

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

## The Labor Party

*A Debate Between James Burnham, Max Shachtman and Hal Draper*

Means and Ends . . . By John Dewey

*A Critical Comment on Leon Trotsky's "Their Morals and Ours"*

Government Spending and the Stock Market

By David Cowles

Max Eastman Answers & Is Answered

TWENTY CENTS

AUGUST 1938

# At Home

"THE best all-around issue so far"—was the general verdict on the July issue. We think so too, but there's better to come. All party branches and Y.P.S.L. circles, with one important exception, continued to do well in circulating the magazine. Praise from far and wide reached the office more than ever before. . . . Yet the fly is trying to climb into the ointment, and has its feet already on the edges. Summer always takes its toll with radical publications; circulation is affected. But THE NEW INTERNATIONAL disposed of its entire July output—only a small quantity still on hand—and if Local New York had done even its usual part, there would have been quite a shortage. New York slumped inexcusably with the July issue, almost entirely because of neglect and indifference by a few party branches and the Y.P.S.L., despite strong efforts by literature director, Abe Miller. Over 200 less copies than usual were sold—an amount easily covered, and more, if the Party and Y.P.S.L. members endeavored to circulate the magazine in various places: open air concerts at stadiums, college and university summer schools, street meetings and more adequately among party and Y.P.S.L. members themselves. Wake up, New York! You're needlessly careless, when properly you should be way ahead of the procession in N.I. circulation.

By such slumps as above indicated, the very existence of the magazine is endangered, without good cause. Fortunately, circulation not only kept up everywhere, but increased again in numerous instances, so that July was a virtual sell-out again. BUT—BUT: Agents this past month have been slow in making their bundle payments, thus placing the magazine in a tight financial spot. So hurry along the bundle payments. And another reminder: Quite a few subscriptions have expired. Renewals can no doubt be easily obtained if the branches will proceed to visit the subscribers. That means much-needed money and steady readers. Get busy at once! New subscriptions in June were the highest to date, primarily because of the successful subscription drive being conducted by Minneapolis and St. Paul. It can be done! July so far has been very slow in this field.

The past month brought new bundle orders and numerous increases in bundles. New orders: San Pedro, Calif., G.W., agent; Portland, Ore.; Worcester, Mass., P.T. agent (with an immediate re-order and permanent increase); Evansville, Ind., H.S., agent, with payment for bundle a year in advance (swell idea, comrades, pick it up); Edinburgh, Scotland; 4th International Group, Johannesburg, South Africa, and Bombay, India! Our slogan: The N.I. in every port and every town on land and sea.

Increases in orders: Brisbane, Australia, A. Sinclair, agent, 6 to 10

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME IV

AUGUST 1938

NUMBER 8 (Whole No. 23)

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 118 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles: 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Single copy: 20c. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board: JAMES BURNHAM, MAX SHACHTMAN, MAURICE SPECTOR.

Business Manager: MARTIN ABERN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Question of a Labor Party:

The Challenge and the Answer, by James Burnham and Max Shachtman . . . . .	227
For the Present Party Position, by Hal Draper . . . . .	229
Means and Ends, by John Dewey . . . . .	232
Browder's Two Roosevelts, by Albert Gates . . . . .	233
Zionism and the Lion, by Ben Herman . . . . .	236
A New Mirror in the Old Frame, by George E. Novack . . . . .	239
Spending and the Stock Market, by David Cowles . . . . .	241
Burnham Dodges My Views, by Max Eastman . . . . .	244
A Little Wool Pulling, by James Burnham . . . . .	246
They, the People, by Dwight Macdonald . . . . .	248
More on the Suppression of Kronstadt, by Leon Trotsky . . . . .	249
ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION:	
The Question of the United Front, by Leon Trotsky . . . . .	250
BOOKS:	
The English Worker, by E. Robertson . . . . .	253
Halting Progress, by Rubin Gotesky . . . . .	254
Inside Front Cover: At Home. Notes.	

to 15 copies; W.I.S. group, London, Mildred Kahn, agent, another increase—to 42 copies; Allentown, Pa., active Ruth Querio, agent, from 5 to 15 copies regularly (20 of June); T. Mercer, Glasgow, Scotland, 12 to 24 copies; Cleveland, Gerry Arnold, agent, ordered an additional 15 copies of the July and five of the June issue. . . . However, there were some small decreases, attributed by the comrades to the summer period. Some losses come from non-payment of bills, necessitating cut-offs altogether. Don't let this unnecessary thing happen, agents.

Party and Y.P.S.L. units changed agents in numerous places. Ann Charloff took over in Los Angeles; Morris Slavin went to Youngstown from Columbus, and Harvey Dawes shifted from Youngstown to Columbus: an even trade, both good workers. Lou Merrit is now the agent in Newark, N. J.; Doris Cooper in Toledo; and Olin Stevens in Rochester, N. Y.

They and our readers all have lots to say about THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, with numerous suggestions for future articles. From Carolyn Kerry, Oakland: "June issue was a humdinger and was well received out here." Dave Burbank, St. Louis comments specifically: "The June issue makes a fine impression; the cover is especially good. . . . It is extremely important that we give THE NEW INTERNATIONAL as much dignity as possible, both in contents and format. . . . Many people will respond to this sort of thing; in other party projects we cannot afford the luxury of dignity very often. Trotsky's article is superb, of course. . . ." Says Morris Slavin, Youngstown, "The July issue is a masterpiece. If you can keep up the good work, we'll stabilize the N.I. in short time." And from many others: "Splendid";

"Best number yet; superlatives inadequate"; "More interesting each issue"; a union worker in Texas says, "Received the swell issues"; and so on.

These comrades back up their praise, too, with work for the magazine. From Chicago, Karl Shier writes that a visit to a vacation camp in South Haven resulted in ten copies sold. P.O. News sold 23 copies of July issue on the first day. Max Weinrib and Ray Carlton apparently are the leading salesmen in Chicago, and Sam Alberts, a visiting New Yorker has been ably assisting Shier. Carlton sells 10 copies regular to members of his union group.

Abroad, hard-working comrades like Margaret Johns and Ed Fitzroy of London continue their good work, as do comrades in Glasgow, Leeds and Liverpool. The N.I. agents in Sydney, Australia, N. Origlasso and B. Palley now dispose of 65 copies between them; and in Cape Town and Johannesburg, South Africa, agents Paul Koston and Max Sapire import a hundred copies.

Young and old, we get them all for the N.I.: A 78 year old revolutionist, R. G. Junkin, from Shedd, Oregon, subscribes to and reads the magazine carefully, and in response to a query concerning his interest, writes: "You ask if I'm a farmer or industrial worker. I am not either. I get an old age relief pension. I am 78 years of age. . . . I was one of the five candidates of the Socialist Party of Oregon in 1932 for Presidential elector. . . . Please also send me the program, constitution and by-laws of the Socialist Workers Party." Keenly alive to the problems of the day. Do all Y.P.S.L. and party members read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL?

With all that's happening in Palestine, a reader at the Hebrew Uni- (Continued on page 255)

# Notes

WE continue to feel the pressure of a mere 32 pages, especially now that we have increased the margin separating the page-columns in order to facilitate reading. The result in this issue is that, in order to include the material which we believe will be of greatest interest to the readers, we have been reluctantly obliged to omit a number of our more regular features.

Thus, the monthly comments by the editor had to be left out; so did a number of valuable book reviews (we confess frankly that our book department continues to fall short of requirements and wishes, and that we have not lived up to our promises). In exchange, however, a full measure is being given of other material.

We think we are succeeding more and more in finding a "balance" between an organ of opinion into which the breath of living controversy never penetrates and the "open forum" organ which pretends to no views of its own and is open to controversy for its own sake. It is precisely because we have such confidence in our views that we do not fear but welcome controversy.

In the first few months of publication, new series, we have already given the floor to anarchists to reply to our criticism of their policy in the Spanish civil war; and to critics of "Kronstadt" to reply to the position taken in articles by John G. Wright and Leon Trotsky.

In the current issue, we have three significant discussions going at the same time. Hal Draper, secretary of the Young People's Socialist League (4th International) takes issue with two of the review's editors on the question of the Labor party, on which more is expected in the future. Max Eastman and James Burnham continue the discussion started by the former's article in a recent *Harper's* which the latter criticized in our June issue. John Dewey, America's foremost exponent of progressive education, well known also not only for his service as chairman of the Commission to Investigate the Charges Made at the Moscow Trials Again Leon Trotsky but also for his writings in philosophy, makes his criticism of Trotsky's recent "Their Morals and Ours", to which Trotsky will reply next month.

Also in the next issue will be several articles held over from August and a number of new contributions. There will be Max Shachtman's article on the diplomatic origins of the Stalinist People's Front policy, and an article by E. Robertson on Canada's rôle in world politics, with special reference to her relations with England and the United States—the first article on the subject in our review although the Dominion is both geographically and politically of vital importance to problems in this country. And, as usual, lots and lots more.

THE EDITORS

# The Question of a Labor Party

## The Challenge and the Answer

**P**OLITICAL FORMATIONS IN THE United States are undergoing a radical realignment, and in addition to the old formations, new ones are appearing on the scene. The changes in the situation are of such a nature as to dictate a change in or amplification of the tactics pursued by the revolutionary Marxists in this country.

Two unprecedented economic crises, the second following the first before it reached the stage of boom; the increasingly deep *social* crisis in which the bourgeoisie finds it impossible to solve the problems of its social order in any of the traditional ways; and the organization of the workers in the basic, mass-production industries under the banner of the C.I.O., numbering more than 3,000,000 genuine proletarians, have not only brought into existence an unmistakable movement for working class political action, but have developed it—for all its backwardness—on a vast scale, one never before known in the U.S.A.

The Labor Non-Partisan League, the direct intervention of the unions in the Detroit and Seattle elections and in the Pennsylvania primaries—these are only superficially similar to the ancient Gompers' policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies"; the formation of the American Labor Party in New York is an even sharper break from the traditional position of the labor movement. The advance consists in the fact that for the first time the American unionists are being mobilized *as a class* to participate in politics. The leaders of labor, however, strive to confine this movement to the old capitalist parties, that is, to prevent this class movement from exceeding the bounds of *bourgeois politics*, and taking the form of independent working class political action. The movement is not temporary or accidental. Under the impulsion of the social crisis it will grow and find clearer expression. Who can challenge this save those who expect an early stabilization of U.S. capitalism, an easy surmounting of the crisis?

Side by side with this movement, however, exists and develops the movement for a "third party". Its most concrete form to date is the organization of the National Progressives. This too is not the product of an individual caprice or aberration, but is based objectively upon the discontent and the dilemma of the middle classes suffering intensely from the crisis, which have been deliberately exploited by demagogues like LaFollette. While its very class basis deprives it of an enduring character, at least with its present form and program, it is an important sign of the times.

More important is the simultaneous movement to develop the "American form" of coalition in one party—a reconstituted Democratic party, freed of the "conservatives", and composed of Roosevelt's "liberals", plus the Republican "progressives" and supported by the L.N.-P.L., the A.L.P., and the two trade union movements. The division in the Democratic camp in 1936, the violent inner-Democratic fights in Congress, the present primary campaign, all of which are based on social conflicts within the party itself, indicate the lines of the schism which the crisis will only deepen and toward which many right wing and left wing Democrats are consciously working. Both camps realize that the

The membership of the Socialist Workers Party is now engaged in a discussion of the position of the organization toward the question of a Labor party. At the recent plenary session of the National Committee, the problem was considered in light of the new situation that has developed in the United States. As a consequence, a thesis was adopted by the majority in favor of a new orientation for the support of the Labor party movement. Issue is taken with this position in an opposing thesis presented by the minority.

Both these documents are now before the party membership. Space considerations prevent their publication in the pages of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, but readers can easily estimate and judge the conflicting standpoints by reference to the discussion articles which are printed in this issue. As is our custom, an internal discussion bulletin has been issued inside the party, in which the theses are reproduced and which has been thrown open for discussion articles on the question written by the members. In addition, special membership meetings are being held in the party and in the youth organization to consider the opposing views. At the end of the discussion, a referendum vote is to be taken which will decide the official position of the party.

In order to acquaint not only the party membership but also all those outside the party who follow with interest its position and development, we have decided to make public the discussion on the Labor party in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. In this manner, all friends of the Socialist Workers Party will be made aware of the arguments advanced for the new position on the Labor party advocated by the majority, as well as the arguments put forward in opposition to it. In making public the dispute we are following what we consider the best traditions of the revolutionary movement in discussing candidly and objectively the most vital problems facing not only the party itself but also the entire working class.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE,  
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY.

old alignments no longer correspond to the needs of the new situation.

What, then, are the actual possibilities of development for working class political action on a mass scale *in the next period*? There appear to us to be three.

A national Labor party, similar in scope and position to the British Labour Party, would be far the most probable development *if* one could arbitrarily transfer the present forces back to the period of America's expansion and rise, approximating the the present period of capitalist decline, so forcefully evident in the United States as well, such a development is distinctly less likely. The social limitations imposed upon a reformist party by desperate, decaying capitalism, set the political limits of such a party. Those who believe that a Labor party in the U.S. would play the same progressive rôle, and for the same period of time, as the British Labour Party, are guilty of flagrant dogmatism and of blindness to those very national peculiarities which they accuse their critics of ignoring. While local Labor party movements are already crystallizing and others will undoubtedly develop, there are few outstanding leaders of the trade unions consciously and firmly working toward a Labor party. On the other hand, other movements, now more powerful and having more conscious and determined leaders, are at work absorbing the incipient Labor party trends.

A "third party" is not unlikely to develop. On a small (state) scale, at least, its establishment is even certain. But its class

instability, especially under the brutal blows of the crisis, gives it no great future and indicates that it will split in two extreme directions before it even grows to full stature. A long-lived independent middle class party, especially in our times, is a chimera; politically, the middle class must fly apart, one section following the leadership of the workers, the other—under fascism—the leadership of big capital.

A reorganized Democratic party, embracing in one coalition all the classic components of the People's Front, has powerful forces working for its development. They include not only the Roosevelt wing, but virtually all the prominent leaders of the unions, especially of the C.I.O., and the powerful machinery of the Stalinist party, which is now firmly mobilized against the organization of a Labor party or any other form of independent working class political action. The almost certain reorganization of the Democratic party, while it does not necessarily exclude the other possibilities mentioned, could, for a short but indeterminate period, swallow up the other movements. In the worst case, which is not at all excluded, its realization might conclusively prevent the American working class from developing a Labor party on any important scale. It would, instead, open up two direct roads, one leading straight to revolutionary politics, the other to fascism.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that a new world war—no small or remote factor!—might well interrupt the whole process, especially the trend toward a Labor party, and at all events impel it to find new channels and forms of expression.

## 2.

The position on the question of a Labor party held up to now by the Socialist Workers Party and the movement out of which it developed, may be summarized as follows: The "revolutionary party [cannot] properly take the initiative in advocating the formation of Labor or Farmer-Labor parties" which our Declaration of Principles characterizes as reformist by virtue of "their false program and perspective"; further, "far from constituting independent class politics, the *present* labor party development is, *from the point of view of the bureaucrats and the bourgeoisie*, the method for preventing the growth of independent class politics"; however, "the labor party movement, *from the point of the workers themselves*, does reveal a progressive development in general towards class consciousness"; therefore, "where the labor party develops as a genuine mass movement separate from the capitalist parties, the revolutionists must remain in the midst of the workers . . . [and] stand at each stage for those concrete policies and actions which sum up a progressive and class perspective" (Our emphasis.—J.B.-M.S.).

A study of the development of our position indicates that we based ourselves on two alternatives. If there is no mass reformist party, or movement for it, we do not initiate or form one as a substitute for the revolutionary party, but build the latter directly as a mass party. Where a mass Labor party does exist, we, to whom sectarianism is alien, are flexible in our tactics and, generally, give critical support to such a party; and, as is known, we followed this course in Minnesota where there is an established Farmer-Labor party, supported by the mass of the unions.

But our analysis was *incomplete*, and in some respects, not sufficiently clear. It did not allow for the present stage of development, in which an undeveloped and only party conscious *mass movement* exists and is torn by warring tendencies of progress and reaction, but is not yet crystallized. A contributory cause preventing us from supplementing our analysis was the need of concentrating our attention and attack upon the reformist Labor party conceptions of the right wingers and centrists in the old Socialist party, in connection, particularly, with the problem of the A.L.P. which originated not as a break-away from the old parties, but as a machine to break the advanced and traditional

socialist influence upon the New York workers and to corral the labor vote for an old capitalist party and ticket.

In brief, our old position cannot and does not effectively answer the problems raised by the present stage of development. It cannot even in theory, for the reason that the new situation was not clearly allowed for. More decisive is the fact that practice has also demonstrated its inadequacy, and consequently, the fact that it does not permit us to give concrete answers, not only such as are understandable and acceptable to the masses, but as will develop more speedily their class consciousness, their break with the bourgeoisie and its parties, and also with their petty bourgeois leaders.

In Pennsylvania, after Kennedy's defeat in the primaries, if we do not urge the workers to put up their own independent ticket on a militant program (which, in view of the election machinery alone that is required, means *the* decisive step towards a Labor party formation), and break with the Democratic party—we can only urge them to support in the elections the S.W.P. (which, alas, is yet too weak to put a ticket in the field); in effect, therefore, we leave the C.I.O. bureaucracy and the Stalinists associated with them a free hand in keeping the masses tied to the Democratic party. In New Jersey, our participation in the conferences of the L.N.-P.L. is sterilized because we do not counterpose in the most concrete form independent political action to the Holderman-Stalinist policy of paralyzing the movement, disorienting it, rendering it passive and delivering it to one gang or another in the capitalist parties. In the A.L.P., similar indecision deprives us in advance of the possibility of playing any rôle whatsoever.

Our old position, irrespective of whether it was right or wrong, or of what specific position we adopt now, must be brought up to date. We advocate a *positive* policy, one that is based upon the *present* reality, as well as the *objective needs* of the working class.

## 3.

Our attitude toward the present movement for workers' political action must give concrete and unambiguous answer to these questions:

Are we indifferent to it? We are not indifferent, and cannot be, toward any mass movement of the workers.

Is the movement, in so far as it represents and expresses a break with the tradition of supporting the old capitalist parties, progressive or reactionary? On the part of the workers, as we have declared in the past, it is obviously progressive.

Will the trend towards independent working class political action, towards increased political consciousness of the working class, grow weaker or stronger in the coming period? One cannot seriously hold to the belief that the social crisis in the United States is deepening, that sharper class conflicts are ahead, that the bourgeoisie must seek to burden the masses increasingly with the cost of the crisis, that mere economic action will prove increasingly difficult and insufficient and therefore give greater point to the urgency of political action—without concluding that the American workers are certain to move at a faster and clearer pace towards independent political class action in the period ahead, whatever organizational forms it may at any given moment take.

Will this movement, in any decisive respect, take the form of a mass revolutionary Marxian party during the next period? At most, one can say that it is not theoretically excluded; but all practical and realistic considerations indicate that this will not be the case.

The *actual* alternatives, therefore, are the development of a mass Labor party, or the immersion and sterilization of the movement into a reorganized Democratic or third party. Powerful political forces are working in the latter direction: the bourgeois and social reformists, the trade union bureaucracy, the Stalinists, the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie, *etc.* They are all

deliberately impeding the development of an independent Labor party.

In this *concrete* dispute, we have, and must have, an active preference. As against the last-named elements and their strategy, we are *positively* in favor of the political organization of the American workers as a class, that is, of a Labor party. This alone makes it possible for us to intervene in the labor movement in such a way as to heighten the class consciousness of the workers in the given circumstances, to sharpen their antagonism to the bourgeois parties, to widen the breach between them and their class-collaborationist, bureaucratic misleadership.

In Pennsylvania, we counterpose to the capitulatory policy of the C.I.O. chiefs, the proposal that labor should enter its own ticket, and set up the political-organizational machinery to run this ticket; we conduct a vigorous campaign for this policy which will be realistic and acceptable to thousands of workers, perhaps only a handful of whom will be interested in an S.W.P. ticket. And the policy will be correct not only because it is "realistic and acceptable", but because it will impel thousands of workers to break from the Democratic party, to break with bourgeois politics and also its sponsors in the C.I.O. and A.F. of L., and to seek the road to independent class action. When the bosses of a Labor Non-Partisan League conference propose the endorsement of Democratic Smith or Republican Jones, we cannot seriously counterpose Trotskyist Robinson; it is entirely correct, however, and fruitful for our movement, to fight at the conference for a candidate put forward by labor itself, for a Labor party organized and controlled by the workers. In the ensuing fight, the militant, advanced, comparatively conscious workers will rally to our side and, in time, swell the ranks of the revolutionary party.

Do we then become a "Labor-party party", which, like the Lovestoneites and Thomasites, will carry on an abstract, general, universal and perpetual campaign for a Labor party? Nothing of the kind. We need a position that enables us to give the concrete revolutionary answer to the specific situations that arise (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, the A.L.P., Workers Alliance, etc.). But more important than this is the fundamental point of difference between our revolutionary position and the opportunist position of the Lovestone and Thomas groups. They are the advocates and defenders of a reformist Labor party, a "good" reformist party. Our Declaration of Principles properly defines the present Labor party movement as reformist on the basis of its "false program and perspective". The Socialist Workers Party does not and cannot advocate or support this program and perspective.

