaining unit would best represent the desires of the workers and carry out the purposes of the law. Sometimes the unit thus chosen has been a craft, sometimes a group of related crafts, sometimes a plant, and sometimes a group of plants. Nor does the A.F. of L. always want craft unionism. Indeed, its affiliates have asked for industrial bargaining units more than twice as often as for craft units, and occasionally they have requested larger units than those desired by the C.I.O.

The Senate subcommittee considering amendments to the labor relations act discovered, to its surprise, that the general counsel to the A.F. of L. would not even attempt to define "craft." Nor has any other Federation official attempted such a definition, despite their insistence that craft privileges be protected. The most that they would do was point to their constitutions, and claim the jurisdictional rights there described. Accordingly the labor board has studied the constitution of 85 of the 102 Federation affiliates, with interesting results. Only 12 unions with 26,000 members were found to consist of single crafts, 19 unions with 458,000 members were of the multiple craft variety, 13 unions with 815,000 members consisted of trades, 27 with 611,000 were semi-industrial, and 10 with 816,000 were industrial. If this amendment were adopted, there would be never-ending disputes as to the meaning of "craft." There would be long delays until the fight could be settled by the courts—and the Supreme Court in effect would be determining the structure of the labor movement.

Equally unacceptable are the amendments proposed by employers' groups. The most important of these amendments seeks to fashion the labor relations act

into an anti-labor instrument by listing a series of unfair practices of which unions might be guilty. Among these would likely be the closed shop, the check-off, and the sympathetic strike; unions would be required to make regular financial reports and to live up to prescribed standards in their internal affairs, and they would be barred from making political contributions. It will be observed that some of these proposals, such as those dealing with the closed shop or political contributions, seek to weaken the labor movement. Others, dealing with internal affairs, might prescribe good standards, but would subject unions to close regulation by public bodies which might not always be friendly. Much to be preferred is the achievement of good standards, not from regulations proposed by labor's enemies, but from the pressure of the rank and file of the unions.

Similarly, employers would amend the section barring coercion by them to prevent coercion from any source, meaning by a union. This overlooks, as do the amendments just discussed, the purpose of the law, which is to promote collective bargaining and to remove obstacles placed in the way by anti-union employers. The coercion used by employers was typically the threat or fear of dismissal, which could legally be employed until the passage of the law. The coercion charged to unions, on the other hand, usually is violence and intimidation, which is amply guarded against by other laws. The danger is that such an amendment, if passed, might be construed to bar the legitimate and peaceful organizing activities of trade unions.

Still another amendment may be forced through, if the labor split persists, to make labor board decisions binding, and to forbid a strike or boycott by a losing union. If there is any significant increase in jurisdictional strikes, with labor board decisions disregarded, such an amendment might be passed. Teeth could be put into it by denying privileges of the act to an offending union, or by permitting an injunction to be issued against it. Peace between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., by reducing the number of inter-union quarrels, should end any danger that such an amendment might be passed.

Criticism of the labor relations act has come largely from employers or from unions who have lost labor board verdicts. Yet union victors have a real grievance in the long delays attending a labor board case. Particularly in labor relations may a long-delayed victory be equivalent to a defeat, for morale may be impaired and a union cease to exist. President John Green of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers told the House Labor Committee last July of the Todd Shipyard Corporation case, in which a company union was still flourishing 18 months after the board had ordered it disestablished. Two years after the original hearings had been held the board was still fearing to seek enforcement of its order in the courts, because of



a technical slip-up in the early proceedings. In the meantime the workers were being denied the benefit of the law.

There is no penalty for violation of a labor board order. The board must seek a court order enforcing its findings, and then institute contempt of court proceedings if the court order is disobeyed. The act was passed more than four years ago and held constitutional in the spring of 1937. Violations have occurred literally by the thousands, and yet not one employer has thus far paid one penny as a fine or served one minute in jail. In only one case, the Hopwood case, have contempt proceedings been instituted thus far. In this case the employer violated the labor relations act in March of 1937, was served with a board order on January, 1938, and with a court order in July of that year. Finally in June, 1939, he was held in contempt and a master was appointed to take testimony. Those who complain that the laws now give labor an unfair advantage might contrast this tender regard for law-breaking employers with the treatment accorded a worker whose behavior on a picket line fails to please the local police officer. Enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act must be speeded up, and the LaFollette Oppressive Labor Practices Bill should be passed to bar the use by employers of spies, strike-breaking agencies, oppressive armed guards, and industrial munitions.

These objectives could be achieved, harmful amendment of the labor relations act prevented, and progress made in many other directions if the labor split could be healed. When the C.I.O. was first formed all progressives, and all who were alive to the realities of modern industry, applauded its proposal to organize mass production workers into industrial unions. Experience had shown that under modern conditions the likely alternative in those industries was not craft unionism, but company unionism or no unionism at all. Formation of the C.I.O., and its vigorous organizing methods, brought hundreds of thousands of recruits to the labor movement, while its challenge awakened the A.F. of L. to more activity. For a time, therefore, the labor movement gained from the rivalry much more than it lost; that time has long passed, however, and now the losses far outweigh any gains.

When peace negotiations between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. were first held in the fall of 1937, one of the chief stumbling blocks was the procedure to be followed. The C.I.O. proposed that all its affiliates be admitted into the A.F. of L. and differences then settled, union by union and industry by industry. To this the A.F. of L. spokesman objected that the conflict would thus be carried within Federation ranks; they suggested that the former A.F. of L. affiliates then in the C.I.O. first be readmitted, and that the cases of the newer unions then be disposed of. The C.I.O. conferees objected that this would mean the abandonment of their newer and

weaker affiliates. Finally a compromise formula was agreed upon: first differences would be settled, union by union and industry by industry, then the C.I.O. would enter the A.F. of L., in a body or not at all.

Just when it looked as though the negotiations were succeeding, they were abruptly terminated. The evidence indicates that John L. Lewis must bear primary responsibility for this. Matthew Woll, one of the A.F. of L. negotiators, told the millinery workers' convention in May, 1939, that the conferees had reached a complete agreement, only to have it repudiated by the C.I.O. representatives after a meeting with Lewis. Under the terms of the agreement, Woll asserted, 34 unions were to be admitted into the unified labor body on an industrial basis. The automobile, steel, rubber, and cement industries were among those to be organized industrially.

In March, 1939, following increased pressure from the White House, negotiations were again resumed. In typically dramatic fashion, Lewis proposed that the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., together with the independent railroad brotherhoods, be merged into an American Congress of Labor. The Federation and the C.I.O. were to get equal representation on the governing body, with proportionate representation for the rail unions. Neither Green nor Lewis was to be eligible for office in the proposed organization, but Green was to get life tenure at his present salary for services rendered.

It is difficult to consider this proposal other than as a publicity device. The C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. each claims 4,000,000 members, but the A.F. of L. figures represent a membership on which per capita dues are paid each month, whereas the C.I.O. figures, in all likelihood, include large numbers who have merely signed application cards. If the labor movement is reunited, each union should be represented in convention according to its dues-paying membership, and the convention should elect the executive body. Were such a convention to be held this year, there is little doubt that the A.F. of L. unions would have the larger voting strength. Moreover, Lewis would remain the leader of the industrial union forces, whether or not he was eligible to run for office in the new organization, by virtue of his presidency of the United Mine Workers. Green has no such office to fall back upon. The proposal to pay Green his salary for life can readily be interpreted as a studied insult, for it gives the impression that Green is most concerned about his personal income. It is likely that Lewis and his advisors wanted the papers, at the opening of peace negotiations, to headline the rejection of a C.I.O. peace plan by the A.F. of L.