Let us put it more concretely. We are not the advocates of a Labor party "in general", in the abstract, or even of the Labor party as it stands now. We say to the workers: You want to break from the capitalist parties, to form a party of your own? Excellent! That is a step forward, it is progressive. Such a step we will support; we will urge all workers to do likewise. A political party is formed to take control of the affairs of the nation, and we are for the workers taking such control. *But*—you cannot take control and impose your will and interests by means of a reformist program and tactics or under a reformist leadership. That is demonstrated by the experiences in England; right now in the United States; in fact, throughout the world. We of the S.W.P. are a revolutionary party. We therefore propose to you, not a program of petty reforms which the deepening crisis prevents from really improving your conditions; not a program of reforms for reconciling you with your hateful class enemy and its bankrupt social order; but a *program of revolutionary transitional demands* which correspond at once to your needs and desires and to the objective situation. We propose, in order to advance the Labor party movement toward class struggle and not class collaboration, that you adopt a program calling for workers' control of production, for militant Labor Defense

Guards to protect our democratic rights and combat fascism, for the expropriation of the industrial and financial dictators of the country, etc., etc.

This is our program. If the workers do not adopt it as a whole, or at all, we continue to give support to the Labor party, but *critical* support. We are not sectarians or ultimatumists. We give the labor movement no ultimatum: Accept our program, join our party or we will have nothing to do with you. On the other hand, we *accept* no ultimatums, even from the labor movement. We have our views, and if labor does not accept them in full, we continue with our comradely criticism and do not make our own the inadequacies or mistakes of the working class; but support unmistakably every progressive step, even small ones. In this way, we help to revolutionize the mass movement, and to make a mass movement out of the revolutionary party. There is no other way.

Our main aim is to build the revolutionary party, and all tactics must subserve this aim. The Labor party tactic is not, of course, given for all time. It is imperative for the period ahead. If the trend toward a Labor party is swallowed up in the coming period by a third party or "Democratic Front", the Labor party slogan may lose its effectiveness, and the struggle will take the form of combat for direct leadership of the masses between the revolutionary party and the reformist-patriotic movement. The coming war, after a short period, would, for example, enormously sharpen all relations and problems. It will be recalled that the big reformist movements after the last war broke in two, with such large sections coming over to revolutionary Marxism that the small communist sects in many countries became mass parties almost overnight. Such a perspective is far from excluded in the United States. But it is still not on the immediate horizon.

While the next period does not indicate the likelihood of the revolutionary party directly becoming a mass party, there is no reason at all for lack of confidence. The adoption of the Labor party slogan, as elucidated by us, does not mean giving up the revolutionary party; it means the best way, under the concrete circumstances, of rooting the party in the living mass movement and of building it into a stronger force. Given a correct policy on our part, the very same forces pushing the workers now toward a Labor party will, as they deepen and as experience is accumulated, push the workers even more firmly towards the revolutionary party. The terrific social crisis, and the impending war, open out directly revolutionary perspectives, with a concomitant tumultuous growth of our party which will bring the United States to the very forefront of this old world. We need only know how to exploit the vast possibilities in a realistic, practical, effective, *i.e.*, Marxist manner. An arena in which our ideas are brought to the masses and our party built—it is in this sense, above all, that our tactics toward the Labor party must be understood.

James BURNHAM  
Max SHACHTMAN

## For the Present Party Position

**T**HE PRESENT PARTY POSITION on the Labor party question as embodied in our Declaration of Principles—now the position of the National Committee minority in the discussion going on—was adopted only last December. What has happened since to make the Political Committee decide that we must advocate the formation of a labor party?

*Where Is the Labor Party Movement Going?* The present trend in the Labor party movement is further away from independent class politics than when the Declaration was written. The L.N.-P.L. leadership is intent upon following its present policy of tailing after the capitalist parties. Their perspective is the formation of a third party movement, through a coalition

with the left Democrats, banking on a split in the Democratic party—a bourgeois Democratic Front with or without the Stalinists. The C.P. has dropped even the slogan of a Labor party. In practise, the L.N.-P.L. has produced hardly a single instance of independent labor candidacy. In such a place as New Jersey, the L.N.-P.L. has proved itself incapable of capturing the enthusiasm and loyalty of the same workers who are conducting militant struggles on the economic field—the New Jersey L.N.-P.L. leaders admit they are “generals without an army”. In New York, the A.L.P. branch meetings are attended largely by the “politicals”—social-democrats, S.P.’ers, Stalinists, independent radicals, *etc.*—assembling under the disguise of the A.L.P. in order to work on each other.

Certainly nothing to stampede us into reversing our position . . . provided that our basic approach itself has not changed.

*Our Basic Approach.* This trend which we saw and foresaw is not accidental or the result merely of a particular conjuncture of personalities at the head of the movement. It is rooted in objective social forces, in the rôle of reformism in the period of declining capitalism.

At the time when reformist advances were still possible under a rising capitalist order, the formation of a Labor party might have been able to play a part in raising the working class to higher levels of class consciousness. But today and increasingly, “even the most pressing immediate problems of the workers” cannot be solved except through the social revolution, for the ravages of the capitalist crisis cancel whatever gains may be made by the struggle organs of the working class. A Labor party has to meet these harsh alternatives: For socialism, or for the defense of capitalism—which? In periods of sharp social crisis, middle grounds crumble away, forcing one to take refuge on one side or the other.

Today, the program which might have been the basis of an attempt at a “middle-ground” Labor party has been taken over by the New Deal Democrats. Is it any wonder then that the L.N.-P.L., which has no other program than this, finds no *political* basis for independent working class action?

It is for these reasons that we came to our conclusion: In this period of capitalism, a Labor party can play no progressive rôle. Without having made a single attempt to show why this analysis is false, indeed while even admitting that it still holds true today, the majority speaks of the Labor party as playing a progressive rôle! “Theoretically”, this “abstract” analysis holds good,—but what are you going to do in Pennsylvania?—this is the answer of the majority.

*Can a Labor Party Be Progressive?* The “abstractly” reactionary rôle played by a Labor party manifests itself quite concretely. Here we must consider two questions.

1. If we take our own words seriously, the outbreak of imperialist war is imminent. And unless one believes that we are going to, or can, get such an animal as a “revolutionary Labor party”, the outbreak of war will find the Labor party or Labor party movement not only a strong bulwark of imperialism but one of the main means of deceiving the masses. The channelization of the workers into the Labor party means putting them directly under the influence of the social-patriotic machine; building the Labor party means building our political rival, a tremendous obstacle to our work.

Our job now is to attack and discredit in advance every political tendency which acts as one of the channels of imperialist influence or illusions on the working class. Our job is to warn the workers now against the sources of their betrayal in time of war. To advocate a Labor party, on the other hand, means precisely to put it before the workers as the center for them to rally about, and so make it all the harder to break them away from their social-patriotic organizational allegiance in time of war.

Here is a central question: are we going to tell the workers the truth as to what the Labor party will mean to them—that it

cannot solve “even their most pressing immediate problems”, that it cannot fight war but on the contrary will lead the workers into the next imperialist slaughter, that it plays capitalist politics? And how can we tell them this and at the same time tell them to build this Labor party—which will do nothing significant for them? On the basis of the majority position, this contradiction must be solved *in practise* (whatever the protestations) only by fostering the illusion that the Labor party *can* do something, and thereby sowing the seeds of disillusionment not only with the Labor party but also with ourselves.

2. But, say the majority, the swing of sections of the workers away from the old parties toward a Labor party is a progressive development, and we must encourage it.—This is true; from the viewpoint of the subjective development of the workers there is progress. But the same thing is true when a worker quits the Republican party and joins the C.P. because he believes it to be a working class party. The same thing is true when a worker who voted for Roosevelt in 1932 under the Democratic label, voted for him in 1936 under the A.L.P. label. In each case, the worker is manifesting a progressive sentiment, but in each case this sentiment has been corralled into a reactionary channel. There is the point: the workers want independent political action? that is fine; but the crystallization of this trend into the organizational form of a Labor party has only reactionary consequences objectively.

Further on this point, the majority bases itself on the belief that the formation of an independent Labor party would raise the political class consciousness of the workers. Actually the relationship is the other way around. Suppose the desire for independent political action assumed large proportions and threatened to get out of hand, leaving the L.N.-P.L. heads behind: the classic answer of the bureaucrats is to run around in front of the movement and form the “independent Labor party” which is demanded, in order to continue playing capitalist politics with an independent party as the instrument instead of an L.N.-P.L.—capitalist politics in a subtler and more deceptive form. This is the old device of going-along-with for a distance, if sufficiently pushed, in order to stem the movement more effectively and siphon it back into the old channels.

“Far from constituting independent class politics, the present Labor party development is, from the point of view of the bureaucrats and the bourgeoisie, the method for preventing the growth of independent class politics,” says the Declaration of Principles. And this is also the answer to that variety of the majority position which is represented by comrades Shachtman and Carter, who emphasize the fact that since the labor bureaucrats don’t want a “real, independent labor party”, by advocating it ourselves we set the workers into collision with their leadership. “The resistance of the bureaucracy [to this mass pressure] will be broken,” the majority resolution assures us; an independent Labor party *will* be formed—but why necessarily over the heads of the bureaucrats? Who will be left holding the bag when Lewis and Hillman are mass-pressured into forming their version of an “independent Labor party”?

*How Independent Is an Independent Labor Party?* So far we have accepted the category of “independent Labor party”. But what is it independent of?

According to the majority resolution, if the L.N.-N.P. coalesces with a split-off wing of the Democratic party, the resulting party would be a bourgeois third party, unworthy of our support. But if the L.N.-P.L. forms a party on the basis of its own forces, that would be the independent Labor party, the good kind.

But what makes one a “third party” and the other a “Labor party”—both being equally independent of the old parties in the sense of running their own candidates? Program? Where does the L.N.-P.L. differ in program with the left Democrats? Mass basis? The mass basis of the coalition party would necessarily be the L.N.-P.L. trade unions. Methods? Support of capitalism?



It is not enough for the majority to paste on labels—how would they tell the difference? After all, there is no scarcity of left Democratic elements in the A.L.P. now—Eleanor Herrick, *etc.* And wouldn't the majority be in a pickle if the L.N.-P.L. formed their "independent" party—the S.W.P. gives it "complete and unambiguous support"—and *then* a split-off section of the Democratic party becomes ripe for a coalition! Would this "independent Labor party" automatically become a "third party" as the result of such a coalition *after* its founding?

The point is evident: in this period, a party may be independent of the old capitalist parties in the same way that LaFollette's aggregation is—in the formal, organizational sense—but in the political sense, independence from capitalist politics means revolutionary politics. Here again there is no middle ground.

*The Transitional Program.* Thus far we have considered the question on the basis of considerations held by our party for some time. Some of the supporters of the majority, however, especially emphasize the fact that the adoption of our Transitional Program and of the analysis of the social crisis of capitalism contained in our general thesis automatically indicates the tactic of advocating a Labor party. They attempt to attach the P.C.'s Labor party position as a kind of "rider" to the Transitional Program.

Now the minority bases itself upon an acceptance of the Transitional Program as the correct strategical line for our party in this period. The question is: what effect does our new strategy—the general thesis—have upon our Labor party position? We must state that so far the attempt of the majority to show why, if you accept the Transitional Program, you must also accept their reversal on the Labor party, has remained in the stage of mere assertion.

The first point of the general thesis is that American capitalism has entered the period of an intense *social* crisis, not merely one of the periodic depressions which have come and gone, but this time a permanent, chronic crisis of the system itself, with fluctuations but no prospect of lifting to another boom era. This, we are convinced, is correct.

But if it was correct for us to say (as we did) that in a period of capitalist decline, a Labor party cannot be progressive—and if the majority has still not a word to say against this analysis except to call it correct but "abstract"—then what are we to believe? This, according to the majority: that in a period of capitalist decline it is abstractly true to state that a Labor party cannot be progressive, BUT—just when this capitalist decline becomes sharpest, enters the stage of permanent social crisis, makes it necessary to lead toward the question of power, THEN the Labor party does become progressive! This is literally their position, make sense of it who can.

One could take almost every paragraph of the general thesis and lay it aside the proposal to advocate a Labor party with nothing but astonishment; but the sharpest and most basic contradiction is with the perspective embodied in the general thesis that *we must begin now laying the ground for the development of soviets*, the slogan for the formation of shop and factory committees, *etc.* This is the organizational form which we present as the means of carrying out the Transitional Program—workers' organs of struggle on the extra-parliamentary field. Again we ask—how in the world does the majority square the proposal to prepare for soviets and to advocate the Labor party at the same time? Are we going to build the Labor party and soviets side by side?

*A Line of Action for the Party.* It is precisely the transitional program which represents the *alternative* to the Labor party approach—from the point of view of the question: how are we to build the revolutionary party?

The line of the majority is: there is now a mass movement for a Labor party, and we have to be in; the easiest way to get in is

to ourselves come out as advocates of a Labor party; and once in, we can put forward the transitional program in order that it may be carried out by the Labor party.

It is our opinion that the existence of a mass movement for something we don't want (whether it be war or a labor party) doesn't change our minds about not wanting it. If it is true that a Labor party can play only a reactionary rôle in society today, then precisely because of the illusions in the minds of the workers, it is our duty to speak out the truth about it. Otherwise the disillusionment with the Labor party will react upon us too.

What then? Does speaking the truth about the Labor party doom us to isolation from the "mass movement"? Nonsense!

Even if we advocate a Labor party we can have influence only in proportion to the extent and effectiveness of our work in the trade unions, and our fractions in the Labor party movement—*i.e.*, only in so far as we seriously undertake and carry through *mass work*. This is the key. As long as we have our roots in the union movement we cannot be isolated, no matter what position we take on the Labor party.

Our main line of approach to the militant workers must be the presentation of our Transitional Program in every situation which opens up the opportunity. In New Jersey, concentration on agitation for workers defense around the Hague menace, not the panacea of a Labor party. The extra-parliamentary action of the workers, on the economic field, in workers defense corps, *etc.*, along the lines of our transitional demands. Political agitation pointing to the necessity of *revolutionary* organization to solve the basic problems of the workers: the only lesson we can draw from our analysis of the situation of capitalism.

On this basis, the Labor party movement itself offers us an excellent forum, an arena, for our agitation. It is absolutely necessary that we undertake serious fraction work inside the Labor party movements, putting our transitional demands before them, *etc.*

Speaking of the Labor party movement, the Declaration of Principles says: "To stand aside completely from such a development where it comprises the bulk of the militant and advanced sections of the workers would be hopelessly sectarian for the revolutionists . . . the revolutionists must remain in the midst of the workers who are passing through that experience. . . ." This is the real conclusion to be drawn from the existence of a "mass movement" for a Labor party: not that we too therefore advocate it, but we must go through the experiences side by side with the workers in order to point out the lessons—but not merely to point out the lessons after the workers have found them out for themselves, but IN ADVANCE, NOW.

In our fraction work inside the Labor party movements, our concrete policies become a matter of tactically adapting our proposals to the stage of development of the workers and the concrete circumstances: critical support to Labor party candidates under certain conditions; where the organization endorses capitalist party candidates, we raise the slogan of independent labor candidates; inner-party democracy, *etc.*; where independent candidates *are* put forth, we concentrate on raising programmatic questions. But whatever the form of our tactics, the *main line* is the utilization of these experiences, before and after, to disillusion the workers with Labor party politics and break them away. While the majority also of course favors work inside the Labor party movement, their main line must necessarily be to convince the workers of the necessity of building and broadening the Labor party. There the lines part, in precisely the vital spot.

It well may be that this dispute may turn out to be more important symptomatically than in itself, as a reflection of pessimistic, conservative and opportunist currents within the party. The key is a plan of action to build the party, including a line for our work inside the labor party movement. This the minority will elaborate further in the course of the discussion.

Hal DRAPER

# Means and Ends

## Their Interdependence, and Leon Trotsky's Essay on "Their Morals and Ours"

THE RELATION OF MEANS AND ends has long been an outstanding issue in morals. It has also been a burning issue in political theory and practise. Of late the discussion has centered about the later developments of Marxism in the U.S.S.R. The course of the Stalinists has been defended by many of his adherents in other countries on the ground that the purges and prosecutions, perhaps even with a certain amount of falsification, was necessary to maintain the alleged socialistic régime of that country. Others have used the measures of the Stalinist bureaucracy to condemn the Marxist policy on the ground that the latter leads to such excesses as have occurred in the U.S.S.R. precisely because Marxism holds that the end justifies the means. Some of these critics have held that since Trotsky is also a Marxian he is committed to the same policy and consequently if he had been in power would also have felt bound to use any means whatever that seemed necessary to achieve the end involved in dictatorship by the proletariat.

The discussion has had at least one useful theoretical result. It has brought out into the open for the first time, as far as I am aware, an explicit discussion by a consistent Marxian of the relation of means and ends in social action.\* At the courteous invitation of one of the editors of this review, I propose to discuss this issue in the light of Mr. Trotsky's discussion of the interdependence of means and ends. Much of the earlier part of his essay does not, accordingly, enter into my discussion, though I may say that on the ground of *tu quoque* argument (suggested by the title) Trotsky has had no great difficulty in showing that some of his critics have acted in much the same way they attribute to him. Since Mr. Trotsky also indicates that the only alternative position to the idea that the end justifies the means is some form of absolutistic ethics based on the alleged deliverances of conscience, or a moral sense, or some brand of eternal truths, I wish to say that I write from a standpoint that rejects all such doctrines as definitely as does Mr. Trotsky himself, and that I hold that the end in the sense of consequences provides the only basis for moral ideas and action, and therefore provides the only justification that can be found for means employed.

The point I propose to consider is that brought up toward the end of Mr. Trotsky's discussion in the section headed "Dialectic Interdependence of Means and Ends". The following statement is basic: "A means can be justified only by its end. But the end in turn needs to be justified. From the Marxian point of view, which expresses the historic interests of the proletariat, the end is justified if it leads to increasing the power of man over nature and to the abolition of the power of man over man." (P. 172.) This increase of the power of man over nature, accompanying the abolition of the power of man over man, seems accordingly to be *the* end—that is, an end which does not need itself to be justified but which is the justification of the ends that are in turn means to it. It may also be added that others than Marxians might accept this formulation of *the* end and hold that it expresses the moral interest of society—if not the historic interest—and not merely and exclusively that of the proletariat.

But for my present purpose, it is important to note that the word "end" is here used to cover two things—the final justifying end and ends that are themselves means to this final end. For while it is not said in so many words that some ends are but means, that proposition is certainly implied in the statement that some ends "lead to increasing the power of man over nature, etc." Mr. Trotsky goes on to explain that the principle that the

end justifies the means does not mean that every means is permissible. "That is permissible, we answer, which really leads to the liberation of mankind."

Were the latter statement consistently adhered to and followed through it would be consistent with the sound principle of interdependence of means and end. Being in accord with it, it would lead to scrupulous examination of the means that are used, to ascertain what their actual objective consequences will be as far as it is humanly possible to tell—to show that they do "really" lead to the liberation of mankind. It is at this point that the double significance of *end* becomes important. As far as it means consequences actually reached, it is clearly dependent upon means used, while measures in their capacity of means are dependent upon the end in the sense that they have to be viewed and judged on the ground of their actual objective results. On this basis, an *end-in-view* represents or is an *idea* of the final consequences, in case the idea is formed *on the ground of the means that are judged to be most likely to produce the end*. The end in view is thus itself a means for directing action—just as a man's *idea* of health to be attained or a house to be built is not identical with end in the sense of actual outcome but is a means for directing action to achieve that end.

Now what has given the maxim (and the practise it formulates) that the end justifies the means a bad name is that the end-in-view, the end professed and entertained (perhaps quite sincerely) justifies the use of certain means, and so justifies the latter that it is not necessary to examine what the actual consequences of the use of chosen means will be. An individual may hold, and quite sincerely as far as his personal opinion is concerned that certain means will "really" lead to a professed and desired end. But the real question is not one of personal belief but of the objective grounds upon which it is held: namely, the consequences that will actually be produced by them. So when Mr. Trotsky says that "dialectical materialism knows no dualism between means and end", the natural interpretation is that he will recommend the use of means that can be shown by their own nature to lead to the liberation of mankind as an objective consequence.

One would expect, then, that with the idea of the liberation of mankind as the end-in-view, there would be an examination of *all* means that are likely to attain this end without any fixed preconception as to what they *must* be, and that every suggested means would be weighed and judged on the express ground of the consequences it is likely to produce.