When the committees met for a serious discussion this plan was quickly forgotten, and the chief point at issue became the enlarged jurisdiction of the industrial unions that had formerly been Federation members. The United Mine Workers had taken in gas and coke



workers, for example, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers had organized laundry workers. For a long time the conferees were deadlocked on this point, until finally the A.F. of L. negotiators gave way, agreeing to recommend to their Executive Council that the C.I.O. unions in question be admitted with their enlarged jurisdiction. They made the recommendation, and what followed is in dispute. Lewis declares that the A.F. of L. Council rejected the recommendation; the A.F. of L. asserts the contrary. Whatever happened at the first meeting, the A.F. of L. is now on record publicly as having acceded to the C.I.O. demand, and that should satisfy any reasonable person.

As in the case of the 1937 negotiations, however, those of 1939 were broken off just when they seemed on the threshold of success. John L. Lewis made the public appearance in this case, with a statement on June 14 that peace was impossible because the A.F. of L. was controlled by a small group of reactionary leaders, powerfully entrenched, who were tolerant of many evils in the organization. Whatever the accuracy of the charges, some important and some petty, that Lewis

hurled at the A.F. of L. chieftains, they were not the issues that the C.I.O. conferees had raised in the negotiations. This is some evidence to support the Federation claim that it was willing to concede the main points at issue. Whatever the personal failings of the Federation leaders, moreover, they should not be made the stumbling block in the path of labor peace. Formation of the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee by the C.I.O., with its attendant invasion of the A.F. of L. building trades' stronghold, will further embitter relations between the two groups.

More than ever peace between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. is necessary, if labor's gains are to be preserved and further advance is to be made on the economic, legislative, and political fronts. The ambitions of leaders must not be allowed to stand in the way; considerations of power, prestige, and personality must be brushed aside. Until the breach is healed, partisan feelings must not interfere with labor's larger goals and its general progress. These are the tasks of the rank and file of both organizations.

---

## Roosevelt and Latin America

by S. Fanny Simon

TWO themes have run through Roosevelt's policy in Latin America. The major one has been the Good Neighbor policy announced immediately upon his inauguration and sold to the Latin Americans at the Pan American Conference held in 1933 at Montevideo. As one of the obligations of a good neighbor, the administration has now evolved another one—the policy of hemispheric defense. Surely no good neighbor would permit the house next door to be pillaged or burned without doing everything in his power to prevent it. The Roosevelt administration sees this continent threatened by fascist aggression. No good neighbor can tolerate aggression against any country on this continent. Therefore, what is more logical than that the 21 republics of the western hemisphere should provide for measures of common defense? What is more neighborly than to tell the Latin American countries that the United States pledges itself "to give economic support so that no American nation need surrender any fraction of its sovereign freedom to maintain its economic welfare"?

When the statements and acts of the administration are put under the microscope, the altruism of the administration loses much of its benign character. It has already been shown (*Socialist Review*, March-April, 1939) that the Good Neighbor policy stemmed primarily from the trade needs of United States capitalism.

That does not mean that we necessarily disapprove of it. The policy of hemispheric defense grew out of the menace of the fascist powers, especially Nazi Germany, to the economic and political dominance of the United States in Latin America.

Thanks to the Good Neighbor policy the average Latin American is beginning to look upon the United States with less suspicion. Nevertheless, the old distrust of the "Colossus of the North" has not entirely disappeared. This is in part due to the equivocal manner in which the policy has been not infrequently applied. To the progressives in Latin America the policy is suspect because Roosevelt has not only been willing to play ball with their dictators but has pursued tactics which tend to solidify them in power. The Latin Americans applauded the revised treaty made with Panama that removed some of the humiliating provisions and the injustices inflicted upon the country in 1903. This good deed lost some of its force when the administration failed to push its ratification. Three years after the treaty was made and ratified by Panama, the Senate of the United States finally gave its assent in July 1939.

Every lover of peace and international understanding is happy that the Mexican desire to obtain greater control over the natural resources, which involved the expropriation of American interests, has not led to American intervention, as it would, undoubtedly, have done



during the period of "Dollar Diplomacy". Latin Americans, however, think back to an earlier episode—that of Cuba. They are not quite sure whether the new or the old action has become the pattern of our relations with them. They recall the intrigues of Sumner Welles, the American ambassador to Cuba and now undersecretary of state, and how he imposed upon the Cubans the de Cespedes puppet government and how the United States caused the downfall of the truly nationalist government of Grau San Martin because he refused to favor American interests. Once Grau San Martin was out and a government more amenable to American interests installed, the United States proceeded to give it the recognition it had refused Grau San Martin. It helped it entrench itself in power going so far as to abrogate the Platt Amendment. The abrogation of the Platt Amendment was all to the good but the same could not be said for the help given to the bloody Batista to consolidate his power. At present Batista has relaxed his arbitrary control. Having made a deal with the Communists, Batista has now become in their eyes a champion of the working class.

With increased aggressiveness of the fascist countries and their successful inroads into the trade of Latin America, American interests became quite worried. Thereafter the menace of fascism in Latin America came to figure prominently in the news. Certain sections of public opinion were not uninterested in creating hysteria and the impression that the Latin American countries were in danger of invasion by the fascists. Roosevelt began to speak of the great threat to the "democratic" institutions of the western hemisphere. Always a big navy man, he saw in these conditions the opportunity to increase the naval expenditures and argued that the continent as a whole ought to go in for increased armaments. It might not be amiss to remember that many Latin American countries were already spending heavily on armaments, that Italian and German armament and aeroplane manufacturers were competing successfully with American. American naval, army and aerial interests saw themselves menaced by this competition. They proceeded to convince our government that it must do something about it.

At first the Roosevelt administration refused to be a party to the arming of Latin America. The disclosures of the Nye committee of the shameful tactics used by the munition makers had discredited them with the American public. Matters took another turn when unemployment remained the administration's number one problem and fascism became more aggressive. Roosevelt began to believe that there was danger of a naval and a military invasion of this hemisphere. This conviction happened to coincide with increased munitions and aeroplane sales by Germany and Italy to Latin America. By intensely courting the Latin American dictators, by barter deals, and the extension of favorable

credit terms, Germany and Italy were able to make tremendous gains in the sale of aeroplanes. In addition to the above methods, they resorted to military and aerial missions and invitations to army and aviation leaders to visit and study in Germany and Italy.

The Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce wanted the United States government to give them as much help in the sale of planes to Latin America as the fascist powers were giving their nationals. They argued that Italy and Germany had been able not only to gain markets and increase employment but to obtain political influence as well; they insisted that the infiltration of European aircraft and airmen removed the natural barrier afforded by the Atlantic Ocean. These arguments convinced many. Of course, what really worried Mr. John H. Jouett, the president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, was the fact that Germany and Italy had been able to outsell the American aeroplane manufacturers in 18 countries. While the United States sold in 1938 planes and aeroplane parts totaling \$12,518,232, enough to give employment to 3000 workers, Germany and Italy sold during the same period a total of \$7,368,459 or close to 60% of the United States' total. In some countries the sale of aeroplanes by the fascist powers exceeded many times the value of American sales. Thus, in Chile the value of sales by Germany was \$2,264,622 and by Italy \$1,221,951, whereas that of the United States amounted to the measly sum of \$64,331. In Peru, Italy sold \$811,355 and Germany \$63,453 compared with the United States sum of \$223,490; in Paraguay, the amounts were: Italy, \$1,014,338, the United States, \$6,162; In Uruguay, Germany's total was \$281,522 and the United States \$115,207. Germany led in the sales to Ecuador and Salvador. In all other countries the United States was far in the lead. Nevertheless, Germany was rapidly increasing sales in a number of them, notably in Brazil and in Argentina.

President Roosevelt was rightly perturbed by the fact that Argentina had bought 99 military planes from Germany during the three year period, 1936 and 1938. Other Latin American purchases of military planes were Chile 36, Brazil 20, Bolivia 3 and Colombia 1. Against whom were these countries arming? Surely, not against the United States. We had no aggressive designs on Latin America. Against Germany? Germany would not deliberately arm and train countries which she intended to attack in the near future. If the Latin American countries feared an attack by Germany or Italy or Japan and were arming against such an attack then their stand in Lima seems incomprehensible. Why should Argentina, which was spending the most on armaments and military planes presumably against an attack by the fascist powers refuse to adopt joint defense measures such as were envisioned by President Roosevelt in his program of hemispheric defense. It was Argentina that was



chiefly responsible for fighting Roosevelt's program of hemispheric defense. It was Argentina that saw to it that the Declaration of Lima was merely a document of high sounding phrases with as much power as had the League of Nations or the Kellogg Peace Pact in preventing aggression.

There are, of course, a number of other possibilities which might explain the furious arming going on in Latin America. Perhaps, Germany and Italy were arming Latin America against the United States? In spite of the preposterousness of the idea there are many who believe it. Such a plan presupposes complete subservience on the part of the Latin American countries to the totalitarian states of Germany and Italy and there does not seem enough evidence to sustain this. None of the Latin American nations is interested in committing national suicide. The state of world trade, their own lack of currency, often the desire to decrease the predominant influence of the United States have contributed to the increase in trade of the fascist nations. Signing a statement against barter trade as was done at the Lima Conference does not do away with economic realities as subsequent events proved. Immediately after the Latin American countries had signed the statement at Lima barter agreements were made by Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay.

That did not prevent Brazil, Argentina and Chile from taking measures to clamp down upon Nazi political influence. In Brazil dictator Getulio Vargas used the Nazis to establish his totalitarian state. Rome and Berlin rejoiced. The Italian press predicted that Brazil would be the first nation in the western hemisphere to join the anti-Communist pact. Once in control Vargas did not relish dividing his power with the Nazis. He turned on them and threw the Brazilian Nazis into prison. More recently President Germán Busch of Bolivia proclaimed a totalitarian state. The newspapers reported that the influence of the Nazis was particularly strong and that Bolivia had gone fascist. Immediately afterwards President Busch denied that his government was totalitarian after the German model. He insisted that it was purely or typically Latin American. In this case as in the case of Brazil, the coup was merely to maintain himself more firmly in the saddle. German and Italian influence in Bolivia may be strong and Germany may even have obtained a new aeroplane base there. Nevertheless, neither in Bolivia nor in the rest of Latin America is there today fascism in the sense that we see in Italy and Germany. There are in Latin America semi-feudal military dictatorships but not fascism. The objective conditions for fascism do not exist in semi-colonial nations such as most Latin American countries are.

This should not be taken to mean that Nazi and fascist influence is not real nor its menace great. Already the ugly head of anti-Semitism has appeared

among a people until recently almost entirely lacking in race prejudice and where the Jewish population in relation to the total population is insignificant. Nazi racial doctrines have already caused riots in Mexico, have led to the discharge of Jewish workers at the demand of Nazi agents and have caused the doors to be almost completely shut to Jewish immigration in countries in need of immigration. Anti-Semitic propaganda is common in Argentina, the country with the largest Jewish population, and in most of the other Latin American nations. Fascist agents swarm over Latin America and are exercising an important influence over education and other cultural activities.

Socialists have nothing to gain by minimizing the menace of fascism. They know only too well its brutality and inhumanity and the harm it has done and can do to everything that is decent and civilized. Because the danger of fascism is so real, Socialists must not be carried away by mere emotionalism but must weigh carefully in the light of Marxist analysis the factors responsible for its spread and the measures needed for its defeat. Unfortunately, much of Roosevelt's program is adapted to fighting windmills and not fascism. It is bound to be shipwrecked on the rocks of imperialist contradiction. Capitalist nationalism can no more effectively fight fascism than it can fight unemployment. A democratic capitalist nation by gearing its economy towards war preparations may temporarily solve the unemployment problem. As its economy becomes geared more and more towards war, its political system begins to take on many of the features of fascism that it is presumably fighting. There are signs of this both in England and in France. In France rule by decree has been on the calendar for some time. Daladier has now decided that it is too risky to have parliamentary elections.

There is no danger that fascism will come to the western hemisphere as a result of military or naval invasion from across the seas, as many in the Roosevelt administration want us to believe. Upon this belief is predicated the program of hemispheric defense. Even the threat of fascism through indirect aggression, about which so much has been heard lately, of which Czechoslovakia was the victim and which has presumably delayed the Anglo-French Soviet agreement, can not exist unless there are internal factors to feed upon. In Latin America the fascist countries have had as their allies the bad world trade situation, the sins committed by American imperialists and their native dictators. The existence of dictatorial regimes acts as an unstabilizing factor, for these cause the opposition to want to overthrow them. To maintain themselves in power the dictators may resort to the fascists for aid. Where in Latin America people are free to express themselves, there they have repudiated fascism in no uncertain terms.

*(Another article in the next issue)*



# Progressive Mexico, Backward U. S. A.

by Clarence Senior

NOW that the United States has awakened to the existence of a semi-colonial economy south of the Mason-Dixon line, the similarities between the problems of its own South and the problems faced by semi-colonial Mexico might well be pointed out. The economic, political and social problems of our Southern neighbor and of our Southern states supply many striking parallels; the attempts at solution however, are quite divergent.

The human resources of the two areas suffer high disease and death rates in common. Tuberculosis, "the poor man's disease", takes a larger toll in the Southern states than in Northern, and Mexico ranks at the top of all nations in tuberculosis deaths. The highest incidence of syphilis, the worst of the "ignorance" diseases, is found in the South. Near the close of the Diaz regime, an outstanding Mexican physician wrote of venereal diseases, "We may assert without fear of exaggeration that these diseases cannot spread further, because the population is already saturated with them". Of one hundred and eighty priests who claimed ill health as an excuse for not obeying orders of the revolutionary government in 1915, forty-nine were found on examination to have venereal disease.

Mexico and Egypt vie for the highest general death rate in the world; Mexico, 25.1 deaths per thousand, Egypt, 26.8, and the United States 11.1 for its whole area. The South has a significantly higher rate. Three of every five Mexican children die before they reach their first birthday. As in the South, malaria and pellagra reap their toll in Mexico because of the undrained swamps and the inadequate diet. Floods take a constant toll of life and property in both areas.

Through the increasingly large amounts of money which are being spent on the education of Mexican children, the illiteracy rate of 70 percent, inherited from the Diaz regime, has been reduced to a little under 50. The South leads the United States in illiteracy.