But this is *not* the course adopted in Mr. Trotsky's further discussion. He says: "The liberating morality of the proletariat is of a revolutionary character. . . . It *deduces* a rule of conduct from the laws of the development of society, thus primarily from the class struggle, the law of all laws." (Italics are mine.) As if to leave no doubt of his meaning he says: "The end flows from the historical movement"—that of the class struggle. The principle of interdependence of means and end has thus disappeared or at least been submerged. For the choice of means is not decided upon on the ground of an independent examination of measures and policies with respect to their actual objective consequences. On the contrary, means are "*deduced*" from an independent source, an alleged law of history which is *the* law of all laws of social development. Nor does the logic of the case change if the word "alleged" is stricken out. For even so, it follows that means to be used are not derived from consideration of the end, the liberation of mankind, but from another outside source. The professed end—the end-in-view—the liberation of

\*Their Morals and Ours, by Leon Trotsky, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, June 1938, pp. 163-173.



mankind, is thus subordinated to the class struggle as the means by which it is to be attained. Instead of *interdependence* of means and end, the end is dependent upon the means but the means are not derived from the end. Since the class struggle is regarded as the *only* means that will reach the end, and since the view that it is the only means is reached deductively and not by an inductive examination of the means-consequences in their interdependence, the means, the class struggle, does not need to be critically examined with respect to its actual objective consequences. It is automatically absolved from all need for critical examination. If we are not back in the position that the *end-in-view* (as distinct from objective consequences) justifies the use of any means in line with the class struggle and that it justifies the neglect of all other means, I fail to understand the logic of Mr. Trotsky's position.

The position that I have indicated as that of genuine interdependence of means and ends does not automatically rule out class struggle as one means for attaining the end. But it does rule out the deductive method of arriving at it as a means, to say nothing of its being the *only* means. The selection of class struggle as a means has to be justified, on the ground of the interdependence of means and end, by an examination of actual consequences of its use, not deductively. Historical considerations are certainly relevant to this examination. But the assumption of a *fixed law* of social development is not relevant. It is as if a biologist or a physician were to assert that a certain law of biology which he accepts is so related to the end of health that the means of arriving at health—and the only means—can be deduced from it, so that no further examination of biological phenomena is needed. The whole case is prejudged.

It is one thing to say that class struggle is a means of attaining the end of the liberation of mankind. It is a radically different thing to say that there is an absolute *law* of class struggle which determines the means to be used. For if it determines the means, it also determines the end—the actual consequences, and upon the principle of genuine interdependence of means and end it is arbitrary and subjective to say that that consequence will be the liberation of mankind. The liberation of mankind is the end to be striven for. In any legitimate sense of "moral", it is a moral end. No scientific law can determine a moral end save by deserting the principle of interdependence of means and end. A Marxian may sincerely believe that class struggle is *the* law of social development. But quite aside from the fact that the belief closes

the doors to further examination of history—just as an assertion that the Newtonian laws are the final laws of physics would preclude further search for physical laws—it would not follow, even if it were *the* scientific law of history, that it is the means to the moral goal of the liberation of mankind. That it is such a means has to be shown not by "deduction" from a law but by examination of the actual relations of means and consequences; an examination in which given the liberation of mankind as end, there is free and unprejudiced search for the means by which it can be attained.

One more consideration may be added about class struggle as a means. There are presumably several, perhaps many, different ways by means of which the class struggle may be carried on. How can a choice be made among these different ways except by examining their consequences in relation to the goal of liberation of mankind? The belief that a law of history determines the particular way in which the struggle is to be carried on certainly seems to tend toward a fanatical and even mystical devotion to use of certain ways of conducting the class struggle to the exclusion of all other ways of conducting it. I have no wish to go outside the theoretical question of the interdependence of means and ends but it is conceivable that the course actually taken by the revolution in the U.S.S.R. becomes more explicable when it is noted that means were deduced from a supposed scientific law instead of being searched for and adopted on the ground of their relation to the moral end of the liberation of mankind.

The only conclusion I am able to reach is that in avoiding one kind of absolutism Mr. Trotsky has plunged into another kind of absolutism. There appears to be a curious transfer among orthodox Marxists of allegiance from the ideals of socialism and scientific *methods* of attaining them (scientific in the sense of being based on the objective relations of means and consequences) to the class struggle as the law of historical change. Deduction of ends set up, of means and attitudes, from this law as the primary thing makes all moral questions, that is, all questions of the end to be finally attained, meaningless. To be scientific about ends does not mean to read them out of laws, whether the laws are natural or social. Orthodox Marxism shares with orthodox religionism and with traditional idealism the belief that human ends are interwoven into the very texture and structure of existence—a conception inherited presumably from its Hegelian origin.

NEW YORK CITY, July 3, 1938

John DEWEY

## Browder's Two Roosevelts

**T**HE CURRENT LINE OF THE Communist Party of the United States is misrepresented as a continuation of traditional Marxist-Leninist policies. This fraud does not require a great deal of effort to expose. The entire program of Stalinism marks a back-sliding from the theory and practises of Marx and Lenin. We present some evidence of this fact in the attitude of the American C.P. toward Roosevelt in two distinct periods: at the end of the miscarriage known as the Third Period, and in the post-Seventh Congress years. In the former stage, Stalinism was an aberration of an ultra-left character. At the present time it represents the most extreme variety of opportunism, that is, social-patriotism and class collaboration.

It is not difficult to recall the mixed reactions to the election of Roosevelt and the subsequent endeavors on the part of his administration to institute the Industrial Recovery Act. He was hailed simultaneously as savior and menace. Both charges, depending upon your class point of view, were and are correct.

The attitude of the Communist party was absorbing, to say the least. The C.P. had entered the elections with an independent presidential candidate, who campaigned on a vigorous party

platform under the general slogans of "Class Against Class", and "The Revolutionary Way Out of the Crisis". Receiving an extremely small vote, the Stalinists were bursting with pride because it was a "communist" vote based upon sharply delineated class issues emphasizing the socialist society as the immediate issue of the day.

Upon the election of Roosevelt, the C.P. at once sought the mobilization of united actions against the new administration on the ground that "Roosevelt's policies, as is already evident, are policies in the interests of the bankers and big industrialists and against the interests of the toiling masses. *The dictatorial powers already taken by Roosevelt—already a step toward fascistization—are being used against the toilers.* The militarization of labor, the economy program at the expense of the masses . . . increased military and naval expenditures in preparation for a new war which the masses will be called upon to be the cannon fodder—*this is the anti-working class program of Roosevelt*"\* (Statement of the Central Committee, *Daily Worker*, March 30, 1933).

In the wake of this statement of policy by the Central Com-

\*Unless otherwise indicated, all italics are mine. A.G.

mittee, a veritable barrage of anti-Roosevelt articles was unloosed in the *Daily Worker* and other party organs. All the leading party writers and specialists in translating C.C. resolutions were hauled into action.

First in line came a number of articles by a party hack, Harry Gannes. In a series entitled, "The Keystone of Roosevelt's New Deal and How It Hits the Worker's Living Standards", Gannes argued that the entire program was a gigantic swindle of the working class in the interests of safeguarding the existence of decaying capitalism. On June 24, 1933, he wrote: "Just as world capitalism drives to a new world war under the greatest flurry of peace banners ever assembled, so Roosevelt leads the present and prospective attack on the standard of living of the entire American toiling population, under the most powerful demagogic apparatus ever assembled by American capitalism. The machine that Roosevelt is building up for his attack is similar to that of a similar species of organizer of the 'new age', Woodrow Wilson."

If it was easy to see through the openly reactionary attack of a Hoover, Gannes quite correctly illustrates that "it was not so easy, however, to blast through the *more subtle manœuvres of the sharper class contradictions behind the Roosevelt attack, an attack which must be more virulent against the workers*, and which at the same time must be larded with defter lying phrases about the new deal. . . ."

Earl Browder comes upon the scene, to speak his piece as the leader of the party. In his article, "The Roosevelt New Deal and Fascism" (*Daily Worker*, July 8, 1933), Browder wrote: "The 'New Deal' is a policy of slashing the living standards at home and fighting for markets abroad for the single purpose of maintaining the profits of finance capital. It is a policy of brutal oppression and preparations for imperialist war."

Further on, in treating specifically the question of fascism, he declared: "It is true that elements of fascism long existing in America are coming to maturity more rapidly. . . . First, it must be understood that fascism grows naturally out of bourgeois democracy under the conditions of capitalist decline. It is only another form of the same class rule, the dictatorship of finance capital. . . . *The development of Roosevelt's program is a striking illustration of the fact that there is no Chinese wall between democracy and fascism. . . . Roosevelt operates with all the arts of 'democratic' rule, with an emphasized liberal and social demagogic cover. . . . Yet behind this smokescreen, Roosevelt is carrying out more thoroughly and brutally even than Hoover, the capitalist attack against the living standards of the masses at home and the sharper national chauvinism in foreign relations.*"

By and large, the general historical character of the Roosevelt régime is aptly put, but the Third Period Browder continues. "It is clear that fascism already finds much of its work done in America and more of this is being done by Roosevelt." In the event that he may not be fully understood, and for the purpose of emphasis, Browder goes on. Denouncing the Industrial Recovery Act as "an American version of Mussolini's 'corporative state'", he said, "It is one of the steps toward the militarization of labor. *It is a forerunner of American fascism.*"

Hot upon the heels of Browder came another eminent Stalinist scribbler, Jack Stachel, to declare in the *Daily Worker* of July 3, 1933, that "every act of the Roosevelt administration since its coming into office has been against the masses. *The Roosevelt government no less than the Hoover government is a Wall Street government.*"

William Z. Foster contributed his bit of wisdom to this campaign of enlightenment. In a series of articles entitled "Who Is Roosevelt?" (*Daily Worker*, August 29, 1933), he proceeded to inform all and sundry that "the policy of Mr. Roosevelt's party is identical in all essentials [no less!] with that of the Republican Party. . . . Mr. Roosevelt is . . . a lightning rod for capitalism to protect it from danger."

Under a sub-head "Roosevelt—Imperialist", Foster reiterates

what all the others had written, namely: "The election of Mr. Roosevelt would mean the continuation if not the intensification of the militant imperialism of the U.S. in China, Latin America, Europe,—all over the world. *His election would mean an intensification of the war danger—the greatest of all problems menacing the workers of the world.*"

And finally, again Browder. In his article of September 9, 1933, the secretary of the C.P. wrote: "Like the Fascist Hitler, he [Roosevelt] must use radical phrases to cover up the capitalist policy which he puts over even more ruthlessly than did Hoover."

One could go on endlessly and quote similar gems from scores of other Stalinist writers, propagandists and agitators. Is there any doubt, however, bearing in mind its confusion on the subject of fascism, where the C.P. stood shortly after the election of Roosevelt?

The Stalinist line on Roosevelt was created in the first stage of the world offensive of fascism and reaction. Hitler was already in power. Fascism was on the rise in all European countries. In this respect, nothing fundamentally was altered in 1936, 1937 and 1938 to warrant (even for the sake of the argument) a new approach toward Roosevelt in the form of support to him. Certainly, there has been no basic change in the direction of his administration. A mellowing of attitude toward Roosevelt came, however, with the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States. The Communist International was subsequently to embark on the course of "defending democratic capitalism from the fascist aggressors". Collective security replaced the revolutionary aim long dormant in the Comintern. The immediate program in Europe has become the maintenance of the *status quo* among nations thereby barring any revolutionary action by the European proletariat. This hindrance to revolutionary action was fortified by the Franco-Soviet pact and the theory and practise of People's Frontism. The slogan of "Class against Class" was relegated to the limbo of history by the leaders of the Communist International.

The May 1938 convention of the American C.P. officially ordained the social, patriotic and class collaborationist program. (See: *The Stalinist Convention*, by Max Shachtman, *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, July 1938.) The Stalinists are now content to play the rôle of a loyal opposition to Roosevelt. The demands of the party in relation to domestic problems are extremely modest ones because "socialism is not a problem of today". As a result, its program, hardly one whit different from that of the New Deal, shapes up as follows: Extension of the W.P.A. with a monthly minimum wage of \$60.00 (as against the prevailing \$55.00 wage); unemployment insurance, minimum unemployment benefits of \$15.00 a week; old age pensions of at least \$60.00 monthly for all over 60; free hospitals and health services, abolition of child labor and complete equality for Negroes.

There are no half-way measures for the Stalinists. All the teachings of the founders of scientific socialism are cast aside in the interest of establishing a "democratic front". Capitalist society is no longer divided by classes, but into "reactionaries and progressives". The present crisis, according to Browder, is not due to the inherent contradictions of capitalist economy, but to a sit-down strike of "reactionary" capitalists. He emphasizes that point in his article, "The Current Crisis; Its Cause and Cure". Therein he also declares that to reject the Roosevelt program is to "proclaim that to continue capitalism means to condemn millions of men, women and children to death by slow starvation".

On May 2, 1938, the *Midwest Daily Record*, official organ of the C.P. in the Middle West, calls "for an extension of the post-card campaign in support of Roosevelt's Recovery proposal. . . . The *Midwest Daily Record* also points to the need of unity of all the progressives in the congressional elections of 1938—to the end that Wall Street may be defeated, to the end that *recovery in the full sense may be achieved.*"

In the *New Masses* of May 3, 1938, an appeal for the *Daily*

*Worker* in lyric style informs us that "A new spirit is sweeping across the nation . . . surging through the cities and farms . . . a spirit of hope...awakened by the President's recovery program".

If Browder charged Roosevelt with representing incipient fascism in the United States, it remained for him also to absolve the President and his administration of that charge in the same preposterous manner in which it was made. In his "Questions and Answers", prepared to clarify confused minds on the eve of the 10th National Convention of the C.P., he raises hopes against fascism and war because "right here in the United States, although the majority of the people haven't faced the issue of socialism, they have faced the issue of fascism [!] and they got the administration in Washington that's handcuffing fascism". As the reader will note, no date is given marking this transformation of the Roosevelt régime.

The main task of the C.P. today, according to Hathaway, editor of the *Daily Worker*, in his report to the plenary session of the C.C. and the National Party Builders Congress held in New York, February 18, 1938, "is that of mobilizing the broadest mass of the American people to defeat the forces of reaction in the election campaign". He denounced the Republican "progressives" because "they were as vigorous in their denunciation of the policies of Roosevelt and the New Deal as were Landon and Hoover. Their 'progressive' phrases were only trimmings to conceal their attacks on Roosevelt's progressive policies. . . ." (Emphasis in the original—A.G.).

Thus the Stalinists find themselves engaged in parliamentary activity on the side of the Roosevelt Democrats helping to select candidates in the primaries according to the designation "reactionary" or "progressive", decided beforehand in the headquarters of the C.P. The electoral support of bourgeois parties and candidates is "justified" on the grounds of the necessity of creating the aforementioned "democratic front" in the United States. So Hathaway reports: "From this it should be clear to all of us that our job, the job of the whole progressive movement and therefore also of our party is to mobilize our forces to bend every effort, through every channel, to make full use of our strength and influence. . . . It means that now the party, from top to bottom, must be geared up for our participation in this campaign [the Fall elections] . . ." (Emphasis in the original—A.G.)

This mildness in the sphere of domestic relations is in sharp contrast to the vigorous pro-war position and support to the outstanding militarist President in the history of the nation. The slogan, "Communism is Twentieth-Century Americanism", paves the way for a new patriotic frenzy injudiciously fostered by the new revisionists at the helm of the party.

"The general line of policy guaranteeing our own peace and the world's peace has already been proposed by President Roosevelt," said Browder on May 11, 1938, in his Baltimore speech announcing his newly-discovered community of interests between "communists" and Catholics. "Such a policy is in the best traditions of our country. The people of America must rally to its support and demand its energetic application in life."

The solution to the problem of war, he continues, "is the minimum program . . . contained in the courageous and clear-spoken address of President Roosevelt in Chicago on October 5th. That is a program of concerted action by all lovers of peace to quarantine the war-makers. . . . President Roosevelt points out *the only possible road to avert universal catastrophe of the capitalist world.*"

In his debate with Frederick J. Libby, Browder denounced those who "place in the criminal's dock the government of the United States and President Roosevelt alongside of the Nazi régime and Hitler".

Apparently intoxicated with his own brilliance, Browder continued, "What America needs today, what the world needs is a foreign policy based upon . . . Thomas Jefferson [this in the period of the imperialist decay of capitalism]. The general line

of such a policy has been proposed by President Roosevelt. . . . The whole country must be rallied to support it. . . ."

As if to mock Marx and Lenin, this great advocate of morality in relations between nation and individuals affirms: "We declare that the time has come when the continuation of civilization itself, in America as everywhere, depend upon world organization to enforce a minimum moral standard among nations. . . . These first primitive conditions for a world organization of peace have been established in the Kellogg Pact. . . . Our neutrality advocates have cynically abandoned moral standards. . . . We appeal for the strengthening of moral standards." Not a word about the class struggle. No mention of socialism, the proletariat, the workers' power. Nothing remains here but revolting petty bourgeois and pacifist platitudes that have ever been responsible for confusing and misleading the masses and, finally, betraying them to the bourgeoisie.

It is only logical that the next step, following such social patriotic doctrine, should be the advocacy of imperialist policy. The Sino-Japanese war offered the Stalinists precisely that opportunity. The *New Masses* has been extremely concerned over the Far Eastern situation and on more than one occasion admonished Wall Street to hasten to that war area in order to insure the territory for exploitation by the American financial oligarchy. Browder, as befits his rôle of leader of American Stalinism, is very concrete. In the *Daily Worker* of April 28, 1938, he wrote: "The only prospect for profitable investment of American capital is China. But if the United States really wanted to put our 13,000,000 unemployed back to work, to put unemployed capital to work, the United States government [!] should invest about \$5,000,000,000 in building up Chinese industry. We should by agreement with the Chinese government produce machines here, thus putting our unemployed back to work and at the same time building up their industry, which will enable the Chinese to ward off the fascist invasion." Profit is no object, you see!

And finally, the great difficulty, according to Harold Brown, in *The Communist* of March, 1938, is that "the labor movement, by not having as yet taken a clear stand in support of Roosevelt's peace policy, is still holding back the whole peace movement. . . ." And we had always believed it was capitalism that prevented peace, and that peace movements divorced from the proletarian struggle against capitalism were good for nothing except surrender to the imperialists! But we live and learn.

It is not merely a change of line that is involved herein. The support now given to Roosevelt and his administration represents a complete revision of the revolutionary doctrines of Marxism on the struggle for power, the nature of the bourgeois state, the rôle of classes in bourgeois society, the character of capitalist economy. It marks the utter degeneration of Stalinism. Stalinism no longer even pretends to a revolutionary policy, to a struggle for socialism. It openly avows and defends its apostasy against all critics. Obsequiousness characterizes its attitude toward Roosevelt, the New Deal, capitalist society. The party and its sympathizing organizations strive with might and main to become "respectable" citizens, to be accepted in liberal bourgeois circles and to be regarded as true-blue Americans. Roosevelt is constantly referred to in terms of endearment: The President said in his great speech. . . . In his significant Georgian address. . . . F.D.R. was dressed in. . . . The first couple of the land was present! And so on *ad nauseam!*

Organized Stalinism represents everything that is retrogressive and reactionary in the labor movement. The advancement of the interests of the working class, *i.e.*, its emancipation from the pernicious exploitation of capitalism, from starvation, misery and war, is only possible by the overthrow of bourgeois society. But the first step in the realization of this aim is the annihilation of that corroding influence: Stalinism.

Albert GATES

# Zionism and the Lion

"WE CANNOT BE OBLIVIOUS TO THE many interests which Britain has in the Mediterranean. Fortunately for us British world interests are essentially the preservation of peace, and therefore in the strengthening of the British Empire it is not we alone who see an important guarantee for the strengthening of international peace. England will have bases of defense on sea and on land in the Jewish State and in the British corridor. For many years the Jewish State will stand in need of British military protection and protection entails a measure of dependence."

Thus speaks the Labor-Zionist, Ben-Gurion, member of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, a leading member of the Palestine Labor Federation, the Histadruth, and the head of the Jewish Agency's Jerusalem Executive. Zionism dependent upon England! Where could a more open indication be found of the crisis into which the whole Zionist movement has been plunged by the proposed plan of Great Britain for the partition of Palestine.

Britain's course in Palestine is based upon her well known policy of divide and rule. In 1917, the famous Balfour Declaration was issued. In order to obtain the support of the Jews for her war against Germany, England promised that Palestine would become a National Homeland for the Jewish people. The fact that two years previously, to obtain the support of the Arabs, a promise was made that Palestine would become part of an independent Arab nation bothered the English diplomats not one whit.

The Balfour Declaration has allowed Britain to parade as the friend of the Jewish people. Actually, however, Britain is a "friend" of the Jewish people and of the Zionists only in so far as she allows hope to spring eternal in the Zionist breast. But these hopes, sad to relate, England dooms to eternal disappointment. The essence of Britain's policy is to encourage the Zionist movement as a buffer against the Arab national movement, as a bogeyman which strikes fear into the hearts of the Zionists and makes them cling more firmly than ever before to the apron-strings of Mother England.