Superstitions which interfere with health and educational work in the South are even more prevalent in Mexico. However, our country has had an advantage that few citizens realize in the absence of a church-state tie-up such as existed in Mexico with an hierarchy entrenched as social, political, and economic co-rulers and with a stake in the continued ignorance of the producing groups.

The two regions have shared another pernicious institution: large-scale landowning with production under a semi-feudal system. The Civil War broke the political, but not the economic, hold of the plantation system. The Mexican Revolution is still struggling

with the *haciendas*, many of which have been expropriated and turned over to the peasants in the form of *ejidos*, collectively owned farms. The haciendas and plantation system still interfere with the growth of institutions of self-government and democracy.

Both regions have been similarly exploited, both as to land and other natural resources, by absentee owners. Three-fourths of Mexico's mining production and smelting is under U. S. control; before expropriation, oil was 52% in U. S. hands; the railroads were built by Harriman and other promoters from north of the Rio Grande with exactly the same methods which were used to fleece the people of the U. S.; the light and power industry is divided between the U. S.-owned Electric Bond and Share and the British-owned Mexican Light and Power Company, while telephonic communication is controlled by the I. T. & T. through two companies which are supposed to be competitors, the Mexican Telephone and Telegraph company and the Swedish Ericsson Telephone company. The latter fell into the I. T. & T. bag with the collapse of the Krueger & Toll empire.

The largest part of the food industry of Mexico is in the hands of the Spaniards, and the biggest share of textile mill ownership is Spanish, followed closely by French. The department stores are also divided in the main between the two groups, both of which have actively aided anti-Semitic agitation in Mexico because of the competition furnished by the new arrivals, who sell in small shops and street carts and stands.

Outside railroad ownership has expressed itself in the same way in both Mexico and the South. Freight rates have been used to discriminate against native products which would compete with those of other regions in the United States, and in Mexico the roads were built for the purpose of taking raw materials out of the country. Freight rates and locations of roads made much of Mexico's trackage useless for the internal distribution of food products.

As is the case with the South, foreign ownership of all important sources of raw materials and of almost all manufacturing has led to lack of native capital and credit. Neither local merchants, manufacturers, nor farmers can obtain credit on reasonable terms. The Southern state and local governments are starved because of their inability to reach the real wealth of the region as it goes into the hands of outside financiers. That Mexico suffers from the same inability to support its rapidly-expanding governmental program has been shown many times. Nearly 75% of her rural population centers have no safe drinking water supply.



The average annual income of the South in 1937 was half that of the remainder of the country; \$314 contrasted with \$604. However, the average annual income of the Mexican for the far more profitable year of 1929 was only \$36. Since averages are deceptive, it should be noted that the income of Southern tenant farmer (53% of the total Southern farm families) ranged from \$38 to \$87 per person.

While the problems faced are in many ways similar, Mexico is burdened in addition with the incrustations of many more years of foreign exploitation; the existence of the *hacienda* system since Colonial times, i. e., almost 400 years; and the presence on her northern border of a nation which has stolen more land from her than Mexico now contains, and interfered with her domestic affairs on numerous occasions.

The future may show, however, that the United States will have much to learn from Mexico in the methods used to cope with similar problems.

Mexico follows a new philosophy which places human values above economic interests. Instead of subsidizing an uneconomic plantation system as did the AAA, Mexico is expropriating the haciendas and turning them over to the land-workers. In place of loans to put the sharecropper on an inadequate piece of land, competing against the better and bigger lands of his former master, Mexico is building collective farms on which the peasants work in a cooperative manner toward a civilization based on cooperation and mutual aid, rather than on a continuance of the present dog-eat-dog system. The banking system is geared to the aid of both workers who have taken over bankrupt factories in which they had worked, and the peasants who have taken over the *haciendas*.

The end of land distribution under the agrarian law is officially seen in the Six Year Plan as coming only with "the complete satisfaction of the agricultural needs of the centers of rural population in the Republic".

Farm laborers who have not yet received lands are legally entitled to a minimum wage, free housing "with hygienic comforts indispensable for life and health", free medical and pharmaceutical attention, land for growing household produce and for pasturage of their own livestock, free use of water for home and livestock, and a school meeting the educational requirements stipulated by the government. Peasant organization is officially promoted by the government.

Cooperatives, both producers and consumers, are encouraged, and even financed in many cases, by the government, both "to promote social discipline and technological knowledge among the producers", and to combat the "middleman who parasitically profit from the work of those who devote their energy to the primary activities of production".

Preachers in Arkansas who used their churches as

centers of landlord propaganda and served as spies for the planters were paralleled in Mexico by the priests who played the same role. The economic and political power of the church in Mexico has been broken, and a frontal attack is being made on its medieval teachings and its fosterings of superstition. More than 300 teachers have been killed since 1934, when the fight between the church and "Socialist education" was intensified as the Constitution was amended to make naturalistic and socialistic teachings the basis of all education in the nation.

The school is the dynamo of the local community. In it the peasants learn their rights under the agrarian and labor laws. Women are brought forth out of the centuries-old tradition of being tied to their kitchens, and are taught to take their part in civic affairs. On many collective farms the women have organized the cooperative stores and communal corn-grinding mills. The school children produce plays which teach them and their parents of the collective system and what it means, how alcoholism harms the home and the community, how exploitation took place under the old system. (Under a poster of a drunk lying in the gutter, painted by a 5th grade child, I saw the caption, "This worker does not fight against the boss"! ) The teacher organizes sports, social hygiene committees and music clubs, to promote community feeling and solidarity.

As a model for other collectivized regions, the *ejidos* and the government have built a socialized medical system in the Laguna region, site of the country's most ambitious farming experiment under the new regime. Here the parallels are most striking, since this north central region supplies almost half of the nation's cotton. Over 300 collective farms containing more than 32,000 families participate in the medical set-up. For two pesos a month, a family is entitled to medical, dental, and surgical care, including childbirth attention. The latest model General Electric X-ray apparatus is a symbol of what the collective-cooperative medical organization has brought to the peasants, most of whom had never seen a doctor or dentist before the expropriation of the *haciendas* on Oct. 6, 1936. Real evidences of a genuine social revolution in the region are found in the statistics of a 15,000 percent increase in the use of the medical service from the first three months of its operation to the last quarter of its first year and a half, as well as in the evidences of increased consumption of food, the purchase of beds to replace straw pallets, and greater purchases of clothing.

Company stores, company credit (which worked the same way it works in the South), and company sponsored or tolerated gambling houses and saloons on the *haciendas* have been abolished. Dependence on one crop has been eliminated by planting wheat, beans, corn, melons, cane, and alfalfa. The peasants now have individual plots for their own gardens, and can raise



# British Policy in Palestine

by Bezalel Sherman

*(In order to develop a truly Socialist policy on the Palestine question specifically and the Jewish question generally, the Socialist Review herewith presents the first of a series of discussion articles on this subject. Other opinions are invited. The Review assumes no responsibility for the contents of these articles.—THE EDITOR).*

ONLY the Royal Commission headed by the late Lord Peel rose above the soulless bureaucratic shallowness and hardheartedness which characterize British Colonial investigations.