Britain suppresses the Arab terrorist movement against the Jews, with just a sufficient demonstration of force to keep the Arabs aware of who the real boss is but not enough to afford the Jewish masses as any real protection. Britain proffers the bait of Jewish immigration into Palestine and for this Zionism is ready to sell its soul. At the same time, however, immigration quotas are cut to the bone. The 1937 labor immigration quota was so infinitesimal, that for the first time in its history the Jewish Agency rejected the available immigration certificates as a measure of protest. On March 14 of this year, Ormsby-Gore, Colonial Secretary, announced that the entry of ALL Jewish laborers was indefinitely suspended.

Britain is haunted by the fear, natural to all imperialist powers, of the Arab nationalist movement. She follows, therefore, a carefully conceived program of keeping the Jews and the Arabs at constant odds with each other. This divides the Palestine masses and at the same time creates a "law-and-order" problem which Britain graciously agrees to solve by maintaining her armed forces in Palestine. Britain allows the Zionists their illusory dream and in return obtains a mass base against the Arabs. She simultaneously diverts the Arab nationalist movement from its legitimate goal of colonial liberation into a pogrom movement directed against the Jews.

Britain's whole policy is epitomized in the proposed plan for the partition of Palestine. This scheme would divide the land into three parts: an Arab state, a Lilliputian Jewish state, and

a British military corridor. Such a plan seeks to sharpen the antagonism between the Arab and the Jew while at the same time appearing to satisfy the claims of both. The need of the Jewish-Zionist State for more land would abolish forever all hopes of Arab-Jewish reconciliation and would initiate a period of bitter warfare. Britain would be allowed a free hand to establish a powerful military base which would completely dominate both proposed states and employ the antagonism between them to perpetuate her influence. This is a perfect solution for England and would enable her to preserve her domination over Palestine with a minimum of effort and expense.

This whole strategy of forcing a stalemate between the Arabs and the Jews forces the Zionists to cling ever more closely to Britain. Not that they are satisfied with the concessions, but because for them, without Britain there is nothing.

## Is Zionism Possible?

British diplomats can lightly promise Palestine to both the Jews and the Arabs.

But Palestine is a vital and sensitive nerve-center for British imperialism. It will be surrendered by her only to superior military force. The land of Jehovah is also the guardian of the Suez Canal, Britain's jugular vein in the Near East, the gateway to her African colonies and the route to India. The harbor of Haifa is a proposed British naval base. Oil pipe lines from Iraq terminate here and provide a refueling station for British ships. The Holy Land is intersected by such mundane realities as railway lines and air routes.

Britain, moreover, cannot permit the realization of Zionism because of her need to placate the 12,000,000 Arabs of the Near East. The sentiment of these people is becoming more and more anti-Zionist. Britain cannot permit the existence of the pre-conditions for the physical absorption of the oppressed Jewish people into Palestine. The Jews can have the door of the country really opened to them only on the basis of the most advanced industrial methods, only after the development of efficient and large-scale machinery which will provide the means for the support of the inhabitants of the land. But it is entirely excluded that Britain will permit such an eventuality.

The development of modern industry will mean the concomitant germination of a modern industrial proletariat. This possibility can do nothing but strike fear into the heart of England, which sees the proletariat everywhere in a state of unrest. A significant modern working class in Palestine would serve as the guiding force for revolution and would move the whole nationalist movement along the lines of an anti-imperialist struggle. Britain is well aware of this danger. The existence of a modern proletariat in Egypt is such a specter to the friend of the Jews that proposals have been made for the digging of a new canal to take the place of the Suez and which would wind through southern Palestine to the Red Sea. Every possible obstacle is placed in the path of the development of industry. Onerous duties are placed upon the most vital industrial necessities, while at the same time real tariff protection is denied to Palestine industry. Trade relations with surrounding lands is impeded, and industry and intensive agriculture are subjected to rigorous taxation. Transportation facilities remain backward and government loans and credits are conspicuously absent.

## Zionism and the Arabs

If Britain will not really allow the realization of Zionism then why does the movement continue in its partnership with

her? Palestine is already peopled by a nation of Arabs who are hostile to the aims of Zionism; Zionism cannot therefore succeed in making any inroads without the support of the power of England. Mass uprisings of the Arab people have taken place regularly and repeatedly . . . 1920, 1921, 1929, 1933, 1936. These movements began as movements for national independence but degenerated into terrorist movements against the Jews, much to the benefit of the Arab landlords and British imperialism, who are enabled by Zionism to channelize the movement into the harmless (to them) stream of anti-Semitism. This anti-Semitic trend is spreading among the Arabs of the whole Near East. For more than a century the Jews in all the countries of the Near East outside of Palestine have lived in peace with their Arab neighbors. The partition plan has raised the Zionist question to the fore once again and has led to the rise of vicious anti-Semitic trends. These trends are undoubtedly encouraged by the reactionary feudal elements who, like Britain, benefit from the division of the population into warring groups. But their existence cannot be waved aside.

The Zionists cannot understand why the Arab population should be hostile to the idea of a Jewish homeland. They are fond of citing statistics to demonstrate, in the best Great Power manner, that the standard of living of the Arabs is constantly rising in the Jewish areas, and that the conditions of life of the Palestine Arabs are superior to those of the Arabs of the surrounding land. But somehow, like the colonial people everywhere, the Arabs do not seem to be influenced by these statistics and opposition to Zionism and British imperialism remains.

This is a hard cold fact which the Zionists are forced to admit. Says Ben-Gurion at the conference of the Palestine Labor Federation in 1937: ". . . for 6 months Jewish, Arabic, and British blood flowed for only one cause, for the stoppage of immigration. . . ." And at the Zionist Congress he adds, "The opposition of the Arabs is constantly growing stronger and Arab power is constantly increasing." The *Jewish Day*, writing of the 1938 annual convention of the Labor Federation states, "Mr. Ben-Gurion warned against the illusion of finding a pro-Zionist attitude at the present time among the Arabs."

Arab hostility to Zionism need be no mystery to us. Zionism bases its claim to Palestine not upon the right of a people to determine the destiny of its own land but rather upon a chauvinistic claim to privileges over and against the Arab people. That this claim is based upon the Bible changes matters not one whit. Let us listen to Ben-Gurion once again:

Our right to Palestine is not the right of the Palestine Jews but of the entire Jewish people which is scattered the world over and of which only 3 percent live in Palestine. The importance of Palestine for the Jewish people lies not in its being the habitat of 400,000 Jews but in its being a place for continuous and expanding Jewish immigration. . . .

For the rights of the Jews in Palestine are different from the rights of the Arabs; Palestine Arabs have the rights proper to all inhabitants of the country. Armenian and Ethiopian inhabitants of Palestine are entitled to the same rights even though their numbers are small. However the Arabs of Syria, Iraq, or Saudia have no rights in Palestine. On the other hand, the rights which the Jews have in Palestine is their right not as inhabitants of the country, but as Jews, whether they live in Palestine or in any other country. The fundamental Jewish right—is in reality the right in Palestine of non-Palestine Jews, the right of immigration. . . .

The Jewish and Arab claims are not equal with regard to Palestine.

Ben-Gurion bases his remarkable claim to Palestine upon the Bible: "The Bible is our mandate." But the Arab masses who live and toil on the land do not read or recognize the Jewish Bible.

Ben-Gurion's fantastic claim to Palestine simply means that the Arab population which is the overwhelmingly majority cannot have the right to decide the fate of the land. And this is the whole basis for Arab opposition to Zionism. The decisive question upon which all Zionist tendencies are fated to break their necks is the question of the unconditional independence of

Palestine from imperialism and the right of the population to govern themselves. The Arab masses raise the demand for the right of self-determination. Among their demands we find the following:

That a genuine representative government be permitted and set up.

That the Mandate be terminated as soon as possible.

That they have an independent and sovereign state.

That their land be returned to them free of mandates.

It is the elementary duty of every proletarian revolutionist to support the right of every nation to self-determination. While not every demand of the Arabs is progressive and deserving of support, the above demands express their desire for independence and are entirely progressive. But Zionism is utterly incapable of giving aid to these demands and, quite the contrary, is their uncompromising and inveterate enemy.

A section of the Zionist movement tries to hide this reality with mealy-mouthed declarations that to free Palestine would only mean to deliver it up to some other imperialist power. This is the time-worn argument of the opponents of colonial liberation and, as always, is sheer hypocrisy. Real freedom for Palestine can come only through an armed uprising of the masses and this movement would be the spark to set the entire Near East and North Africa ablaze and would release such energies and enthusiasm among the oppressed masses that the whole imperialist system would begin to totter and crumble. To destroy the invincibility of one of the most powerful imperialist powers would be to dig the grave for all imperialist powers. And conversely, to oppose the movement for colonial liberation in any single land is to help perpetuate imperialist domination everywhere, to delay and oppose the world revolution.

## Zionism and British Imperialism

Faced by a hostile population, Zionism is forced to seek for some ally, to lean upon some powerful friend. The "friend" of the Zionists is Great Britain. The most clear-cut declaration of prostitution to England in return for protection from the Arabs comes from the Zionist-Revolutionists. Says their leader Jabotinsky, on the Arab question:

I willingly confess that we have no "Arab" policy and doubt whether such a policy is at all practicable. History teaches that all colonizations have met with little encouragement from the "native" on the spot; it may be very sad but so it is, and we Jews are no exception. We should of course be genuinely glad if some Zionist party would succeed in discovering some way to convert the Palestine Arabs to pro-Zionism.

But, continues Jabotinsky, nonchalantly, if the Arabs are hostile then we can sell out to Great Britain:

I need not dwell on the well-known truism of Palestine's importance from the viewpoint of British imperial interests; I have only to add that its validity depends on one paramount condition: namely that Palestine should cease being an Arab country. The defect of all England's "strongholds" in the Mediterranean roots in the fact that (with the only exception of little Malta) they are all of them inhabited by populations whose national magnetic centers lie elsewhere and who are therefore organically and incurably centrifugal. England governs them against their will, and this is a precarious hold under modern conditions. There will inevitably come a day when Gibraltar will revert to Spain, Cyprus to Greece, Egypt is already "gone" for Egypt is politically if not racially Arab. Should Palestine remain Arab, Palestine would follow the orbit of Arab destinies—secession, Federation of Arab countries, and elimination of all traces of European influence. But a Palestine predominantly Jewish, Palestine as a Jewish State, surrounded on all sides by Arab countries, will in the interests of its own preservation always seek to lean upon some powerful Empire, non-Arab and non-Mohammedan. This is an almost providential basis for a permanent alliance between England and a Jewish (but only a Jewish) Palestine.

This is the logical fruit of Zionism. But even for Zionism to promise to become an open and reactionary tool of British imperialism will not gain it the support of England. Britain cannot allow the development of Palestine industry and the consequent birth of a large modern industrial proletariat even though the Zionists may agree to mobilize these masses in sup-



port of imperialism. Proletarian masses have the bad habit of deserting their misleaders with historic regularity. Moreover one cannot reckon with Britain alone. It will be the colonial slaves who will be the victors after or during the coming war and explode the entire foundation from under the very feet of those who place their reliance upon the stability of imperialism.

But, our Zionist friends will protest, Jabotinsky and his gang are a crew of scoundrels and fascists, who have split away from the World Zionist Organization to set up a separate international organization. We might expect then, a vigorous attack upon these reactionary ideas by the Labor-Zionist leaders. But alas! Let us hear from Ben-Gurion:

But Great Britain is interested in maintaining a stronghold in the Near East and in Palestine. A large number of Jews strengthen such a hold but it also increases the Arab opposition and Great Britain must send an army to safeguard law and order.

This statement differs from the statements of the Revisionists only in that it is much more brief and to the point.

If Ben-Gurion's infinite trust in Great Britain is an enigma to some unsuspecting people, what term could best describe his sanguine hope for a peaceful and gradual growth into a socialist Palestine? The painful problem arises as to who, in the face of a hostile population, is able to maintain this peace. It is that great friend of socialism, Mother England. A socialism protected by Great Britain? Some may ascribe this idea to excessive optimism. But this is far too indulgent a characterization.

Ben-Gurion speaks as the mouthpiece of the British diplomatic service, which seeks to hide its war preparations with sugar-tongued phrases for peace. What other interpretation can be placed on his statements: ". . . in the strengthening of international peace", or ". . . British interests are essentially the preservation of peace"?

Ben-Gurion long ago took the first step onto the inclined plane of Zionism. Let us not be surprised then to see him slide to the bottom. From Zionism to the support of British imperialism. From the support of British imperialism to the support of its wars. This is the irresistible and inexorable logic-chain of Zionism. To paint Britain as a lover of peace is only the first step to supporting her wars in the name of peace; and Ben-Gurion is not at all loathe to take the final step. Says the *Jewish Day* (May 10, 1938): "David Ben-Gurion . . . urged world wide military and naval training of Jewish youth and fortification of key points in Palestine as necessary to the Zionist cause."

Again some Zionists will protest—we will fight only in defense of Palestine, never in the interests of British imperialism. Idle protest! Even the consolation of a defensive war is forever denied to you. The only war confined to Palestine can be a war between the native masses and Great Britain. To fight on the side of Britain in such a war is to support a war for the perpetuation of colonial oppression and exploitation. If Britain goes to war as part of a general imperialist conflagration the whole character of the war will be determined and dominated by the imperialist aims of herself and her rivals. Support to such a war at any single sector is to support imperialism.

## Left-Zionism

It is an encouraging sign, however, that not all Zionist tendencies and individuals give support to the openly chauvinist declarations of Ben-Gurion. Many Zionists affirm their hatred of British imperialism and all its wars. But it is not enough to express opposition to Ben-Gurion's conclusions. We must be able to *refute* them. Ben-Gurion's support to imperialism derives from his Zionist premises. If you accept his premises, you can avoid his conclusions only by falling into irreconcilable contradictions which express themselves in an inability to carry out abstract anti-imperialist declarations into the realm of living

reality and action. In any case the possibility of a capitulation to imperialist war is ever present.

A typical example of the fate of such Zionism is Hashomer Hatzair, a left-wing grouping, containing in its ranks many young workers and students who are extremely sympathetic to the ideas of revolutionary Marxism. Hashomer realizes that Britain attempts to utilize Zionism for its own imperialist ends and as a weapon against the Arabs. Hashomer therefore demands the fullest coöperation and equality between the Arab and Jew. But Hashomer remains Zionist; therefore its actions necessarily run counter to its abstract declarations. In 1937, it addressed a leaflet to the Arabs expressing noble ideals for Arab-Jewish peace. But it mentions not a single word about the burning need of the Arab masses to throw out their own landlords and take over the land. It mentions not a syllable in support of the Arab demands for a representative assembly and for independence. It says nothing about throwing out British Imperialism. In a recent book, *Deep Furrows* (pp. 136), Ben-Shalom, one of the leaders of the Hashomer describes how groups of Hashomer Hatzair members in Palestine picketed Jewish landowners during a period of unemployment for employing Arabs from distant villages rather than Jewish workers.

Hashomer Hatzair declares itself opposed to British imperialism. Single-handed among the Labor-Zionists it opposes the vicious partition scheme. Among its arguments against partition it states that such a plan could only mean the perpetuation of British domination over Palestine. But in practice, because it is Zionist and therefore cannot counterpose an independent Palestine to a divided one, Hashomer is forced to accept British domination. It opposes British imperialism in the form of partition only to insist upon defending it in the form of the Mandate. The thesis proposed to its last national convention reads: "The demand for the institution of a direct fight against English imperialism is one which we have always considered valueless. Events of recent years have established our point of view emphatically; we must reckon with the factor of England as a constant in the coming political period." And again "The best solution for us in this historical period is the Mandate. . . ." Suppose Britain goes to war in "this historical period" for the purpose of defending the Mandate? The logic of defense of the Mandate is to support such a war. We certainly hope that this question receives serious thought from the Hashomer.

Together with all the great powers of the world, Britain, the guardian of the Zion, is preparing for a new imperialist war. In spite of all its hypocritical protestations for peace, which are ardently seconded by the social-patriots among the workers, we know that in reality it is preparing to send the workers and peasants of its far-flung empire to their death in a struggle to defend its right to oppress and exploit the peoples of the world and to defend its dominion based upon spoliation and murder. Are you for or against this war? There will be no other alternative. All groups, tendencies, parties, and individuals must reply, clearly and unambiguously, to this question.

The crisis of the coming war will unleash a whole series of rebellions on the part of the oppressed colonial slaves. Part of this mighty progressive movement will be a powerful movement in the British colonies, including Palestine. Are you for or against this movement? You cannot be against this movement for colonial liberation and still carry on a fight for the socialist revolution. Zionists, from Revisionist Jabotinsky to Labor-Zionist Ben-Gurion, have already indicated what their reply is going to be. The logic of Zionism forces them to become willing tools of Great Britain. These facts should compel all Zionists whose first loyalty and objective is the defense of the socialist revolution and the struggle against imperialist war to a reevaluation of their whole position and to a real discussion of their attitude toward the coming war and war preparations.

Ben HERMAN



# A New Mirror in the Old Frame

THE RADICAL FERMENT in the United States during the past decade has given rise to a new school of historical writing for the literary public of the left. In their general approach the biographers of this tendency have advanced a step beyond the "debunkers" whom they have superseded in popular favor, being far less preoccupied with the purely private sides of their subjects, their psychological quirks, sexual peccadilloes, and quaint characteristics, than with the socially significant aspects of their careers. Their works are written, that is to say, not under the reactionary 1920's, but in the crisis-torn 1930's, and under the intellectual influence, not of Freudianism, but of Marxism.

The influence of Marxist thought upon most of these authors has been extremely slight and casual, and, indeed, the majority have never professed to be Marxists. On the contrary, they condemn Marxism for its "one-sidedness", for its obsolete Hegelian philosophy or its equally outmoded nineteenth-century economics, for its revolutionary proletarian politics, and, in general, for its unyielding scientific materialism. The hundred and one doctrines they present as improvements over orthodox Marxism are pot-pourris of notions thrown together from diverse sources, Marx, Weber, Sombart, Veblen, Beard, etc., in proportions varied to please the individual taste. These anti-Marxists, no less than the minority of self-avowed Marxists in this group borrow from the treasury of Marxist thought, as from everywhere else, only those elements suited to their momentary needs and petty bourgeois outlook, which they quote learnedly and plaster upon their works for radical decoration.

In revising past events and personalities, the writers of this school refrain from overstepping certain inviolable limits. They are bold—but not overbold; "radical" without being revolutionary. These limits are prescribed for them by their social outlook as petty bourgeois intellectuals, by their intellectual indolence, and by their reformist politics. If they often plumb deeper than their predecessors, they still do not touch the bottom of most historical problems but dangle between the surface and the depths at the mercy of conflicting currents.

Caution and intellectual confusion characterize their political thinking no less than their historical investigations. The purely retrospective character of their wisdom is most clearly shown in their present politics, which consists of New Dealism, Stalinism—and often an amalgam of both. Thus John Chamberlain, who in 1932 performed an autopsy upon the Progressive movement in *Farewell to Reform*, pronouncing it dead beyond recall, comes forward in 1938 to cheer for Roosevelt and the New Deal. Out-jingoing the Stalinists, Lewis Mumford suddenly forsakes his previsions of New Harmonies to beat the war drums for a jihad against the fascist powers.

Matthew Josephson, who stands with one foot in the Stalinist camp and the other in the liberal morass of the *New Republic*, is a virtuoso of this tendency. This biographer of Zola perceives no parallel to the Dreyfus case in the Moscow Trials and no identity between his hero and John Dewey. On the contrary, he emulates the reactionary French scribblers he once excoriated by lending his pen to cover up these frame-ups in the *New Republic*. Nor do his two fat volumes on the patriarchal relations between Big Business and the twin capitalist parties, and on the futility of late nineteenth-century reformism, at all deter him from being well-disposed toward the Roosevelt régime and its left wing, the present avatars of these two tendencies.

These pseudo-radical intellectuals are no better than the Bourbons: they have forgotten nothing and learned nothing. However perspicacious they may be in respect to the past, however

bold in their criticism of their precursors, they are blind and timid as new-born kittens before the great problems of the present. Overwhelmed, disoriented, and unnerved by the prospective war and the onrushing social crisis, they are unwittingly taken into tow by conservative forces far stronger than themselves and involuntarily converted into accomplices of reaction. Likely at any moment to go astray in the tangled thickets of history, they are even less reliable guides amidst the mighty contending forces of today.

Matthew Josephson's latest production, *The Politicos*,\* is an excellent specimen of the historical work of this school. Just as, in *The Robber Barons*, he presented the economic development of the United States from 1865 to 1896 in terms of its principal figures, so now he has aimed to interpret the political history of the same period. It is extremely hazardous to approach either history or politics in this manner. Its fruitfulness depends upon the measure of the author's insight into the social struggles and class dynamics of the time and upon his ability to correlate the ideas, character, and conduct of his subjects to them.

Mr. Josephson best fulfills these requirements in his portrayals of the Republican and Democratic chieftains, Grant, Harrison, Cleveland and McKinley, who held the center of the national political stage, and Blaine, Conkling, Olney, W. C. Whitney and Mark Hanna, the stage-managers who directed them. He delineates their personal and political traits with commendable care and skill. He thoroughly demonstrates the double-dealing of these Presidential figureheads who publicly posed as servants of the people while privately promoting the interests of the plutocracy together with their own personal or factional ends.

They presided over a carnival of corruption unprecedented in American history, aptly characterized by V. L. Parrington as "The Great Barbecue". Under the protecting wing of the government, the conquering army of spoilsmen overran the South like locusts, flung themselves with unleashed appetites upon the national resources, plundered the people, auctioned off or gave away lands, choice appointments, railroad charters, tariffs, and privileges of all kinds. The "Credit Mobilier" scandal in connection with the building of the Union Pacific railroad and the operations of the Whiskey Ring disclosed the intimate connections in these transactions between the highest officeholders and the capitalist interests.

By tracing the activities of the go-betweens of high and low degree in the administrations from Grant to McKinley, Josephson exposes the complicated, costly, and concealed machinery of transmission whereby the demands of the real rulers of the state, the captains of industry and finance, were impressed upon their political agents and translated into the law of the land. He shows the wheels within wheels of the administrative apparatus: the party dominating the government, the faction ruling the party, the boss or clique of bosses running the faction, and, by means of their control over the national conventions, nominating their candidates for President and naming cabinets.

How instructive a handbook for an aspiring capitalist politician! From these pages he could learn how patronage should be allotted, how privileges must be marketed, and what kind of deals must be made to oil the party machinery and keep it running smoothly. He can see how the big party bosses established regular business relations with the big capitalist bosses, who acted as executive heads for their class. He can find out how a cabal of Senators can exercise a dictatorship over Congress, opening or closing the sluices of legislation as they ordain.

The wealth of material Josephson has assembled on the per-

\*THE POLITICOS. By MATTHEW JOSEPHSON. Harcourt, Brace and Company. New York. x+760 pp. \$4.50.

sonnel and methods of operation of the capitalist parties constitute the valuable parts of his work. Here we see bourgeois democracy, not in an unrealizable version begotten in some idealist's imagination, but as it actually existed in the heyday of its development in the United States, when it had freshly issued from a revolutionary purging. What a repulsive spectacle of duplicity, demagogy, and venality is unrolled before our eyes! The final judgment upon the politics of this period, and upon this form of capitalist domination in general, was uttered by "Dollar Mark" Hanna, the Kingfish of the Big Bosses: "All questions of government in a democracy are questions of money."

## The Dictatorship of the Radical Bourgeoisie

The serious shortcomings of *The Politicos* arise from Mr. Josephson's theoretical limitations which prevent him from perceiving the basic historical tendencies at work from 1865 to 1896. This epoch breaks into separate parts. The first, which extended from the close of the Civil War to Hayes' assumption of power in 1877, belonged to the final chapters in the development of the Second American Revolution inaugurated by the Civil War. The political essence of this period, which marked the culmination of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, consisted in the direct dictatorship of the triumphant Northern bourgeoisie over the conquered South and thereby over the rest of the country. The instrument for the exercise of this dictatorship was the Republican party; its wielders the Radical faction. Josephson, who tends to identify the Revolution with the Civil War by itself, does not comprehend the real disposition of the social forces in conflict during this period nor the significance of their political battles. He is consequently unable to answer the key questions posed by the political developments of the time.

His theoretical helplessness is most clearly manifested in his treatment of the conflict between President Johnson and the Republican Radicals. He views this crucial contest as a purely administrative matter in the same bureaucratic way as contemporary liberals interpret the struggle between Roosevelt and Congress. According to him, it was but another episode in the recurrent struggle between a popular, independent, and democratic executive and a partisan, scheming, and autocratic Senatorial clique.

Josephson unmistakably, if indecisively, places himself on the side of Johnson, the "man of the people" and the "radical agrarian". The main reason for his stand is not difficult to discern. Believing, in his liberal simplicity, that formal democracy must always be on the progressive side, he must be for Johnson, rather than the Radical advocates of military rule, congressional control, and dictatorship.

Yet Johnson, who proposed to revert to the political *status quo* before the Civil War, was counter-revolutionary compared to the Radical leaders, who aimed to monopolize their hard-won state power instead of sharing it with their vanquished foes. Josephson's troubled perplexity in the face of this situation demonstrates that he has not yet attained the degree of historical insight possessed by the most resolute and far-sighted leaders of the radical bourgeoisie at that date. They were sagacious enough to recognize that their revolutionary conquests could be safeguarded and extended only by maintaining a dictatorship over the South, and audacious enough to enforce a program to that effect over all opposition. While the Radicals pushed forward along the revolutionary road until they had utterly annihilated their class enemy and cushioned their political positions against the inevitable recoil, Johnson and the faltering conciliators around him, leaning upon the reactionary sections of the petty bourgeoisie and upon the fallen slave oligarchy, wanted to stop short the

revolution and welcome back the rebels. By placing himself at the head of the restorationist forces, Johnson, the formal democrat, was patently reactionary.

Josephson's incapacity to distinguish between the basically counter-revolutionary rôle of Johnson and the relatively progressive position of the Reconstructionists shows how shallow is his understanding of the Second American Revolution and how alien to Marxism is his entire outlook. He cannot reconcile, either in theory or in reality, the contradictory concepts of dictatorship and democracy, although the history of this very period demonstrates that under revolutionary conditions a dictatorship of the advanced class is the only serious way to guarantee the social gains acquired by bloody struggle.

At the same time the dictatorship of the radical bourgeoisie had its reactionary as well as its predominantly progressive side. While the radicals worked to complete the subjugation of their rivals on the right and directed their deadliest blows against them, they also strove to protect themselves and the material interests of the big bourgeoisie against their allies on the left flank, the discontented workers and farmers who instinctively struggled to carry forward the revolution along the lines of their own class interests. The capitalists needed the dictatorship to fight the counter-revolutionists on the one hand and the rebellious plebians on the other. This dual function of the Radical régime, which flowed from the political and social necessities of the upper bourgeoisie, accounted for its contradictory character.

Josephson describes this dual character in the following paragraph:

The politicians in those stormy years of Reconstruction were as men afflicted with dual identity: they were literally Jekylls and Hydes. As Dr. Jekyll, with a generous impulse they emancipated Negro slaves, swept away the feudal, landed order of the South; as Mr. Hyde, they deliberately delayed the recovery and restoration of the conquered states, whose economy languished during many years of disorder; imposed military rule; and established a network of Freedman's bureaus and Carpetbag local governments which were subject to the central Republican Party Organization at Washington and paid tribute to the same. As Dr. Jekyll, they stirred the masses of voters to their support by use of a humane and libertarian ideology of a revolutionary American pattern; as Mr. Hyde, they planned and built coolly, at the height of deliberately invoked, turbulent electoral struggles and parliamentary storms, measures of high capitalist policy, to stand "not for a day, but for all time"; they worked to implant in the covenant of our society safeguards to property and capital which might hold against all future assaults.

Just as he cannot grasp the fact that the radical dictatorship was the dual shield of democracy, so Josephson is completely bewildered by the dual personality of the Radical politicians. In a word, he does not understand the dialectics of the situation.

Since it lacks the dramatic values and picturesque color of the Republican regency, Josephson slights the history of the Democratic organization from 1864 to 1876. Yet the resurrection of the Democratic party was not the least remarkable political phenomenon of the period. This party, which had been split in two by the revolutionary crisis and discredited by its policies during the war, rose from its ruins and returned to challenge the victor. Josephson offers no better explanation for the resurgence of the Democratic party than the immortality of the two-party system. The profound regroupings of social forces that expressed themselves in the political realignments after the Civil War are left obscure and unregarded.

Finally, Josephson only partially appreciates the historical significance of the disputed Hayes-Tilden election of 1876. He correctly points out that the secret bargain between the Republican and Democratic chiefs sealed the reconciliation between the sundered ruling classes of the North and South over the prostrate bodies of the Negroes, the wage-workers, and poor farmers. But he fails to note that, by withdrawing the Federal troops from the South and permitting the carpet-bag governments to collapse, the Republicans relaxed their outright dictatorship and thereby terminated the last chapter of the revolution. Having consolidated their conquests and securely entrenched

themselves in power, menaced far more from the plebian left than from the planters on the right, the capitalist oligarchy was moved to restore "formal democracy" to the South. From then on, their reactionary dictatorship masked itself behind democratic processes, except in those instances of acute class conflict, when the Presidents called out Federal troops against striking workers. The edge of the dictatorship was turned almost entirely against the rebellious proletariat.

## The Struggle Between the Big and Little Bourgeoisie

The political axis of the next twenty years from 1876 to 1896 revolved around the struggle of the plebian masses against the rule of the plutocracy. The rural petty bourgeoisie took full command of the parliamentary fight against the big bourgeoisie, leading the proletariat behind it. Their revolt expressed itself in the Greenback, Granger, Populist, Single-Tax, and finally in the Free-Silver movements.

For the first sixteen years of this period the political security of the big bourgeoisie at Washington remained unshaken. During this age of economic progress, they ruled indifferently through the Republican and Democratic parties without serious threat

from the workers and farmers. Then the crisis of 1893 cut across this comparative calm, resulting in a speedy and sharp consolidation of the opposing forces.

In 1896 the plebian hosts rallied under the banner of the Democratic party and the leadership of Bryan to storm the citadel of monopoly capital. Their campaign was subsidized and supported by big mining interests. Bryan's crusade against the Gold-Bugs was the high-water mark of the post-revolutionary struggle of the lesser bourgeoisie. Their failure to dispossess the direct representatives of Big Business from power underscored their political impotence and initiated their political decline.

This period properly ends, however, not with McKinley's election, bought with Mark Hanna's funds, but with the Spanish-American war. This inglorious adventure was the imperialist solution to the social crisis precipitated by the economic panic of 1893 and aggravated by the bitter contest of 1896. By arbitrarily cutting short his exposition at McKinley's victory, Josephson indicates his incapacity to understand the stages of development and grasp the great turning points in the political history of the time.

CONCLUDED IN NEXT ISSUE

George E. NOVACK

# Spending and the Stock Market

ON MONDAY, JUNE 20, the stock market spurted sharply and continued upward. The response has been immediate. The capitalist economists are aflutter with hopes of a new prosperity. The capitalist press magnifies the spurt with front-page headlines; it proclaims it as the trumpet call to recovery; it seizes upon it as proof that the long depression which has oppressed the lives of the workers and taunted the hopes of the farmers and middle class, is now behind; and in all ways it utilizes it to perpetuate the falsehood that capitalism is capable of restoring prosperity.

Already there is an answering echo of pious hope among rank and file workers, untutored labor leaders, pink-tea liberals and plain, ordinary deceiving scoundrels in the ranks of the working class. The dilettante radicals and opportunists who base their political programs primarily upon "the mood of the masses" and not on objective economic and social trends, will soon whirl and gyrate with every flurry of the ticker tape. They, too, will join the shouting throng, although somewhat late.

Among responsible Wall Street investment services, there is much less optimism. In its issue of June 18, Poor's Investment Service wrote, "The stock market is gradually working itself toward a point from which a sizeable move may develop. Direction cannot be predicted with certainty, although the economic background suggests the downside." And their judgment of the economic background was that "only in the January 1932-April 1933 interval of the Great Depression was business activity below the current level".

Standard Statistics made a similar analysis in its *Weekly Review of the Business Prospect* published as late as June 24. It summed up its leading article as follows: "Decline Is Becoming Progressively More Sharp, but Living Costs Are Receding Very Slowly—Purchasing Power Is Already Curtailed, and Total for the Full Year Probably Will Not Be Much Above That in 1932—Drop Is Most Severe in Industrial Trades."

The fact that despite widespread economic decline the stock market spurted upwards is of prime importance. In the past, stock market trends reflected existing profits due to increasing productive activity. Or it reflected hopes of future profits to be gotten from expected expansion in production. In both cases,

the hopes were based on the self-generating expansion of American capitalism and on the expectation of profits to be garnered from it. But this was in the progressive period of capitalism.

Today, capitalism is in decline and the stock market no more reflects its self-recuperative powers. The present stock upsurge, for instance, did not begin June 20. It began, actually, two and a half months before, in the opening days of April. From that time on it climbed slowly and waveringly until it began its sharp rise on Monday, June 20. At no time did this rise reflect rising production and expanding business activity. Both these continued to decline. They gave decreasing profits in the present and even less hope of profits for the future. Such prospects could not sustain a falling market, much less stimulate a rising one. Looking only toward private industry, Poor's could see no justification for a rising stock market and concluded logically that "the economic background suggests the downside" in the stock market.

Were capitalism dependent upon itself for recovery, Poor's prediction would have come true. However, capitalism today is incapable of self-recovery. Today the great stimulant of recovery is government aid. In 1933, government aid in the form of pump-priming and credit expansion gave the impetus to recovery. The current crash began in the early months of 1937, when government aid dwindled away. Today, too, government spending and credit expansion have begun the work of recovery and excited the stock market with hopes of profits. The stock market, therefore, has become an indicator of hopes of profits based on government spending and not on the expansion of capitalism.

## Market Dependency on Government Spending

That this is true is proven beyond question if we compare the stock market trends with government spending. The stock market rise that began in April reflected increased government spending that had begun in March. Between February and March, government spending for public construction in 37 states had increased from \$50,000,000 to little less than \$100,000,000. This fact is doubly important. As a user of capital goods, the construc-

tion industry is interwoven with practically all the durable goods industries, some of which are dependent upon it almost entirely for their market. Furthermore, as a disburser of purchasing power, construction activity distributes purchasing power in greater degree than average industries. The purchasing power it distributes is all used for consumption purposes and serve to stimulate the consumption goods industries.

Building construction—and naval construction—had direct effect upon other industries. Steel production halted its precipitous decline. Lumber and cement industries began to pick up immediately. The increased purchasing power distributed was reflected in increasing output of cotton goods and in increased sales.

By April, there were growing signs that the depression was scraping bottom, that government spending was taking hold and that recovery was around the proverbial corner. Some of the more important indicators of cyclical revival began to appear. The unadjusted index of automobile production began to rise slowly in February and continued upward into April. The unadjusted index of new passenger car sales rose over fifty percent between February and April. The index of total residential building contracts awarded rose almost one hundred percent during the same interval. Net railway operating income, which declined very sharply during March to April 1937, smoothed out its decline during the same months of 1938. The most comprehensive economic indexes have either slowed up their decline or made slight upturns.

The question is no more "When will decline end?" The real questions now are: How great will be the recovery? How long will it last? What will it mean to the workers?

The extent and duration of the recovery are conditioned by the dominating fact that recovery is the product of government spending. The lack of private capital expansion is due to the unprofitableness of investing in new capital goods when the old are not used to their full capacity because it is unprofitable to use them. The moans that government spending is competing with private spending and driving it out of the market is sheer nonsense that may deceive the capitalists into unfounded self-confidence, or dupe their gullible listeners, but no one else. The reason is that this competition is sheer myth. There is not enough private capital expansion to speak of. That is precisely why the depressions are so deep. That, too, is precisely why government spending determines the upswing out of depression and sustains the recovery.

Government spending and credit expansion are so important that we would do well to analyze their nature and limitations; their economic significance and class-political import.

In previous periods, government spending was limited to maintaining the government and aiding an expanding capitalism expand more rapidly and more profitably. The permanent items in government expenditures were the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government; the government bureaucracy; the military service and its armaments; various direct aids to aid the expansion of industry and agriculture; and aducational grants to states. Except in unusual instances, the revenue to cover expenditures was obtained by taxation. Where this was insufficient, the government obtained a short term loan to cover the deficit. Surpluses from taxation in the next years would suffice to retire the loan. The government revenue, therefore, was obtained by the redistribution of the national income by means of taxation.

During the recent years of declining capitalism, government expenditures have increased by billions due to the appearance of a new group of items. The items have a twofold aim: First and foremost, to stave off decline and to aid recovery in industry and agriculture. The struggle is not for expansion but for a more modest objective: recovery. Second, to stave off revolution by at least partly satisfying the needs of the many-millioned

unemployed. The revenue to meet these expenditures is not obtained through the regular method of raising taxes. This would be difficult and dangerous. Economic decline has borne down upon the workers and unemployed, lower middle class and farmers, and shorn them of ability to pay much more. Economic decline has bitten into the profits of the capitalists and made them unwilling to stand any more. Government revenues for increased expenditures have come from loans made by bankers to the government.

This government spending beyond its regular revenues—this "deficit spending", as the financial journals call it—was, at first, not unwelcome to the bankers. They were overflowing with unused money. If they refused to lend the government money, it might be taken from them in the form of increased taxes. Lending money to the government not only staved off increased taxes but it left ownership in the hands of the bankers and even gave them rewards in the form of regular interest payments from the most stable government in the world. The advantages were obvious: 1) they succeeded in evading taxation; 2) field for profitable investment of unused money. Nevertheless, as the years went by and "deficit spending" loomed in sight without stop, they became more hesitant and more critical.

The critical attitude was not the outcome of mule-headed opposition because recovery was government-inspired. The criticism arose out of their increasing realization of the limitations of a recovery that could only be sustained by "deficit spending". The reason is that government bonds are capital claims on government revenues that must ultimately be met by increased taxation, including taxation upon production and profits. An increasing government debt, which is a stable source of profits to bondholders, is at the same time a drain upon them. It causes them to pay part of the cost of economic recovery at the expense of recovery in their profits.

## The Danger of Inflation

Moreover, there is always the danger that the government might make up some of the deficit by issuing money, and increasing the circulation of money out of proportion to the increase in production—*i.e.*, by inflation.

Inflation would destroy the capital claims of financial interests, although benefitting industrial interests by increasing prices and profits. It would stimulate an upswing in production and wholesale sales resulting from the efforts of producers and wholesalers to prepare themselves against future price increases. In this upswing, workers and farmers would suffer. The wages of workers would lag behind prices and their purchasing power would plummet downwards. Much the same would happen to the farmer, whose cost of production and subsistence would rise faster than the selling price of his goods. These would confront the government with an explosive dilemma. It must either stop inflation or increase it. If it stopped inflation it would stop the increasing prices and the heightened suffering. But if it did this, it would end the rapid rise in profits, remove the inflated expectations of future profits, and destroy the stimulus to further production. It would catapult the country into a drastic depression that would increase suffering and with it the danger of social revolution. The alternative would be confiscatory taxation upon the rich to redistribute the national income and put purchasing power into the hands of the workers and unemployed and the impoverished farmers and lower middle class. Such taxation would practically wipe out profits, the very life-blood of capitalism.

If the government maintains deficit spending, it cannot keep it constant. It must increase it successively. The reason is that rising prices cut purchasing power and consumption lags behind production. Unless consumption is stimulated, there will be growing over-production of goods relative to effective de-

mand. Unless consumption is stimulated, inventories will swell, competition will slash prices, profits will fall, and the inevitable crash will again prove inevitable. But if consumption is to be stimulated, it can only be by the distribution of currency among the workers and unemployed to enable them to meet the rising prices and to consume the output of industry or by direct taxation upon the wealthy and the redistribution of the national income in the interests of increasing the purchasing power of the impoverished millions.

In both alternatives, economic recovery can only be maintained by depressing the profits of the capitalists to the point where they are practically destroyed. This can be done either by keeping down prices relative to wages or by increasing wages faster than rising prices. But this strikes at the very heart of capitalism—profits. It strikes at capitalism at the very time when its profits are already falling due to economic decline. The government, as “the executive committee of the ruling class”, fights to increase profits in a fashion compatible with its own continued existence. It gives the unemployed a small bone in the form of less than subsistence relief. But, at the same time, it more than compensates the capitalists by lending them money—which are really gifts in many instances—by raising prices and by permitting higher profits. But, in doing so, it already lays the basis for the next and worse crash.

This dilemma holds the New Dealers like a vise. It determines their every piece of reform legislation. It determines the present recovery. It determines the extent and duration of the recovery. And it also sets in motion the very conditions that will catapult the country into unheard of crises and pose without qualification the roads: socialism or fascism.

This analysis applies without qualification to the present upswing. Roosevelt's program of spending is \$4,100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, according to the estimate of the *Economist*. The deficit approximated by Roosevelt in an official summary is just about equal to it. It is \$4,084,887,600. In addition, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to lend up to \$1,500,000,000 to corporations requesting loans. That much, and maybe most, of the loans will amount to gifts is proven by the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently wiped off its books \$2,500,000,000 of unpaid loans. To cap it all, the government has begun a policy of stimulating credit expansion, thus reversing the former policy of restricting credit expansion in order to avoid inflation. The program of inflationary credit expansion consists of two items: 1) The government has reduced the reserve requirements of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and has thereby increased their excess reserves by \$750,000,000. This sum can serve as the basis for a credit expansion of five times as much. 2) The government has desterilized \$1,400,000,000 worth of gold and placed it to its credit with the Federal Reserve System. The government's spending power is increased proportionately without having to resort to taxation or loans. This sum, too, as it is spent, will become part of the excess reserves of the member banks, who altogether will now have \$2,150,000,000 excess reserves which can be used to finance the expansion of private industry.