Appointed to investigate the disturbances which broke out in Palestine in April 1936 and continue to the present day, the Peel Commission removed the halo from the Balfour Declaration. With delightful frankness and simplicity the Commission brought the Declaration down from the celestial sphere of international justice to the realm of terrestrial interests. England had no more desire to right the historic wrong which the world committed against the Jewish people, than she had intentions of fighting for the rights of the Arabs to national self-determination. The Balfour Declaration, which promised British aid in the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, aimed to gain for England, in one of the darkest hours in her history, the moral and physical support of the Jews; just as the McMahon pledges of political independence to the Arabs were to have rallied the Arab masses to

chickens, pigs and even cattle, a privilege formerly denied them by most of the *hacendados*.

The United States government is worried about the 11,250,000 bales of "surplus" cotton in which it has invested some \$600,000,000, and on which storage charges are around \$45,000,000 annually. It can think of nothing, however, except to perpetuate, by subsidies, the feudal and uneconomic system under which cotton is grown. Furthermore, it maintains, through its refusal to come to grips with the so-called problem of "under-consumption", an internal market in which people are living in desperate need of food, clothing, and shelter for want of enough income to pay both for legitimate costs and the maintenance of an owning class.

Barring war, into which the United States will attempt to drag Mexico if it engages in another European adventure; barring Fascism, which our own imperialists are helping to advance in Mexico through their oil boycott and their support of counter-revolutionary groups; and barring further pressure against Mexican progress by the Washington government, Mexico will go ahead on its social program. The success of the recently-freed semi-serf and near-slave furnishes an inspiring example which some day may be used to dethrone ailing "King Cotton", and set up a sharecropper and landworker democracy in his place.

the cause of the Allies in the World War. In both cases England scored notable successes.

And what England won in the war she had not the slightest intention of relinquishing after the war was over. Legally England was granted no more than a mandate over Palestine—to be held only until such time as the country was fit for self-government; but Great Britain never regarded Palestine as anything but an integral part of her empire and conducted herself accordingly.

All this the Peel Commission explained with perfect ingenuity. Not that we had to wait for its report to discover the real aims of British policy in Palestine. Twenty years of British rule should have opened the eyes even of the blind.

Since 1920, the Jewish community in Palestine was subjected to four pogrom-attacks—each more violent than the preceding one. Now, if we have learned anything from Jewish history, we learned this: no pogrom occurs in any country whose government does not want it to occur. Surely, British imperialism, which rules over a quarter of the globe, could find a way to cope with the small terrorist bands in Palestine, especially when the Palestinian Jew is not at all ready to be slaughtered without a fight.

The pogroms were never unexpected. The air was charged before each attack. There was ample time to take precautionary measures. But the government did nothing. If it did not actually instigate or encourage the pogroms, it is certainly guilty of criminal negligence—negligence which gave the terrorists the right to claim that the Government was with them. The Peel Commission was quite outspoken on this point. It publicly made the charge that the Palestinian government failed to give Jews the protection to which they were entitled.

Every pogrom resulted in a commission being appointed to determine its causes. And the report of every commission led to some new restriction of Jewish immigration and endeavor in Palestine. In the intervals, the government would sometimes relent in the enforcement of the restrictions without, however, repealing them. They were held as a sword over the head of the Jewish population.

Whenever there was a clash of interests between Arabs and Jews, the government sided with the first. At the same time it tried to appease the Jewish population by granting it some minor concession. It has enacted laws which, in effect, rewarded the terrorists for their attacks on Jews, and attempted to offset it by overlooking slight violations of the same laws by Jews.

Great Britain, while upholding the cause of Arab



semi-feudalism in every important showdown, tried to appear before the world in the role of an impartial arbitrator. This is why Jewish objections to British regulations were, until very recently, never completely ignored. Some people were deceived by this attitude; they—and this includes important Zionist leaders—mistook it for lack of firmness and absence of policy. In reality it was part of British policy in Palestine—not to appear to have a policy. Ostensible lack of decision was the best means of keeping the country in constant turmoil, of setting up one part of the population against the other, and of playing both ends against the middle.

But England has not overlooked something that Zionist leadership has failed to notice for a long time, namely—the coming into being of an Arab nation. She realized that new methods would have to be applied if her rule over the Arab lands was to continue. Before the war, there were only Arab tribes, scattered over a number of countries and forever quarreling with each other. British promises of Arab political independence have certainly contributed to the Arabs' enlisting under the English flag. But after reading the memoirs of T. E. Lawrence, organizer of the "Arab Revolt" against Turkey, one cannot escape the conclusion that British gold played an even more decisive role. The support of the Arab chieftains was simply bought and paid for.

But the situation changed. In the first place, the Arabs who entered the war as tribes, came out of it a people, even if only in embryo. In the second place, a new bidder for Arab cooperation appeared on the scene: Hitlerism-Fascism. A number of Arab states were born. In Palestine, Jewish activity has given accelerated tempo to the process of Arab social differentiation, bringing in its wake a process of Arab national consolidation. Arab land-owners and their servants—the Muftis and intellectuals—put themselves at the head of the national movement in order not to be swept out of power by the social awakening of the Arab toiling masses. Hence the ultra-reactionary character of the Arab Nationalist Movement. Hence, too, the close relationship between the movement and Hitlerism.

That the Arab National Movement has, from its very inception, assumed an anti-Jewish character goes without saying. Jewish settlement spelled the death-knell of the very system upon which the economic and social power of the Arab leaders rested. And they could no more be expected peacefully to accept Jewish development in Palestine than could the French aristocracy be expected to make peace with the French bourgeoisie at the time of the Great Revolution.

England was not unmindful of the *objective* danger of the Arab National Movement eventually turning against herself—and she tried to control its direction. By catering to the anti-Jewish sentiments of the incited

Arab mobs, she hoped to prevent, or at least to retard, the development of the movement into an anti-imperialist force.

This explains why the English government tolerated the pogrom-activities of the Effendis (Arab feudal land owners). Here we also find the explanation for the fact that the government always supported the most reactionary leaders and helped them crush all opposition emanating from more liberal Arab groupings.

British maneuvers in international affairs have also had repercussions in Palestine. To a certain extent British policy in Palestine has become a barometer by which could be ascertained the social climate of the world. Whenever international liberalism gained the upper hand, Jewish effort in Palestine was allowed to proceed unfettered. However, in times of reactionary tides, a pro-Arab policy was pursued by the English Government. Is it any wonder, then, that the "White Paper" coincides with the policy of "appeasement"?

The lines are now becoming visible. On one side we have the Arab nationalist movement headed by fascist elements who are desperately trying to check the cultural and economic growth of Palestine in order to retain an obsolete system. On the other hand there is Jewish upbuilding which is revolutionizing the country. Between them stands England, trying to strike a balance by giving the loaf to Arab reaction and some crumbs to the Jews. She occupies the same position in the world at large; standing between democracy and fascism, feeding bread to the latter and stones to the first.

But what of Zionism and what stand must Socialists now take in relation to it?

A correct answer to these questions is possible only on the basis of the following considerations:

1. To many Jews Palestine represents the glory of their national past. To others it represents a normal national future. But to the vast majority of the more than a quarter of a million Jews who have immigrated into Palestine in the past ten years, and to many more hundreds of thousands of Jews who are waiting for a chance to enter Palestine,—that country means the only escape from an unbearable present. They are not carried to Palestine on the wings of national aspirations or social ideals; they are driven thither by the most brutal persecution in modern history.

2. Socialists must evaluate events and processes from the point of view of their effect on the play of social forces. A movement is progressive if it advances the cause of social liberation; it is reactionary if it is detrimental to that cause.

Proceeding from these considerations I hope to be able to show, in a subsequent article, that it is the duty of true socialists to support the Jewish upbuilding in Palestine.



# Contradictions and Perspectives of Fascism

by Otto Bauer

GERMAN fascism has rearmed the German Reich, which was defeated in the world war and disarmed by the Versailles Treaty. It has re-introduced universal compulsory service. The taxation of industry by the state served primarily to acquire, in a few years, the implements for a modern gigantic army. Fascism has completed vast fortification constructions, has rapidly expanded the industries important for war and moved them from the border regions into the interior, has built strategically important motor roads. Fascism endeavors to make Germany blockade proof by utilizing German mineral resources, by intensifying German agriculture, by the building of new great industries for manufacturing substitutes and by the accumulation of important raw materials for war reserves.

Economic and political rearmament go hand in hand: the suppression of all parties, social organizations and spiritual movements that might oppose war and the preparation for and waging of war; the organization of an awe-inspiring apparatus of force, that in time of war shall crush all opposition to the waging of war; the nationalist-imperialist impregnation of the whole people by propaganda, monopolized by the ruling party, and by the nationalist-imperialist education of the youth.

Thus strengthened German fascism could force the democratic powers into the defensive, occupy and fortify the Rhineland, intervene in Spain, annex Austria, threaten Czechoslovakia,\* place all of south-eastern Europe under its thumb and demand restoration of the colonies lost in the war.

This vast success is no doubt the result of the fascist political, economic and labor relations set-up. Only the totalitarian dictatorship has made it possible to concentrate the whole might of the nation upon the strengthening of national imperialism. Only the fascist economic set-up has made possible the fearful strengthening of Germany's armaments and potential war might within a few years. Only the fascist rules for labor relations have, through intensified exploitation of the working class, placed the state in a position where it has at its disposal the vast surplus values, which are needed for the rapid and mighty expansion of its war machinery.

However great this success, fascism faces insurmountable barriers. The arming of a modern giant army, the construction of fortifications and motor roads, the relocation of war industry, the building of new industries for manufacturing substitutes—all this is work, which has to be done only once. As soon as it is practically completed, the fascist dictatorship is confronted by this choice:

It can throw the whole mass of workers, employed in these undertakings, out of work and plunge the whole economy into a severe crisis, in which the contradiction between the vastly expanded productive apparatus and the greatly lowered buying power of the people must express itself, a crisis which will severely shake the political mastery of fascism.

Or it can set in motion the war machine, built by these enormous labor productions, i.e., start a war.

The economic and military rise of the fascist states has completely altered the balance of power in the world. At the end of the World War the victors dictated a division of power, which no longer corresponds to the new conditions of power. The contradiction between the two-decade-old dictated system of states and the new power conditions calls loudly for a violent revision of political borders through another war. The powers that are threatened by the aggressive imperialism and armaments of the fascist states have been forced into no less feverish counter armaments. The world has been plunged into a state of feverish competitive armaments and chronic war scares.

In order to minimize, as far as possible, the danger of a naval blockade the fascist states are building up their own production of raw materials regardless of cost. They produce in their own countries raw materials which they could import from abroad considerably cheaper. Thereby they raise the general price level in the world market, they grant export premiums to their own countries. In order to be able, nevertheless, to compete in the world market, they grant export premiums to their industry from public funds, acquired from selling below cost in foreign markets. The expansion of the production of raw materials in the fascist countries causes the overseas producers of raw materials to lose part of their export markets; they are thereby plunged into export crises. The fascist states utilize their manipulation of the money system to rob their foreign creditors, to subsidize their own exports with funds thus obtained, and to compel foreign states to accept payment of interests of debts in the form of merchandise.

In this way the policies of the fascist states sorely disturb the whole world economy. The international division of work, developed during the growth of capitalism, receives a set-back. World trade shrinks. The international economic crises become more acute. The armament race leads everywhere to painful increase of the tax burden. The war scare prevents all productive investments. The conflicts between the capitalist classes in all countries grow sharper. As a result of the serious cracking of world economy, the imperialist tendencies become stronger everywhere.

\* This was written before September 1938. [EDITOR.]



In this way fascism places the world in a situation from which it can find no way out except through war. Fascism has placed the whole political, economic and social life of great nations completely in the service of the task of preparing for war. It has thereby completely changed all conditions of political power and all economic relations on the whole earth. It therefore inevitably leads to war.

Fascism won its first victories in Italy and Germany, the states which were not satisfied by the events of the World War. The example of Italian fascism promoted the fight for power of German national fascism. In the same way the example of German and Italian fascism today entices the capitalist classes of the other countries.

German and Italian fascism shows them how it is possible to crush the workers' organizations, keep down the working class, increase the exploitation of the working class, and strengthen military and economic war preparations and armaments. Therefore fascist movements of different strength develop in every country. The reactionary sections of the capitalist class come under the influence of fascist ideology. So also do rebel movements amongst the petty bourgeoisie, the farmers and the intellectuals.

In some countries the reactionary ruling parties are threatened by petty bourgeois fascist movements. They try to resist these movements by themselves establishing dictatorships and imitating the fascist methods of ruling. Such semi-fascist dictatorships have become the prevailing form of government in all eastern Europe: in Austria from 1934 to the Anschluss, in the Baltic countries, in Roumania and also, though under different forms, in Poland and Hungary.

In countries where democracy still remains, the ruling classes use the menace of fascism to scare the working class and force it onto the defensive and retreat.

The fascist states utilize for their own purposes the hate of the capitalist classes for the working class movement and fear of proletarian revolution. Wherever fascism has been victorious it has forcibly suppressed the working class movement and socialist propaganda. It cannot, however, prevent the radio from daily bringing news about the great labor movements in the democratic countries and the message of socialist building in the Soviet Union to the masses of workers suppressed by fascism. It can therefore not feel secure in its own power as long as great democracies with mighty labor movements exist in the West and the country of the proletarian revolution exists in the East. It makes itself the champion on an international scale of the fight against "Marxism" and "Bolshevism". It tries thereby to win the sympathy of the capitalist classes in every country. It does this to prevent the conservative imperialist countries, though they are menaced by its own aggressive imperialism, from uniting with the Soviet Union

against fascism. It tries to disguise its own imperialist aims under the pretense that it is necessary to fight against the proletarian revolution. When fascism wants to lay its hand upon Spanish or Moroccan ores, it calls it "fighting bolshevism". It prepares a war in eastern Europe by pretending, that its fight for farm land and mineral resources is "a fight to save European civilization from bolshevism".

Fascism recommends itself to the capitalist classes of the whole world as the champion of the capitalist counter revolution. It proclaims its right to counter-revolution and intervention in any country in which the working class has advanced itself. It intervened in Spain in favor of Franco and the church nobility against the Spanish workers. It claims the right to step in with armed force wherever "Bolshevism" has any success, meaning by "Bolshevism" any free revolutionary labor movement. The fascist "axis", Berlin-Rome-Tokio, demands the right to defend the capitalist system by armed force, against proletarian revolution, wherever in the world it is threatened. Thus the Holy Alliance once demanded the right to defend with armed force the feudal state and social system, wherever it was threatened, against the bourgeois revolution. Liberation from fascism is therefore necessary in order to free the world proletariat, just as—a century ago—the crushing of the Holy Alliance was necessary in order to emancipate the bourgeoisie.