The theory underlying the whole program is that private spending and expansion can be stimulated by giving recovery a government send-off. Presumably public works will demand increasing output of capital goods, stimulating the capital goods industries and spreading purchasing power. Presumably, increased purchasing power should stimulate capital expansion in consumption goods as well as in capital goods industries, and all this expansion will take place in anticipation of increasing profits. Once this upward spiral has begun, government spending can taper off gradually. Private investment would then be left to carry the full burden of recovery.

Unfortunately for the theory, private investment itself is sup-

ported by government spending. Government spending for public works, in creating a demand for capital goods, also makes it profitable for the industries to make replacements. However, they are unlikely to make investments on any large scale. New investments to be profitable would have to be accompanied by increasing output and the output would not be increased unless there were a reasonable expectation of having markets for it. The very fact that there is no appreciable market for an increasing output of capital goods is what shuts the basic industries and characterizes capitalist decline. Government spending for public works, at the same time that it opens up a sizeable market also makes the capital goods industries unable to produce without it.

Another, and indirect, stimulus to capital goods output is government subsidies to consumption in the form of relief. This purchasing power is spent entirely on consumption and it stimulates consumption industries to replace obsolete capital equipment. The capital goods industries are required to use the plant capacity more fully or order new equipment. The resulting increase in wages and purchasing power of the workers in the capital goods industries contributes to swell the total purchasing power. But successive demands for capital output cannot remain equal to the first. They must surpass it. If not, capital goods activity will not increase, the purchasing power it distributes to workers in their industries will not increase, the displacement of workers in industries by technological improvements will reduce the total purchasing power at the very time that there is an increasing output of consumption goods flung upon the market by the more modern equipment.

This will mark the beginning of the crash unless foreign trade increases or general consumption increases. But foreign trade offers no rosy prospects. It is declining and it cannot take an increasing export of manufactures and capital goods. The deadly competition between countries for the world market is only a bloody witness to the decline of world capitalism. This avenue of escape from economic stagnation, hitherto open, is already measurably closed. A general increase of consumption would enable the depressed masses to consume, what is from the standpoint of the profit system the “surplus goods”. This could be achieved by reductions in prices accompanied by giant outlays for public works at trade union wages, by giving employment to all unemployed through drastic reductions in working hours, by raising the general wage level, and by financing the consumption with drastic taxation upon the wealth of the rich. But this alternative would result in drastic declines in the rate of profit and endanger capitalism itself.

## The Dilemma of Profits or Plenty

This dilemma of profits or plenty holds the New Dealers like a vise. It limits their every piece of reform legislation. It limits the present recovery. It limits the extent and duration of the present recovery. And it also sets in motion the very conditions that will catapult the country into unheard-of crises.

Meanwhile, the upswing has begun. Its meaning for the workers we described in a former issue of the *Socialist Appeal*, when the “recovery and relief” program became law. The analysis given then holds just as true today and is worth repeating:

At best, the program will bring a feverish recovery that will be short in duration, precipitate in decline, and at all times will press down the living standards of the workers and farmers. The public works program will employ a portion of those displaced from private industry by the current depression. The major portion, however, will still be unemployed. In addition, there will remain the 9,000,000 who were unemployed at the peak of economic activity in 1937. The housing program will increase employment in the building industry as well as the auxiliary capital goods industries. However, all this will fail of its purpose unless private industry joins in the expansion. The Roosevelt administration realizes this. The purpose of desterilization of gold and the



expansion of credit is to stimulate expansion in private industry by inflation.

The inflation program will cause a spurt in economic activity, causing a further increase in employment, although it will never absorb all the millions of unemployed. However, it will also increase prices and the cost of living for the workers. Workers now employed will suffer substantial cuts in real wages. The unemployed who are now on relief or getting \$54 a month on works projects, will be even more depressed. Those unemployed only will get temporary relief who get jobs in private industry as a result of this inflationary upswing.

But this relief will be shortlived. Inflation will cut the purchasing power of the workers and unemployed. Surplus products will pile up as capitalists prepare themselves against future price rises. Consumption will have lagged again behind production. And the illusion of recovery will crash into the reality of depression.

# Burnham Dodges My Views

IT BORES ME TO HAVE TO reply to James Burnham's article "Max Eastman As A Scientist", because although written for the most part graciously and without the usual billingsgate, it is not the kind of article a man writes who really wishes to grapple with a problem. Burnham either agrees or does not agree with my criticism of dialectic materialism as a disguised metaphysical idealism. I suspect that he agrees more than he disagrees with it. But he is careful not to let anybody, perhaps not even himself, perceive this, for the very simple reason that he is politically a Trotskyist, and he knows that if he renounces dialectic materialism, or even questions it, Trotsky will renounce him—and probably call him a coward besides.

What I say about scientific method derives its essential meaning in the circumstances from my thesis that Marxism contains this element of wish-fulfillment metaphysics. It is impossible profitably to discuss the article either as criticism of Marxism, or as advocacy of scientific method, or as appraisal of the Russian experiment, or as anything else, without opening this question and honestly grappling with it. One need only read Trotsky's excommunication of me in the same issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL to see that for Trotskyists such questions are closed. The article "Max Eastman As A Scientist" therefore scrupulously avoids touching its real theme.

On any other subject—in any other situation—James Burnham, who occupies a responsible post in a scholarly university, would be ashamed to answer a clearly defined and plain-spoken thesis such as mine about the difference between Marxian socialist philosophy and a practical socialist hypothesis, and some of the consequences which result from substituting the one for the other, with the pretense that the author "meditates on a variety of problems" and reaches conclusions "so vague and general as to be hardly arguable". Every word of his subsequent argument proves this a disingenuous pretense, particularly the statement soon following that my article "ends with the listing of eight proposed points for a revision" of the socialist ideal.

Equally disingenuous, whether consciously so or not, are the indecisive and elusive remarks which follow that introductory pretense:

"The problem what Marx really meant is an interesting one for *scholarly research*." "None of us is surprised that Marx was limited by the stage which scientific *knowledge* had reached in his day." "I, for one, agree that it is desirable to change, in part, his *terminology* [!]." "These problems of scholarly and *linguistic* [!] reform."

The italics are mine and so are the exclamation points, but they are unnecessary. Anybody who having read my article reads these remarks, and believes that Burnham has the slightest intention of grappling with my theses is either a natural born sucker intellectually, or else eager to pull the wool over his own eyes for Trotskyist party purposes.

One modification only has to be made to this conclusion. The inflationary upswing will at the same time have tuned up the productive machinery in preparation for war. Within less than two years the alternatives—of catastrophic depression accompanied by the danger of social upheavals or war of imperialist expansion—will present themselves. Wilson before him had chosen the alternative of World War. Roosevelt, far more than Wilson, has prepared for this alternative and will take it when the occasion arises.

The present stock upsurge not only reflects the government's inflationary policy of stimulating recovery but it also presages the coming war for American imperialism. David COWLES

Burnham's suggestion that my article might be "mere eye-wash and pot-boiler", I regard as on a par with the statement of Trotsky that I have "fashioned a profession" for myself out of "the struggle against dialectics". It shows about the same level of common sense, the same realism as to cultural conditions in America. I had that essay "Russia and the Socialist Ideal" on my desk for ten months after I wrote it, checking over and rejudging every sentence it contained, so that there should be no word in it untrue to my most deliberate convictions. I received from Harper's three hundred and fifty dollars for it. That is the only cent I ever made on any writing relating to dialectics. On the other side of the ledger, I paid for the publication of my book, *Mark and Lenin, the Science of Revolution*, and I paid for the publication of my brochure, *The Last Stand of Dialectic Materialism*. That is how it stands in America with the profession of attacking dialectic materialism, and with eye-wash and pot-boilers made out of painstaking studies of socialist theory. It takes no more than common sense to know it. When I come to writing pot-boilers, there are plenty of profitable subjects I can write on.

I introduced my article by remarking that I seem to be in a better position to reconsider the theoretical assumptions of the Russian revolution than Trotsky. That is a specific and unimportant judgment about two individuals, and has nothing whatever to do with my advocacy of the methods of science as opposed to the methods of Hegelian philosophy in socialist thinking. Here again Burnham is running excitedly up a side alley, hoping to be followed by his readers. In general the pretense of my critics that I am posing as a "scientist" makes me tired. I know what scientific method is, and so do they.

Burnham finds it "amusing" that although I oppose wish-fulfillment thinking, yet the "content and very wording of a number of the eight points listed in my revision of the socialist ideal are simply—wishes". That is not true, but if it were, it would not be amusing except to a person ignorant of—or in a political position compelling him to ignore—the difference between wishes and wish-fulfillment thinking.

Burnham says that contemporary science "recognizes no problems of being or of universal history"; after that he says that such questions are "ruled out of scientific discourse". The former statement is incorrect, the latter correct. They are ruled out of scientific discourse—except by a tiny group who maintain that logically they have no meaning—because now if not forever they cannot be answered. I advocated on the same ground that they be ruled out of socialist discourse. Burnham calls my simple formulation of scientific scepticism "rationalist metaphysics". What is the use? Why not discuss the issues?

I make an allusion to "the *universal* attributes of human nature", and Burnham, identifying that with "the *essential* nature of man", jumps into a harangue about my wanting to "go back



not merely to the Romantic, to the Eighteenth-Century Rationalists, but hurtling headlong into the Middle Ages", my wanting to "revive the doctrines of Substance and Essence". And then a long high-brow lecture about Substance and Essence. How pitiful!

Everybody knows that there are universal attributes of human nature. Does not blood flow in all our veins? Is not arsenic poisonous to us all? Sophistry unhappily is not.

Burnham calls attention to the obvious fact that often in social action "too detailed a blueprint is a defect", and asserts that I demand a "blueprint in detail" of the socialist society. That is not true. I myself carefully warned against a too detailed blueprint, and also called attention to the difference between social and mechanical action in this respect. Burnham has invented this diversion for the same reason as the others—because he cannot discuss the real point I am making.

The point is this: Marx, on the one hand, dispensed with blueprints altogether, or thought he did—"the workers have no ideal to realize". On the other hand, he adopted in the place of blueprints any and every extreme and absolute social ideal that happened to be floating in the wind. He did these two inconsistent things for one reason—namely that he believed in a universal benign evolution of Reality-As-Such to ever "higher forms". My thesis is that both these errors, the alleged absence of blueprints and the existence of utopian blueprints, and the inconsistency between them, are the result of that unscientific faith. Since Burnham dare not touch the question of that faith, he invents a disagreement between us about a matter of simple good sense—a disagreement which, so far as plain English could do it, I carefully forestalled.

"Eastman praises the utopian socialists, Fourier and St. Simon," Burnham says, "because they had blueprints. Revealing praise! Here as before Eastman does not 'move forward' to contemporary science, but swings back to pre-Marxian fantasies." That again is not true. What I said was that even Marx's utopian predecessors raised the problem what there was in human nature to guarantee the possibility and success of a socialist society, and that, instead of developing these "amateurish but obviously necessary inquiries",\* Marx abandoned them, because to him they were rendered superfluous by his faith in a benign universe. Again it is only because he dare not broach the question of that faith that Burnham misrepresents my statement. If he had quoted my remark about Fourier and St. Simon, not one sentence of his comment would have made sense. And he uses more space telling falsely what the remark was, than would have been required to quote it. Revealing measurement!

Speaking roughly, I advocate the amount of blueprinting that would seem sensible to a practical mind not misled by a "philosophy of optimism" (as Trotsky well describes the dialectic faith). On the other hand, I advocate that we abandon those utopian and absolute ideals which we know cannot be realized unless that philosophic dream is true, and talk practical good sense about the future society. It is obviously impossible to discuss justly the equilibrium I am proposing, if one is debarred from grappling with the question of the truth or falsity of the said "philosophy of optimism".

This question of blueprints and resulting mental equilibrium in large-scale social efforts, is the most important methodological question in the world today. Burnham, ignoring for political reasons my careful approach to it, merely asserts *überhaupt* that "the anti-blueprint temperament is . . . necessary to decisive political action". I wonder if he realizes how much that statement can mean in the present conjuncture. The lure of "decisive political action" without blueprints is the very magic wand of fascism. It is a wand also ruthlessly employed by Stalin. I do not know how much Stalin was helped in shifting the Bolshevik locomotive from the road toward socialism to the tyrant road by the Marxian mystic disposition to believe that any decisive politi-

cal action taken with the support, or plausible support, of the proletariat, would lead inevitably to "higher forms". I know that he was helped a lot. He was helped in getting these disgraceful, world-deluding, lying "confessions" from his opponents. Americans, even when they pretend to believe in it themselves, hardly realize that the Russian Bolshevik leaders *really did believe* in that antique religion.

At any rate, in the present crisis of man's hopes, to have able men going around advocating "decisive political action" with no scientific plans, no concept of human nature, no apprehension of the problems to come, no recognition that they will be in large part the same problems that have arisen in Russia—nothing but an antiquated German-romantic faith in a universe where planets are revolving in "ever more magnificent circles", and things on them from bugs to bureaucracies are in a state of everlasting progress "from the lower to the higher"—is anything but helpful. To transplant all this disguised Hegelian rationalistic animistic balderdash into our western world, which has been so largely characterized by practical and therefore sceptical, empirical good sense, is unqualifiedly bad. When Trotsky says that what we need in this country is "more dogma", he ought to be resisted as an obscurantist by every alert and free and educated mind in America—and he will be.

There is one other magic wand, wielded by Hitler and Mussolini—and also by Stalin. That is the *redefinition* of popular key words like freedom, democracy, socialism, etc., to make them mean whatever the tyrant and the bureaucrats may have in mind. This wand is also wielded by George Soule in his *Future of Liberty*, where we are told without a smile that we can cling to the ideals in the Declaration of Independence, if we will only "redefine" liberty and make it mean "*subordination* to a common purpose". Soule is merely tracing out the road by which our soft-headed liberals can with some few scant ragged piteous relics of their mental dignity go over to Stalin. It is no accident that Burnham, defending not only "decisive political action" by the "anti-blueprint temperament", but also the system of having instead of blueprints ideals so utopian that by his own admission "many of them can never be completely realized", finds himself also involved in the disgraceful business of redefining a clear term. Governmental regulation and freedom, he declares, are only "verbally contradictory". Coöperation and governmental regulation would only "make impossible a romantic kind of freedom, which considers the free man to be one who does immediately whatever comes into his head, who acts from every momentary impulse with no thought of consequences or social effects". Why "immediately"? Why "momentary impulse"? Did anybody say that freedom is opposed to hesitation, to deliberation, to judgment of consequences or social effects? Freedom is being in a position to do what comes into *your own* head, to act whether soon or late on *your own* impulses, to restrain those impulses when you do restrain them because of *your own* judgment of consequences and social effects. That is what freedom means, and anybody who clouds that meaning is well on the road toward "liquidating the opposition".

The way to approach the problem of the relation between freedom and a well-organized economy is to say candidly and clearly what freedoms, and how many, must be sacrificed to such organization. That is the scientific compromise between anarchism and socialism. The metaphysical compromise effected by dialectic materialism, complete endorsement with indefinite postponement, leads with perfect logic down the road that Burnham and George Soule are mapping out, and Stalin has already travelled. Do not forget that Stalin was a socialist. Mussolini was a socialist. Hundreds of thousands of the followers of Hitler were socialists or communists, converted overnight by the lure of "decisive political action", and by a small redefinition—a small sacrifice of what is "Romantic"—in the principle of human freedom.

We want blueprints definite enough to make that process of

\*I quote from memory.

conversion difficult. Is it too much to ask of the professed defenders of civilization in its hour of crisis that they should have aims that they honestly believe in—that they believe *can*, and if the appropriate action is taken, *will* be realized. Is it just or truthful to impute “despair and resignation” to a person who makes this demand?

Burnham says in conclusion that “Eastman is compelled, if he is responsible, to propose another . . . program”. Taking “program” in a very general sense, that is true. To my sensibility it is the one statement in his article that seems to come quite clearly

from the heart. If I live I will complete my thesis. If the profession of struggling against dialectics were a little more lucrative, I would complete it sooner. But even so I would not hurry. I know it cannot seem so to party militants, and they have always my humble respect, but to me it seems just now in America a period for deliberation. It is so at any rate in my own life, and, both for pecuniary and intellectual reasons, I am combining this review of socialism with a review of my life.

Max EASTMAN

## A Little Wool Pulling

**F**OR A MAN SO BORED with my article that he says so twice over, Max Eastman displays an unconscionable degree of heat in replying to it.

And for one who has had so much to say about the viciousness of amalgams, he does some pretty fancy amalgam-making out of Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, myself—and George Soule. I am rather accustomed to the Hitler-Mussolini amalgam, since the era of the Trials began; the inclusion of Stalin is no surprise, what with the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, and the *Evening Post*; but I'll admit that George Soule brings in a new angle.

And for so constant a critic of the shocking tone of Trotskyists, the repetitions of “ashamed”, “disgraceful”, “afraid”, “does not dare”, ring with a peculiarly lurid note.

And for an opponent whose main thesis it is that I have “dodged his views”, it is unexpected to discover that the main portion of his rebuttal is occupied with personal apologetics and analysis of my character and motives.

The personal apologetics deserve an additional few sentences. I did *not* suggest that Eastman's article might be mere eyewash and pot-boiler. I mentioned this assumption to *reject* it, and to make clear that I was taking his article seriously, as a responsible statement of his views. But even if I had made this suggestion, I would obviously have meant the term “pot-boiler” to refer to an *ideological* not to an economic pot-boiler; just as Trotsky obviously meant ideological not economic profession when he spoke of Eastman fashioning a profession for himself out of the struggle against dialectics. When we say that Lovestone has made a profession out of Trotsky-baiting, nobody understands this to mean making it a financial racket: everyone grants that Lovestone could do much better for his financial self in other and quite different fields. Since all this is quite usual and obvious, Eastman's comments on the subject, whatever his intention, perform the function of vulgar demagoguery, a form of the “Look-at-my-wounds;-and-vote-for-me” argument which was traditional with candidates for the Roman consulship. In Coriolanus' bitter irony:

Your voices: for your voices I have fought;  
Watch'd for your voices; for your voices bear  
Of wounds two dozen odd; battles thrice six  
I have seen and heard of; for your voices have  
Done many things, some less, some more; your voices:  
Indeed, I would be consul.

I judge a man's views by the weight of the argument and evidence; and these are not altered by the financial arrangements.

Eastman says that I am guilty of “disingenuous pretense” when I wrote that he reached conclusions “so vague and general as to be hardly arguable”. Consider a couple of the *ostensible* conclusions, to which I was referring: “4. Those [components of the socialist ideal] obviously fantastic in the light of modern biological and psychological knowledge, to say nothing of modern common sense, should be thrown out. 5. None of those

remaining should be conceived as absolute.” Can any man deny that these are “vague and general”? And who would be so foolish as to argue them, I cannot imagine.

What then is the argument about?

It is *not*, of course, about dialectical materialism. This is merely Eastman's own brand of herring. It is true that I do not believe in orthodox dialectical materialism. This should certainly be no surprise to Eastman: he will find in his files of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, for example, a critique by me of one of the key doctrines of dialectical materialism (“the inevitability of socialism”) to which no reply has yet been made and which I have found no reason to alter. On other occasions where it seems relevant and called for I have made and will make my criticisms of dialectical materialism.

But I was precise in defining the incidence of the article, “Max Eastman as Scientist”. His *Harper's* article, I pointed out, was a new departure. Along with “his perennial attack upon the ‘philosophy’ and ‘religion’ which he attributes to Marx”, along with the “vague and general conclusions”, “Eastman takes up arms against the socialist ideal”. Eastman, in his *Harper's* essay, attacked the socialist ideal and revolutionary politics as a method for achieving that ideal. He based his attack, so he said, on scientific method, the conclusions of modern science, and the experiences of the Russian Revolution.

Does he deny that this was done in his essay? Have I misrepresented him? Then why doesn't he say so, explicitly and directly? Or does he find it more expedient to list eight points in “our revision of the socialist ideal” and in the next breath speak of “we socialists”; to write for a “practical socialist hypothesis” with one hand, and a “scientific compromise between anarchism and socialism” with the other? And then to pass the whole attack off as an exposure of the “theology of dialectical materialism”.

I was then concerned to defend the legitimacy of the socialist ideal and of revolutionary politics as the method for realizing it from his attack by proving on the basis of his article that: Eastman does not understand scientific method; he has failed to prove any incompatibility between the conclusions of science and the socialist ideal or revolutionary politics; he has failed abysmally in his pretended explanation for the degeneration of the Russian Revolution; his argument tends toward conclusions which are politically either meaningless or reactionary. “In general,” writes Eastman, “the pretense of my critics that I am posing as a ‘scientist’ makes me tired. I know what scientific method is, and so do they.” I am afraid I am not so generous. If Eastman is not posing as a “scientist”, with or without quotes, then what in the world is he posing as? And if he is not, what business does he have dealing with such subjects as he selects? But, with reference at least to the problems under question, my article sought to show, in detail, that Eastman does *not* “know what scientific method is”. The mere statement of claim is hardly

proof to the contrary. And in general, with two exceptions to be noted in a moment, Eastman answers none of my specific argumentation.