Fascism consolidates the power of the state into unbridled totalitarian power. It forcibly and effectively suppresses all resistance of the exploited classes against capitalist exploitation, which it intensifies to the highest degree possible. It subjects the capitalist process of production to its decrees and thereby raises its level of productivity. Fascism thus appears to be the utmost in capitalist victory over proletarian socialism. In spite of this, however, fascism is the product of the deterioration of capitalism. It appears first when the capitalist bourgeoisie no longer can keep the mass of people obedient through moral leadership under democratic forms but only through a dictatorship of terror. It appears first when the economic machinery can no longer be effectively regulated by the desire for profit of the individual capitalists but requires the social direction provided by the state.

The planned social direction of the economic life shows, even in fascist fetters, its ability to produce and its superiority over the anarchy of private capitalism. Under the fascist dictatorship, however, the social direction of the economic life succeeds on the basis of capitalist property conditions, and it serves exclusively armaments, war preparations and the imperialist struggle for power of the state. It thereby subjects the working class to unbearable state slavery. It intensifies exploitation. It can be maintained only by a dictatorship of terror. It becomes even more viciously opposed to



the vital interests of the working class. It leads to a further setback of the division of work in world economy. It intensifies all economic and political contrasts between the states. It leads unavoidably to war.

Under the fascist dictatorship the social direction of the economic life is based upon private ownership of the means of production and transportation. The state leaves the means of production with the private owners who operate only for the sake of profit. It will not, however, allow the operators to dispose of the profits, which it regulates by direct decree. It subordinates all special interests of the individual group of employers to the interests of war armaments, claiming this to be for the common good. The bureaucracy which directs the economic life comes hereby inevitably into conflict with one special interest after the other. These conflicts multiply. This struggle represents the conflict between the social direction of the economic processes and the private ownership of the means of production.

Fascism is the political form of a capitalism which nationally and internationally fears the proletarian revolution and seeks to suppress it. But it creates a society whose organization is in the sharpest conflict with the vital interests of the working class; a society whose ruling caste every day and hour must come into conflict with the special interests of every single group of the possessing classes; a society whose development can end in no other way than in a war, which will destroy all existing forms of power within the state; a society which contains stronger revolutionary pressure than any society before it.

Revolutionary tendencies are inherent in fascist society even though they are hidden by the terror of the fascist dictatorship. These tendencies, however, are themselves full of inner conflicts. The conflict which exists between the social direction of the processes of production and the private ownership of the means of production can be solved in two ways:

Private ownership can shatter the chains of the social direction of the processes of production. Thus society relapses into the form of liberal capitalism.

Or the social direction of the processes of production can remove the barriers of private ownership of the means of production. Society thus changes from the social direction of capitalist economy, in the interest of imperialism, into a social organization of economy in the interest of the satisfaction of social needs. In the revolutionary tendencies, inherent in fascist society, is therefore hidden the conflict between liberal and socialist tendencies. This conflict can only be liquidated through a historical process in which the anti-fascist revolution crushes the fascist corporation and then evolves into the socialist revolution, which rebuilds the organization of society and the direction of the economic life on a higher plane, for a higher purpose.

## THE FAILURE OF COMMUNISM

WORLD COMMUNISM, A History of the Communist International, by F. Borkenau, W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1939, 442 pp., \$3.75.

This excellent book was published before the infamous alliance between Stalin and Hitler was publicly announced; but its carefully written and authentic pages, devoted to a history of the Third International, contain the *rationale* for the pact.

Long before the middle of August 1939 Borkenau could honestly write: "Much of what the Comintern does today is conscious and intentional imitation of Fascism: the Fuhrer-worship of the leader of every communist party, the nationalism, the appeal to youth, the military atmosphere." He might have added: the one party dictatorship, the suppression by blood purge, exile, concentration camps of all dissident opinion, the perversion of scientific truth in the interests of party orthodoxy . . . these and other characteristics have marked the demoralizing path of the Third International until today it brazenly and brutally embraces the sworn enemy of the working class.

How does this come about? How did this avowed instrument for workingclass liberation become the betrayer of its declared ideals? Every serious worker, every serious thinker has been, certainly now is examining the basic ideology and practices of the Soviet Union and its leader in order to discover how revolutions are made; how revolutions are betrayed; how to avoid the treachery and betrayal if we are to go forward to a democratic Socialist society. For unless the answers to these questions are found, unless Socialism can be presented in antithesis to both Capitalism-Fascism and Russian Communism it is doomed in this epoch of history.

Since every Revolution produces its contemporary as well as later reflections it will help us to reread Luxemburg and Martov as against Lenin and Trotsky; it will be useful to read Victor Serge, Balabanoff and Souvarine and the book here reviewed.

Important as the question of workers' democracy is in planning for a future society, there is yet another yardstick by which one examines the tragic policies of the Third International. It is sometimes argued by Communists and ex-Communists that the Third International had really hoped to unify the workers' movement and bring about a united front of all those who are truly concerned with the emancipation of the workers of the world. The record here is a sorry one. During the period that marks the formation of the Third International, Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev and the others attempted to impose on the workers' movement outside Russia the famous 21 points which in relation to the workers' movement were comparable to the vicious 21 points that Japan sought to impose upon China in 1915. Failing in this they split the workers' movement throughout the world but then attempted to establish a united front. It was the united front, however, which in the words of Lenin in *Left-Wing Communism* would support the reformists "as the rope supports the hanged man." The united front effort was given up by the time of the Fifth World Communist Congress. This, in 1924, marked a turn to the left which split the trade union movement and by 1928 had evolved into the theory of social Fascism. Now this theory made Socialist and Labor parties the main enemy, the third parties of the bourgeoisie; parties that had to be destroyed even before an assault would be made upon Fascism, Naziism and other reactionary forms of finance capitalism.

A review can hardly do justice to this book but I should like to end by urging all readers of this review, especially



those who bear responsibility in the workers' movement, to regard the reading and application of Borkenau's "World Communism" as one of the major tasks in the coming period. Undoubtedly there are pages in the book with which every reader will not always agree, but this is small matter in proportion to the debt which we owe to the author for having assembled this material.

—FRANK N. TRAGER.

## FORCES IN MODERN MEXICO

"Mexico Marches", by J. H. Plenn, New York, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 386 pp.

The increased interest in Mexico, in part evidenced by the increased number of tourists, has been the result of the flood of books on Mexico that have appeared in the past few years. Of these Mexico Marches distinguishes itself by its genuine interest in the common people of Mexico, especially the workers and peasants who have looked to the revolution which began in 1910 for a change in their economic and social position and have seen their fondest hopes cheated again and again by those who led them and made them flowery promises. Mexico Marches is an impressionistic picture of modern Mexico. It is neither very profound nor very scholarly. It does, however, communicate to the reader the love and understanding of the common people which the author feels and which is the product of his long residence in Mexico or on the border of Mexico.

The book opens with the most significant event in modern Mexico, namely, the expropriation of the American and British oil companies, the spearhead of imperialism in Mexico. It sketches briefly the history of the struggle with the oil companies. It recalls how the solution of the problem was sidetracked through the diplomacy of Ambassador Morrow and shows that the problem is bound up with the fight for national economic independence, one of the chief factors in the revolution against Díaz.

The same technique of working from the present to the past and again to the present is used in other parts of the book. Mr. Plenn, as so many other writers on modern Mexico, rightly sees in the agrarian problem the key to modern Mexico. Agriculture is the occupation of more than 70% of the population. The lack of land was the chief factor that drew the masses to the support of the revolutionary movements and the solution of the problem remains the biggest task for all those who claim to be revolutionists.