Eastman finds me involved in the "disgraceful business of redefining a clear term", an occupation which sends me well on the road toward liquidating the opposition. I do not quite comprehend, I confess, just why redefining a term, even a clear term, should be disgraceful. And if "freedom" is a clear term, a great many thousands of pages have been lamentably wasted in worrying over it. But let us consider what this clear term clearly means: "being in a position to do what comes into *your own head*, to act whether soon or late on *your own* impulses, to restrain those impulses when you restrain them because of *your own* judgment. . . ." If dialectical materialism is theological baloney, this is certainly cracker barrel soda-pop, the genuine country store article. What conceivable meaning, in terms of discernible empirical consequences and determinate procedures (as the scientist demands), could be given to this cluster of particles and abstractions?

But, trying in all charity to discover a meaning, the only possibility would call for the social system of Robinson Crusoe—though with Friday left out. If this is freedom, it is then not so much wrong as silly; it has neither relevance to nor importance for actual life. Freedom, like all other general ideals, takes on new meaning and content for every significant change in the conditions of life and society (which means, among other things, that it must constantly be "redefined"). And the kind of freedom appropriate to the complex society of now and the future has no relation whatever to the backwoods anarchism of Eastman's definition.

And as for human nature: this section of his reply serves as a comment not merely on Eastman's science but on his polemics as well. Eastman objects to my shifting from his "universal attributes of human nature" to "the essential nature of man". Now ordinarily, to speak of the universal attributes of human nature would be taken to presuppose a doctrine of substance: a substance which had those universal attributes. But let us waive answer, with an exception, here. Eastman now goes on: "Everybody knows that there are universal attributes of human nature. Does not blood flow in all our veins? Is not arsenic poisonous to us all?" Well, the careful scientist, so much concerned over the religion of Marxists who believe in "inevitability", would hardly call these loose statements of generalizations (the second of which, by the way, a generalization with notorious exceptions) *universal attributes*. Why is it, in passing, that Eastman, so particular about the words used by "religious" Marxists, permits himself so cavalier a vagueness in his own language.

But the payoff: Where and how did the dispute about "human nature" come in? Eastman offered "the universal attributes of human nature" as *the explanation for the degeneration of the Russian Revolution, as well as the reason why the socialist ideal must be revised*. Did he perhaps rely on this having been forgotten by the reader? or did he himself forget it? Or is he seriously meaning to tell us that *such* "universal attributes" as the blood in our veins and the poisonous properties of arsenic (whether these or any similar in kind) explain—the degeneration of the Revolution.

Though, naturally, relatively stable biological and physiological characteristics of human beings constitute a limiting condition for the possibilities in social change, "human nature" could be relevant as a causal factor in explaining historical events only in its social and historical aspects. And it is precisely these which Marx outstandingly and virtually all of contemporary social scientists of any school show can be treated intelligibly only as functional, as changing, only by rejecting the truly theological and idealist conception of "universal attri-

butes". Eastman's preposterous dragging in of blood and arsenic is only another yard of the wool he is pulling.

I hardly feel it necessary to comment on Eastman's remarks about "blueprints" and the "anti-blueprint temperament", since I devoted more than a thousand words of my article to a careful explanation of the rôle of "blueprints" in social action, to what extent and how, they are appropriate, to Eastman's disastrous confusion on this point between scientific hypotheses and directive ideals (a confusion, by the way, which is a distinguishing and peculiar mark of all *idealist* philosophies), and to establishing a context where what I meant by "anti-blueprint temperament" would be clear.

The pressure for Eastman's amalgam is compounded out of his gross and unwarranted distortion of my remarks about "anti-blueprint temperament", squeezed further by the "redefinition of freedom". Since the amalgam is spun out of Eastman's head, and bears no relation to my views or those of Fourth Internationalists generally, there is no particular reason to write on it at length. An observation or two might, however, be in order:

Eastman, in his zeal to exhibit a rational deduction of fascism from the ideas and policies of revolutionary Marxism, in his haste toward the full-flowered position against dictatorships, whether of the left or the right ("the scientific compromise between anarchism and socialism"?), which Eastman apparently kids himself into thinking a brand new discovery of his own, implicitly and in part explicitly rejects the class analysis of fascism. Fascism, we now learn, sails down from the non-material skies as a seductive medley of the anti-blueprint temperament plus decisive political action plus a redefinition of freedom. Ah, if it were only as easy as that! Then, indeed, could the pure men of good will, following the shining ideals that came into *their own* own head, acting under the dictate of *their own* impulses, soon put the dragon to rout. But, alas, in a world of struggling classes, good will must be linked to strong arms and disciplined organizations, ideals carried out through, I am afraid, that very decisive political action from which Eastman so prophetically shies. Chastity was felt by the Schoolmen to be the purest of virtues; but no virgin ever had a child.

Eastman, in conclusion, accepts his responsibility to produce another program; though he declines to declare himself on the policies of the Fourth International, which are well known to him, which are not obscure, which apply to the burning and immediate questions of our time, which daily guide the actions of revolutionists. Let us hope that his program will be in our hands before the war, or at the very least before fascism. To him, "it seems just now in America a period for deliberation". To an intelligent man it is always a time for deliberation, but deliberation is not necessarily divorced from action, even temporarily. If an individual seriously doubts and sincerely wishes to retire for deliberation apart from action, we may regret this but we can hardly condemn him. But it is then his duty to keep his deliberations to himself until they have at least reached a point where they issue in an alternative program of action. This course Eastman does not follow. For in truth he is not deliberating: he is publicly advocating a *program* of deliberation; that is, a program of passivity, of *inaction*, of submission. I am for my own part always ready to examine any program, and to accept it if I find it better than the one I hold. But, after examining the premises from which he is starting, I confess to a certain scepticism not merely with reference to Eastman's present program but even toward that future program which he promises.

James BURNHAM

ONE year ago, agents of the G.P.U. lured Ignace Reiss to his death near Lausanne, Switzerland. In the next issue of the magazine, the anniversary of his assassination will be marked by an article written for the occasion by the widow of comrade Reiss.

# They, the People

By Dwight Macdonald

THIS MONTH I PROPOSE to follow chiefly the conservative columnists: Frank R. Kent, whose "The Great Game of Politics" is syndicated to 112 papers; David Lawrence ("Today in Washington"—100 papers), Mark Sullivan (54 papers) and Arthur Krock, whose column in the *New York Times* is not syndicated but has a nationwide influence because so many small town editors take their cue from the *Times*. The output of this group is on the dull side compared to that of the gloriously confused centrist school of Lippmann-Pegler-Thompson-Johnson, just as integrated personalities are often less interesting than schizoids. Their definitely fixed right-wing position doesn't allow them the brilliant rationalization, the remarkable intellectual manoeuvres of the centrists. They also labor under the handicap of knowing their field thoroughly—*Time* long ago demonstrated that amateurs can always write more intriguingly on any subject than experts. Lawrence, still in his early forties, is the editor of the *United States Daily*, a specialized paper, designed for business men, which reports on the day-by-day course of government in Washington. Kent is a veteran political writer and the author of several excellent books on American politics. Sullivan has been writing on national politics for some forty years. His six volume work, *Our Times*, a running journalistic chronicle of post-1900 events, is well known. Krock is the head of the Washington bureau of the *Times*.

These men write with an impersonal weight of authority which, among the centrists, only Lippmann can achieve. On specific issues, what they write is often acute. But they are as confused as any Liberty Leaguer by the broader aspects of contemporary politics. Their blindness is basic: a failure to recognize that the capitalism of the Coolidge era can no longer satisfy the needs of society and that some major modification is necessary. This failure, of course, derives from the fact that to them "the American people" means the handful who have incomes of \$5,000 a year or over. This obtuseness may render them highly immoral, from a Popular Front-New Deal viewpoint, but it also renders them highly ineffective.

Trustworthy on details, these columnists are dangerously misleading—from the bourgeois point of view—when it comes to larger issues. Every year their political approach becomes more academic, every year it presents less possibility of solving capitalism's problems. So long as the bourgeoisie continues to follow the lead of such writers—and of their counterparts now in control of the Republican party—the danger of fascism is remote. But when the business community turns from Lawrence and Sullivan to Pegler and Johnson, from Hoover and Landon to LaGuardia and the National Progressives, then the threat of fascism will become really serious. Meanwhile, it is safe to predict that the New Deal will remain securely entrenched in power, for all Mark Sullivan's brave whistling in the dark to the tune of 120 additional Republican seats in the next Congress. It is *reactionaries* and not *conservatives* who are to be feared by the Left.

\* \* \*

The impotence of the conservative position is illustrated by Lawrence's June 27 column, which attacks the New Deal as "an experiment in State Socialism" and which concludes with a call to arms: "Clean government, moral government, honest elections, complete divorcement of governmental power from any control of the voting system of America furnish issues of public policy and public morality as old as democracy itself. They are the only real issues in the 1938 congressional campaign." It is hardly

necessary to point out that any candidate rash enough to campaign on such issues would be snowed under—were his opponent Earl Browder himself. The Laurentian approach is unrealistic from both the long and the short range viewpoints. From the long term view, the victory of "clean" and "moral" government would have about as much effect on capitalism's vast problems as a reorganization of the U.S. Forestry Service. And considered as an immediate political manoeuvre, Lawrence's slogans are to those of the New Deal as ice water is to straight whiskey.

\* \* \*

There is evidently a double standard of political as well as of sexual morality. The favorite theme of the columnists of the center and right last month was the sinfulness of President Roosevelt's intervention in the Democratic primaries. But nothing was said about one reason for his intervening: the fact that some of his bitterest Senatorial opponents have not been above claiming his support in their primary battles. "Most politicians," writes Krock casually, "find it essential to . . . pay lip service to a President of their own party in the campaign, however much they may disagree with his policies." This is either a very cynical or a very naïve statement, depending on how highly one rates Mr. Krock's intelligence.

\* \* \*

Kent and Sullivan vote the straight anti-New Deal ticket, refusing to admit that any good can come out of Nazareth. When Sullivan can't find anything else to complain about, he writes a column about his pet hate, the A.A.A.—"BUTTER FOR IDLE, OLEO FOR TOILERS CALLED SEQUEL OF A.A.A. POLICY". Kent seems to have a personal grudge against the entire New Deal, and an especially corrosive hatred of the President. Compared to these fire-eaters, Lawrence is sober, realistic, and judicial. Writing exclusively and consciously for business men—who read him for information rather than emotional release—Lawrence doesn't hesitate to give the New Deal credit when its policies are "sound"—*i.e.*, favorable to business. He admitted the Federal reorganization bill was a wise and necessary measure (though he blamed its failure to pass on Roosevelt for having aroused the "distrust" of Congress!). And while Kent was denouncing the pending monopoly investigation as "calculated demagoguery" and Johnson was fulminating about "a mass production of witch-finding with a St. Bartholomew's massacre of all business opponents of the New Deal at the end", Lawrence was predicting that the inquiry would be "reasonable" and "objective" and advising business men to cooperate. Later reports seem to indicate he was right in his appraisal.

But this superior insight applies only to details. Lawrence goes as haywire as any of them on large political issues. Like his colleagues, he is constantly seeing revolution under the bed. His June 20 column began: "Within the last two weeks something so fundamental has happened in the history of the United States that it is doubtful whether the people generally realizes it. . . . Government in America has crossed the Rubicon." It turns out that he is referring to recent legislation on wages and hours, child labor, and flood control, which he thinks has violated states' rights. Even allowing for a reasonable degree of journalistic exaggeration, the trump of doom Lawrence sounds is rather absurd. So long as its conservative opponents fight the battles on this juristic plane, the New Deal is in no danger.

"The new concept of government in America," Lawrence continues, "is that a majority of both houses of Congress may at will disregard the basic rights of the minority, including property rights." He predicts that ultimately the masses, with a truly noble disinterestedness, will rise in their wrath and overthrow the New Deal, restoring to the minority its long-lost property rights. (Mr. Lawrence would no doubt object to Marxism as "idealistic", "visionary", and "contrary to human nature".)

\* \* \*

These gentlemen still play on the antiquated pipe of *laissez-*

## A THOUGHT FOR THIS MONTH

(or)

VOX POPULI

"The chief victims of the depression are the least numerous classes of the population." Arthur Krock, June 17.

"I know of nobody well enough informed to have an opinion who does not believe that, with a fair degree of coöperation between government, labor and management, this depression could be turned the other way immediately." Hugh Johnson, June 22.

"President Roosevelt's speech before the National Education Association brought out to the full his great capacity as the articulate spokesman of American democracy. I have in mind the closing portion of his address in which he spoke of the burning of the books." Heywood Brown, July 2. (EDITOR'S NOTE: *President Roosevelt took a strong stand against book-burning.*)

"We must have reached the stage in civilization where those of us who are not actually participating in a war can give something toward the help of needy children." Eleanor Roosevelt, June 24.

"Industrial capital consists of enterprise and the human relations it creates. This, I think, is demonstrably true." Isabel Paterson, July 13.

"Strictly speaking, poverty is a natural condition." Isabel Paterson, June 27.

"The Democratic majority in the last Congress did nothing to alleviate the condition of the unemployed except to offer them more Federal funds." David Lawrence, June 18.

"In all politics and all history, there is much that is fortuitous." Mark Sullivan, June 16.

"The two rival factions within each party are by no means to be defined glibly by the words 'liberal' and 'conservative' but by the words 'honest' and 'dishonest'." David Lawrence, June 27.

*faire* liberalism not because of any moral repugnance to fascism but because the American bourgeoisie doesn't need fascism yet—or doesn't think it needs it. But already their thinking has begun to take on a faintly fascist tinge. This is especially noticeable in the crucial field of labor relations. Mark Sullivan, for example, is a plump, pink-cheeked, white-haired old gentleman who wears very high stiff collars, smokes a ruminative pipe, and, personally, is compact of genial benevolence. As nice an old gentleman as you'd care to meet. In his younger days, he was an intimate of Teddy Roosevelt, and he still thinks of himself as a bit of a liberal. All of which hasn't prevented him from expressing approval of Boss Hague's tactics. It is worth following his rather involved reasoning to see how the old-fashioned liberal can shade off into the fascist apologist. "Just what the philosophy of C.I.O. is," he begins mildly enough, "I do not undertake to define. To attempt it would be to get involved in hairline refinements of what the radicals call 'ideology'. Mayor Hague says the philosophy of C.I.O. is communism. That is not true of all C.I.O., perhaps not of most of it. . . . But let us confine ourselves to the actions of C.I.O. One early action was the sit-down strike. The sit-down strike is violence. True, the sit-down is only partial violence, what may be called 'static violence'." He points out two ways of dealing with this "static violence" (a nice "hairline refinement of ideology", by the way): (1) "It can be—and of course ought to be—suppressed by the state"; (2) failing that, vigilantes can do the job. ("Vigilante action," he handsomely conceded, "is no more lawful than the sit-down strike.") "This brings us to Mayor Hague. His case is weaker than it would have been if he were a mayor of Michigan or in some other state. For, as far as we know, the Governor of New Jersey would suppress the violence of the C.I.O. sit-down if and when it occurs." Therefore, one might conclude, Mayor Hague was in the wrong. But not at all: "Mayor Hague did not wait for the actual violence to occur. He acted in advance of the violence. . . . Possibly some mayors in Michigan and other states wish they had acted in advance, instead of waiting until after the violence had occurred." What is this theory of "preventive violence" but a small-scale model of Franco's "preventive counter-revolution"?

## More on the Suppression of Kronstadt

IN MY RECENT ARTICLE on "Kronstadt" I tried to pose the question on a political plane. But many are interested in the problem of personal "responsibility". Souvarine, who from a sluggish Marxist became an exalted sycophant, asserts in his book on Stalin that in my autobiography I kept consciously silent on the Kronstadt rebellion; there are exploits—he says ironically—of which one does not boast. Ciliga in his book *In the Country of the Big Lie* recounts that in the suppression of Kronstadt "more than ten thousand seamen" were shot by me (I doubt whether the whole Baltic fleet at that time had that many). Other critics express themselves in this manner: yes, objectively the rebellion had a counter-revolutionary character but why did Trotsky use such merciless repressions in the pacification (and—?) subsequently?

I have never touched on this question. Not because I had anything to conceal but, on the contrary, precisely because I had nothing to say. The truth of the matter is that *I personally did not participate in the least in the suppression of the Kronstadt rebellion, nor in the repressions following the suppression.* In my eyes this very fact is of no political significance. I was a member of the government, I considered the quelling of the rebellion necessary and therefore bear responsibility for the suppression. Only within these limits have I replied to criticism up to now. But when moralists begin to annoy me personally, accusing me of exceeding cruelty not called forth by circumstance, I consider that I have a right to say: "Messrs. moralists, you are lying a bit."

The rebellion broke out during my stay in the Urals. From the Urals I came directly to Moscow for the 10th Congress of the party. The decision to suppress the rebellion by military force, *if the fortress could not be induced to surrender, first by peace negotiations, then through an ultimatum*—this general decision was adopted with my direct participation. But after the decision was taken, I continued to remain in Moscow and took no part, direct or indirect, in the military operations. Concerning the subsequent repressions, they were completely the affair of the Cheka.

How did it happen that I did not go personally to Kronstadt? The reason was of a political nature. The rebellion broke out during the discussion on the so-called "trade union" question. The political work in Kronstadt was wholly in the hands of the Petrograd committee, at the head of which stood Zinoviev. The same Zinoviev was the chief, most untiring and passionate leader in the struggle against me in the discussion. Before my departure for the Urals I was in Petrograd and spoke at a meeting of seamen-communists. The general spirit of the meeting made an extremely unfavorable impression upon me. Dandified and well-fed sailors, communists in name only, produced the impression of parasites in comparison with the workers and Red Army men of that time. On the part of the Petrograd committee the campaign was carried on in an extremely demagogic manner. The commanding personnel of the fleet was isolated and terrified. Zinoviev's resolution received, probably, 90% of the votes. I recall having said to Zinoviev on this occasion: "Everything is very good here, until it becomes very bad." Subsequent to this Zinoviev was with me in the Urals where he received an urgent message that in Kronstadt things were getting "very bad". The overwhelming majority of the sailor "communists" who supported Zinoviev's resolution took part in the rebellion. I considered, and the Political Bureau made no objections, that negotiations with the sailors, and in case of necessity, their pacification, should be placed with those leaders who only yesterday



enjoyed the political confidence of these sailors. Otherwise, the Kronstadters would consider the matter as though I had come to take "revenge" upon them for their voting against me during the party discussion.

Whether correct or not, in any case it was precisely these considerations which determined my attitude. *I stepped aside completely and demonstratively from this affair.* Concerning the repressions, as far as I remember, Dzerzhinsky had personal charge of them and Dzerzhinsky could not tolerate anyone's interference with his functions (and properly so).

Whether there were any needless victims I do not know. On this score I trust Dzerzhinsky more than his belated critics. For

lack of data I cannot undertake to decide now, *a posteriori*, who should have been punished and how. Victor Serge's conclusions on this score—from third hand—have no value in my eyes. But I am ready to recognize that civil war is no school of humanism. Idealists and pacifists always accused the revolution of "excesses". But the main point is that "excesses" flow from the very nature of revolution which in itself is but an "excess" of history. Whoever so desires may on this basis reject (in little articles) revolution in general. I do not reject it. In this sense I carry full and complete responsibility for the suppression of the Kronstadt rebellion.

L. TROTSKY

COYOACAN, July 6, 1938

## Archives of the Revolution

DOCUMENTS of the HISTORY and THEORY of the WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

### The Question of the United Front \*

TO BE SURE, the party is in a very favorable situation; it is the most influential political organization. But it is not the dominant one! What is this party at the present moment? The French party is the result, the crystallization of that great revolutionary wave of the proletariat which rose out of the war, thanks to the courageous action of the comrades who stood at the head of the movement at the time. They used this upswing of the masses, their vague but revolutionary, primitively revolutionary sentiment, to transform the old party into a communist party.

The revolution, however, did not come. The masses had the feeling that it would come today or tomorrow; now it sees that it is not breaking out. As a consequence, there is a certain ebb and only the élite of the proletariat remains in the party. But the great mass experience, so to speak, a psychological reflux. It expresses itself in the fact that the workers leave the trade unions. The trade unions are losing in membership. Formerly they counted in the millions, and now they are no longer members. Men and women join for a few weeks, a few months, and then they leave. What does this mean? The great mass of the proletariat naturally remains true to the ideal of the revolution, but this ideal has acquired a vaguer and less realizable character, has become remote. The communist party remains, with its doctrine and its tactics. There exists a small dissident group which, during this tumultuous period of revolution, has lost all its influence and its authority. But let us suppose that this transitory situation lasts another year, two years, three years, let us suppose this—we do not wish it, but we make the supposition in order to picture the situation—how will the working class of France act if, under such circumstances, there would be a general action in the country? How will it group itself? The numerical relation between the communist party and the party of the dissidents is 4 to 1, and among the

working masses the relationship of vague revolutionary sentiments to conscious revolutionary sentiments is perhaps 99 to 1.