The poorest section of the book is undoubtedly that dealing with the labor and Communist movements. No attempt is made by Mr. Plenn to relate the history and growth of the CROM to the national life. The analysis of the evolution of Lombardo Toledano as the outstanding leader of the Mexican labor movement is inaccurate and leaves much to be desired. Although Mr. Plenn does not directly state so, he implies that Lombardo Toledano became converted from a narrow syndicalism and from idealism to materialism as a result of his acceptance of the "Communist party" line after his break with the CROM. Except for a few rather superficial facts about the history of the Communist Party no analysis or criticism of the party is given anywhere in the book.

The book ends as all books on Mexico must inevitably do with a consideration of the relations of Mexico to the United States. The author realizes that diplomatic opposition to the government of Mexico by the United States makes the life of such a government very uncertain. The author is realistic enough to maintain that "enlightened opinion cannot look upon American imperialism as more virtuous than any other brand". The oil expropriations have proved what some have maintained for a long time that true economic

independence of semi-colonial nations of the type of Mexico is really impossible under capitalism. Emancipation from the domination of American and British oil companies has thrown Mexico into dependence upon the fascist nations.

In spite of many mistakes of facts and interpretations, Mexico Marches presents a sympathetic analysis of the important questions facing Mexico and Mexico's relations with the United States. The book is particularly useful to one who wants to understand the forces directing modern Mexico.

—S. F. SIMON.

## THE GERMANY THAT WAS

"Labour Relations in Republican Germany", by Nathan Reich, Ph.D., New York, Oxford University Press. 293 pp. \$3.00.

This book is sub-titled "An experiment in Industrial Democracy" and is in fact an excellent description of what may, upon superficial analysis, pass for "industrial democracy". There is no doubt that in Germany under the Weimar Constitution, labor had approached as close to industrial democracy as is possible in a capitalist society. Not only had labor obtained the best social reforms of any country, but it had also received constitutional recognition in the form of "Works Councils", the annual election of which was compulsory, whether or not the employer "recognized" the union, whether or not there were any union members in the plant. The author is right in declaring that "no other institution in the industrial life of post-war Germany aroused so many hopes and shattered so many illusions as the institution of the Workers Councils." He does not make clear, however, that the constitutional recognition of the Workers Councils was a method of taming the revolutionary "Arbeiterräte" which arose in 1918-19. The entire system of labor relations in Weimar Germany was an attempt to graft "industrial democracy" onto the capitalist mode of production. The final outcome of this attempt is known only too well. It is therefore all the more important to understand the basic fallacy of all such attempts.

## FACTS ABOUT STRIKES

"Strikes", by John I. Griffin, Ph.D., New York, Columbia University Press. 319 pp. \$4.00.

There is no doubt that the description of this book as "A study in quantitative Economics" is apt, for 100 of its pages are devoted exclusively to an appendix of statistical tables, while in the text itself are included 42 additional tables. In addition, there are 14 charts, mostly full page, illustrating various trends. These figures alone should be a sufficient index of the value of the book, and of the amount of research required to collect and condense this vast amount of information.

Covering the period 1880-1937, the book therefore gives us a picture of strikes in the United States, including annual trends, causes, duration and results of strikes, relations of unions to strikes (incidentally, it will be interesting to note the conclusion that union workers have a strike rate forty times as great as non-union workers; no wonder large employers especially don't like unions!) The author also tries to establish a correlation between strikes and prices, but quite properly warns against drawing any conclusion from the figures, which indicate different trends at different periods. It would, of course, be too much to expect in such a small volume, a correlation between strikes and basic trends in capitalist development. Such a study might, however, clear up the apparent contradiction of strike and price relations. In general, those interested in economics, the labor movement, or related matters, will find this book invaluable.



For Correct Information About

# INDIA

and for its

**MARXIST INTERPRETATION**

Read

## INDEPENDENT INDIA

Published Weekly

EDITED BY M. N. ROY

**A Marxist Revolutionary of  
International Repute**

One Year \$2.50 — Single Copy 10c.

ORDER FROM

### SOCIALIST REVIEW

114 WEST 14th STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

REMARKABLE BOOKS BY M. N. ROY

**FASCISM: Philosophy, Professions and  
Practice.**

**RUSSIAN REVOLUTION: A Review  
and a Perspective.**

OUR PROBLEMS

OUR DIFFERENCES

HISTORICAL ROLE OF ISLAM

MY EXPERIENCES IN CHINA

Order Books From

**INDEPENDENT INDIA**

BOMBAY, 7, INDIA

Dear Comrade Subscriber:

THIS ISSUE is No. 12 of the current volume of the SOCIALIST REVIEW. In a few days, this volume will be bound and placed on sale at \$2.50. But, we still have a number of copies of the previous volume which we must move on to make room for the new volumes. At the same time, we need some immediate cash to take up the slack caused by the summer drought. Instead of asking you for a donation, which means you give something to the REVIEW, we have a different proposal:

IF YOU will secure and send in to us TWO SUBSCRIPTIONS for the SOCIALIST REVIEW we will give you, FREE, a bound volume of the AMERICAN SOCIALIST MONTHLY, containing all the numbers up until the name was changed to Socialist Review.

THIS VOLUME of the AMERICAN SOCIALIST MONTHLY is a veritable storehouse of Marxism, Labor History, Socialist Problems, Controversy, Book Review and other indispensable material. It contains the last articles by the late HAIM KANTOROVITCH on Marxism, Leninism, the Russian Revolution, American Socialist Problems, Trotskyism, Reformism, the Road to Power. It contains other important articles by NORMAN THOMAS, HAROLD J. LASKI, SIDNEY HOOK, DAVID P. BERENBERG, HARRY W. LAIDLER, JAMES T. FARRELL, G. D. H. COLE, DEVERE ALLEN, FRANK N. TRAGER, HERBERT ZAM and others.

NOWHERE else can you obtain such a collection of brilliant and searching articles covering 18 months of International History. And this priceless volume is yours for the expenditure of a little effort. All you have to do is send in TWO full subscriptions to the SOCIALIST REVIEW at \$1.50.

THIS OFFER applies ONLY to subscribers. Non-subscribers may take advantage of it by becoming subscribers—that is, by sending TWO subscriptions in ADDITION TO THEIR OWN.

THIS OFFER expires Sept. 30, 1939.

SEND SUBSCRIPTIONS OR INQUIRIES TO:

### SOCIALIST REVIEW

114 West 14th Street

New York, N. Y.



YOU CAN NOW PRESERVE THE

# **SOCIALIST REVIEW**

IN PERMANENT FORM

---

Orders now taken for

## **BOUND VOLUMES**

of the

### **SOCIALIST REVIEW, VOLUME SIX**

**CONTAINS TWO FULL YEARS in a neat, cloth-bound,  
library style book.**

•

Searching Analysis of National and International Affairs;  
Labor and Socialist Movement; the War Question; the  
Civil War in Spain; the A.F.L. and the C.I.O.

•

FOR A SHORT TIME ONLY, WE OFFER A

## **SPECIAL COMBINATION**

Bound Volume, Socialist Review

**PLUS**

Regular Subscription to Socialist Review

**For Only \$3.00**

---

ORDER AT ONCE FROM

---

**SOCIALIST REVIEW**  
114 WEST 14th STREET  
NEW YORK, N. Y.