This situation lingers on without becoming stabilized and, meanwhile, the time for the new elections is drawing close. What will the French worker think? He says to himself: Yes, the communist party is perhaps a good party, the communists are good revolutionists; but right now there is no revolution, the question is the elections; the problem today is Poincaré, is the last great effort of revenge-nationalism, just like the last blaze of a dying lamp.

After that, what is left for the bourgeoisie? The Left Bloc. But for the success of this political combination, a prop, an instrument is needed inside the ranks of the working class. This instrument is the party of the dissidents. Is it acceptable? At one time we acquired magnificent propaganda successes with *L'Humanité*, which has 200,000 readers, with our schools, etc.

But there are other means and we seek to set the broad masses into motion by organizing meetings, by the excellent speeches of our French friends who, as you know, are not lacking in eloquence. Well, the elections come along. And a great mass of workers will probably reason thus: Yes, a parliament of the Left Bloc is at all events preferable to a parliament of Poincaré, of the National Bloc. And that will be the moment for the dissidents to play a political rôle. It is true that they are not numerically strong as a political organization. They have newspapers which are not, to be sure, widely read, because the most indifferent, the most disillusioned mass of the proletariat reads nothing; it has lost its illusions, it waits for events to occur, and it has a fine flair for coming events without reading. Only the thoroughly revolutionary workers have the urge for the printed word. Under such conditions, the organization of the dissidents, this small instrument of the bourgeoisie, can acquire weighty political importance. It becomes our problem, then,

to discredit in advance the idea of the Left Bloc before the French proletariat. That is a very important question for the French party. I do not say that this Left Bloc would be a misfortune for us. It would be a gain also for us, provided that the proletariat does not participate in it. Let the others collaborate in the Bloc, but not the French workers; the others will only discredit themselves thereby in advance. The big and petty bourgeoisie, the financial and industrial bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intelligentsia—let them all stake their bets on the Left Bloc as they please; we, however, will endeavor to profit by it, and to unite all the workers, at whatever cost, into the united front against the bourgeoisie, bridging all the splits and groupings in the working class.

We do not want, right now, to formulate exactly the methods of our procedure, to ask whether it will be an open or a closed letter to the executive committee of the dissidents—in case there is one. The main thing is to discredit in advance the left bourgeoisie in the eyes of the broad working masses, to compel it to take a position. This bourgeois reserve army still holds back, it does not want to expose itself, it awaits the coming events in the shelter of its editorial chambers and its parliamentary clubs, it aims to let these great and small events occur without being implicated in them and discredited by them. Then, when the elections come, these left groupings emerge from their reserve, appear before the masses, and say: Yes, yes, the communists . . . but we offer you this, that and the other advantage. We communists have the greatest interest in drawing these gentlemen out of their shelters, out of their chambers, and to place them before the proletariat, particularly on the basis of mass action. That is how things stand, that is how the question is presented to us. It is not at all a question of a *rapprochement* with Longuet. And really, comrades, that would be a bit thick, wouldn't it?

\*Concluded from last issue.



Fifteen or sixteen months ago, we sought to impress the French comrades with the necessity of expelling even Longuet. And now come the comrades who were not quite firm at that time with regard to the 21 conditions, and tell us: You are imposing a *rapprochement* with Longuet upon us! I understand quite well that a worker of the Seine Federation, after having read the articles of Victor Méric, would get such an insane idea. His mistake must be explained to him in all tranquillity; he must be shown that this is not the question, that it is above all a question of not letting M. Longuet and consorts prepare a new betrayal in the quietness of their shelters, that they must be grabbed by the collar and compelled by force to stand before the proletariat and to answer the precise questions we put to them.

We have different methods of action, comrade Terracini tells us; we are for the revolution and they are against it. That is entirely correct, I am fully in agreement with Terracini. But if this were not the case, then the question of the united front would encounter no difficulties whatsoever. Naturally we are for the revolution and they are against it, but the proletariat has not understood this difference and we must make it clear to the workers.

Comrade Terracini replies: "But we are already doing it, we have communist cells in the unions. The unions have a very great importance. We are reaching our goal by means of propaganda."

Propaganda will not be prohibited by this conference; it is always an excellent thing, the foundation of everything. But the question is of combining and adapting it to the new conditions and the organizational rôle of the party.

Here is a small, very interesting excerpt from the speech of comrade Terracini:

"When we launched the appeal for a general action of the masses, we conquered the majority in the organizations by means of our propaganda."

"The majority" . . . and then the fine hand of the author made the slight correction "almost the majority". Another point on which we are fully agreed. But what does it mean: "almost the majority"? Both in Russian and in French, it comes down to saying the minority.

Comrades, even the majority does not yet mean the totality.

"We have the majority, we have four-sevenths of the proletariat."

But four-sevenths of the proletariat is not yet its totality: the remaining three-sevenths may yet quite well sabotage an action of the class. For they are, after all, three-sevenths of the proletariat.

And "almost the majority" is only three-sevenths of the proletariat. Now, thanks to propaganda, we have three-sevenths, but it is still necessary to win the four-sevenths. That is not an easy matter, comrade Terracini, and if one thinks that by repeating the same methods he has employed to win the three-sevenths he will win the other four, he is mistaken, because as the party grows larger, its methods must change. At

the outset, when the proletariat sees this intransigent little revolutionary group which says: "To hell with the reformists! To hell with the bourgeois state!"—it applauds and says: "Very good!" But when it sees these three-sevenths of the vanguard organized by the communists, that there is not much change in the field of discussions, of meetings, the proletariat tires of it, it tires of it and new methods are needed to show it that, now that we are a large party, we are able to participate in the immediate struggle.

And to demonstrate this, the action of the whole proletariat is necessary; this action must be guaranteed and the initiative for it must not be left to others.

When the workers say: Your revolution of tomorrow is of little matter to us! We want to fight today to preserve our 8-hour-day!—then it is we who must take the initiative in unification for today's battle.

Comrade Terracini says: "We mustn't pay much attention to the socialists. There is nothing to be done with them. But we must pay attention to the trade unions." And he adds: "There is nothing new in this. Already at the Second Congress of the Communist International, it was said, perhaps unintentionally: the split in the political parties, but unity in the trade unions." I do not understand this at all. I underlined this passage of his speech in red pencil and then in blue pencil, to express my astonishment. We said at the Second Congress, perhaps unintentionally. . . .

TERRACINI: It was in the polemic with Zinoviev. That was irony. You were not in the hall when I spoke.

TROTSKY: Let's put it aside and send it in an envelope to Victor Méric. Irony is his speciality.

INTERRUPTIONS: There's irony in Italy too, as you see. . . . And even in Moscow. . . .

TROTSKY: Unfortunately; for as you see I was misled by it. But joking aside. What does it mean: no splitting of the trade unions? And why not? The most dangerous thing in the speech of comrade Renoult, which I read with great interest and in which I found very instructive things for understanding the state of mind of the French communist party, is his assertion that at the present moment we have nothing to do not only with the dissidents but also with the reformist C.G.T. [General Confederation of Labor]. This will be a pleasant surprise to the most maladroit anarchists, if I may say so, of the Unitary C.G.T. Precisely in the trade union movement, you have applied the theory of the united front; you have applied it with success; and if you now have 300,000 members as compared with the 200,000 supporters of Jouhaux, you owe it, I am sure, in half-measure to the tactic of the united front, because, in the trade union movement, where the problem is to embrace the proletarians of all opinions, of all tendencies, there is the possibility of fighting for your immediate interests. If we were to split the trade unions in accordance with the different tendencies, it would be suicidal.

We said: No, this terrain is for us. Inasmuch as we are independent as communists, we have all the possibilities for manœuvring, of saying openly what we think, of criticizing the others; we enter the trade unions with this conception and we are sure that within a specified time we shall have the majority behind us.

Jouhaux saw the ground slipping away from under him. Our prognosis was correct. He began the split by means of expulsions. We characterized the expulsions as a crime, for it was unity of action that was needed. That was our tactic.

INTERRUPTION: Renoult said that!

TROTSKY: To be sure, Jouhaux shattered the unity by the expulsions of the communists. That's just where the meaning of the united front lies. In our struggle against the reformists, against the dissidents, as you named them, the syndicalist-reformists, social-patriots, *etc.*, we must make them responsible for the split, we must continually force them to express themselves on the possibility of a joint action on the basis of the class struggle. They must be faced with the necessity of stating an open "No" before the entire working class.

If the situation is favorable for the demands of the working class, we must push these gentlemen forward. In two years, let us assume, we shall have the revolution. Meanwhile, we will have an ever increasing movement of the working class. Do you think that the Jouhauxs and the Merrheims will remain as they are today? No, they will always try; they will take one or two steps forward and, since there will always be people in their camp who refuse to follow them, they will experience a new split. We will profit by it. That is naturally a tactic of movement, a very flexible tactic, but at the same time a thoroughly energetic one, for the leadership remains firmly in our hands. And when great events occur—here I am fully in accord with comrade Terracini—the unity of action will be established by itself. We will not prevent it. But, comrade Terracini tells us, at the given moment there are no great events and we have no reason for proposing the united front. . . .

TERRACINI: I never said that.

TROTSKY: Perhaps I am mistaken. Perhaps it is not you who said it. But the argument was brought forward here, for I saw it in the stenogram. The French comrades say: Yes, if great events come; but if they don't come, what then? Then we must bring them about by our own initiative. I contend, and I believe it is an axiom, that one of the obstacles to great events, one of the psychological obstacles for the proletariat, is the fact that *several* political and trade union organizations exist side by side, the differences between which the masses do not understand; they do not see clearly how they are to realize their action. This psychological obstacle is naturally of the greatest negative significance; it is the outcome of a situation which was not created by us, but we must make it easier for the masses to understand it. We propose to an organization

this or that immediate action; this corresponds entirely to the logic of things. I contend that if the Unitary C.G.T. were to adopt the tactic of ignoring the Jouhauxist C.G.T., it will be the greatest mistake that we can commit in France. And if the party commits this mistake, it will be crushed under its weight, because the 300,000 revolutionary workers in the trade unions—and comrades, they are only a minimum—these 300,000 workers are practically your party, somewhat expanded by various elements, that's all. And where is the French proletariat?

You will reply: But they aren't with Jouhaux either! Yes, that's right. But I say that the workers who are in no organization, the most disillusioned or mentally most sluggish elements, may very well be drawn behind us at the moment of an acute revolutionary crisis, but in a dragging epoch they are much rather a prop of Jouhaux. For what does Jouhaux represent? The sluggishness of the working class. And the fact that you have no more than 300,000 workers shows that there is no little sluggishness left in the French working class, even though the French workers are indubitably superior to the backward workers of other countries.

And now once more on the question of exposing the Jouhauxs. How is that to be done? In what way can we force them to express themselves about the mass actions and to take responsibility for them?

There is still another danger. If the Unitary C.G.T. simply turns its back to the reformist Confederation, and tries to win the masses by means of revolutionary propaganda, it will perhaps commit the same mistakes that the railroad union of France has already made. You know very well that the trade union movement, trade union actions, are very hard to direct. The great reserves of backward masses who are represented by Jouhaux must always be borne in mind, and if we ignore Jouhaux, it is equivalent to ignoring the masses of backward workers.

That is how the question presents itself in my eyes.

There is still another urgent question, namely, the question of the conference of the three Internationals. Comrades, it is said: The idea of working together with the people of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals is a great surprise to us. We are not prepared for this idea of international collaboration with those whom we have denounced.

To be sure, it is necessary to prepare all minds in time for a turn of such scope. That is correct. The question has aroused a lively agitation. But what caused it? It was the so-called Geno Conference, which also came up very suddenly. When we received the invitation to this conference, the personal invitation to comrade Lenin, it was a surprise to us. If this conference should really take place, whether in Genoa or in Rome, it will more or less determine the destiny of the world, in so far as the bourgeoisie can do it. Then the proletariat will feel the need of doing something.

Naturally, we communists will do everything possible, by means of propaganda, of meetings, of demonstrations; but not only among communists, but also among the workers, in the working class as a whole, in Germany, in France, there is the feeling, still vague perhaps, of the need of doing something in order to acquire an influence upon the negotiations of this conference from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat.

Now, the Two-and-a-Half International takes the initiative of a conference and invites us to attend. We must decide: yes or no? Should we answer these people: "You are traitors, we will undertake nothing in common with you"? Their treachery is a long-known fact, and it has been branded countless times. But these gentlemen will be able to say: We of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals want to exercise a pressure upon the diplomatic conference of the bourgeoisie through the voice of the proletariat; we invited the communists, but they refused and answered us with abuse. And we reply: Since you are traitors, scoundrels (they will see to it that this word is expunged from the stenogram), we will not go. Of course, our communist audience will be convinced by us, for it is already convinced. We have no need to convince it over again. But the supporters of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals, among whom there are many workers? That is the only question of any importance. If you say: "No, the Mensheviks have lost all influence everywhere", then I don't worry a bit about the conferences of the Second and the Two-and-a-Half Internationals; but say so. But unfortunately, the workers who support the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals are more numerous than the workers who support the Third International.

The fact that must be borne in mind is that Friedrich Adler has addressed himself to us in these words: We invite you to participate in a conference which is to discuss and decide on common pressure to exert upon the bourgeoisie, upon its diplomacy. They invite us and with us the workers of the entire world. If we confine ourselves, in our reply to repeating: "You are social-traitors"—it will be a maladroit answer. The Scheidemanns, the Friedrich Adlers, Longuets *e tutti quanti* would then have an easy job in the working class. There, they will say, the communists claim that we are traitors; but when we turn to them and invite them to cooperate with us for a specific period and a well-defined purpose, they refuse. Let us, comrades, reserve this designation of traitors and scoundrels for the moment after the conference, perhaps even for the conference itself. But it is not now, in our letter of reply, that we should say: we refuse to attend because you are traitors and scoundrels. Will this conference surely take place? I do not know. There are comrades who are more optimistic about it and others who are more pessimistic. But if the conference does not succeed, then let it be exclusively because of the Scheidemanns. Then we shall be able to say to

the workers: Your Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals are impotent to do what they themselves proposed to us. That will not only bring us the applause of the communists, but a part of the Scheidemann people will listen to us and say: There is something rotten here; an agreement was proposed and the German social-democrats did not come. Then the struggle between the Scheidemanns and ourselves will begin anew. We will conduct it upon a broader basis, one more favorable to us. That too is the only result towards which we aspire.

I do not know, comrades, if the conference can be postponed; that surely does not depend upon our wishes. It would be very important from the standpoint of preparing the minds of the workers. But this conference is being proposed to us now, before the Conference of Genoa, and we must reply.

And even if there is a worker in the Seine Federation who exclaims: "My party wants to meet with Jouhaux. No! I tear up my card!"—we will say to him: "My dear friend, you are wrought up now; have a little patience." And if he slams the door behind him, we will regret greatly his departure, but it will be his fault. Then, a few weeks later, when he will read the news of the British Conference, when he will see Cachin and the delegates of the other communist parties participating, speaking and acting as communists; then, after the conference, when the struggle continues but our opponents are more completely unmasked than before the conference—we shall have convinced him and all the other communists and, at the same time, our aim shall have been attained. That is why I believe that the conference should decide unanimously in favor of participation, not with the already ritualized appeals, but with the statement: Yes, we are ready, as representatives of the revolutionary interests of the world proletariat, faced with this new attempt of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals to deceive the proletariat, to try to open its eyes to the criminal policy of these two Internationals.

Leon TROTSKY

Moscow, February 26, 1922

THE press prints the report that Rudolph Klement, who had occupied the post of secretary of the Bureau of the Fourth International, suddenly disappeared from Paris without giving any notice to the comrades with whom he was associated. A few days after he vanished, a most suspicious letter arrived in Paris, apparently signed by him but under circumstances indicating that he must have been under duress, in which he announces his break with the Fourth International. Klement had formerly been the German secretary of Leon Trotsky and it is feared in Paris that the missing comrade was kidnapped by the G.P.U. for transportation to Barcelona where a trial against a number of Trotskyists is pending. This fear is enhanced by the fact that the peculiar letter referred to was postmarked at Perpignan, French town near Spain.

# BOOKS

## The English Worker

SEVEN SHIFTS. Edited by JACK COMMON. xi+271 pp. New York. E. P. Dutton. \$2.50.

Seven English workingmen, some with writing ability, have here deferred the temptation to make romantic "proletarian novels" out of their work-life and simply recorded the daily grind and their feelings about it. Behind them is the inevitable editor who has selected the authors and the material confessedly to avoid "any propagandist line". There is a plasterer and a steel-worker from the Midlands, a blast-furnace stiff from the North, a stoker in a gas plant, a sweated London Jew trying to escape the wage racket by running a stall in a London market, a railway fireman who has never been workless, and an unemployed who has never had work.

The representation is lively but by no means broad. The editor promises a second volume to make up for the lack of women writers, but there is a notable absence also of a Scot or a Welshman—say, a Clyde-side shipbuilder or a Merthyr miner. Factually, of course, the book presents nothing that one English worker doesn't pick up from another in the course of daily fraternization at the local pubs, and politically its contributors either have nothing positive to say or haven't been allowed to say it. For workers in other countries *Seven Shifts* is nevertheless a revealing snapshot album of the English proletariat.

All seven belong to unions; in America that would still suggest editorial collusion; in England, as the plasterer says, membership is "a natural act". The plasterers have had one since 1832. At least two of the writers recognize that the present solidity of their unions is due more to a policy of conciliation than of struggle, so that most strikes must now be "unofficial". Less encouraging, but still typical, is the fact that each is still organized on a craft basis.

Pride of craft is, in fact, as strong in them as pride of class and the two feelings sometimes support, sometimes interfere with each other. The plasterer rightly boasts that no machine can yet replace the skill of his hand with a simple trowel but it's the bosses who can grin when he races with his mates to prove who's the best man, or when steel workers kid themselves into 50 hours overtime in a week out of a bravado of endurance, or a machinist works on, for the same reason, with a finger nail torn away. Class solidarity protects the railwayman whose fellows see him drinking on the job, but craft vanity ostracizes him if he stays sober and makes mistakes or if he doesn't occasionally beat the time-table in.

More potent to make them sweat is of course that universal spectre, fear of the sack. The plasterer, for all his hoary union,

works under the shadow of a two-hour notice; the steel-man has had his bouts of unemployment and expects more. Just what they mean can be learned from the bitter Odyssey of Oxley, who has been looking for work since the War. "The staple diet of the unemployed is committees." When the Means Test has made sure you are naked of goods and relatives, it may allow you about \$4 a week in exchange for digging holes and filling them in again (literally). If you are married you won't even be allowed to perform that sprightly labor; you will sit and rot with your family, physically just alive, mentally dying, industrially dead. A workless pal went fifteen years before developing persecution mania; some don't take so long to reach the asylum or the graveyard. Americans may read their own future here, once the advancing spear of the depression pricks the W.P.A. bubbles.

The American worker ought likewise to take warning rather than pride from the wage levels accepted by these seven as normal. Add a generous one-quarter to their figures, which will more than cover differences in living costs, and the English plasterer still clears less than \$20 a week when working, and the railway firemen, on a crack passenger run, less than \$25 for a steady seven days.

For this each must suffer the diseases of his occupation. The plasterer left his first job as doffer in a cotton-mill because he was being sweated down into a "human whippet"; now he suffers from chronic colds, bronchitis, and lime in the eyes. The hulking barrow-men in the blast furnaces grow misshapen from lifting too much; the feet of the fireman are being crippled by the torrid engine-plates.

On this subject the seven are naturally eloquent and for the most part they write with factualness and energy and slangy good humor, as workers do. But most of them fail to explain clearly the technique of their work, mainly because literary exposition is itself a technique, a craft which they have had little occasion or opportunity to learn. Instead there is much diffuseness, repetition, jargon, and a good deal of feeble literary wit characteristic rather of their Sunday newspapers than of their own pub-language. The editor tells us that two of the contributors have already published books; unfortunately it is not difficult to guess which two. Some of the other chapters cry out for an editor whose conscience is more literary and less political.

Above all, the book needs one good tough cockney bus-conductor to come out and confess actual membership in the Labour party and give his reasons for it. As it is, all seven whisper socialism and not one belongs anywhere, thanks to the editor's (and the publisher's?) distaste for "propaganda"; certainly more than one in every

seven English proletarians is an adherent of some working-class party. Here the nearest to the doctrinaire is the plasterer, who is a potential sucker for the People's Front and a union of democracies to make something or other safe. But he says his "individualism" prevents him from "irk-some" party membership. The unemployed man remembers learning some Marxism from a C.P. study class in 1920, but he concludes like a *New Statesman* editorialist with a despairing enquiry as to how both classes can be "wakened" to their evidently mutual "responsibilities". The socialist gas-worker expects to be pushed off at the boneyard, by accident, lay-off or old age, but in the meantime there's beer and—"well, that's a working lad's life anyway". Blumenfeld and his fellow costers sit bleakly, "incarcerated in a decaying market. . . . Outcasts too, waiting for the sun". The blast-furnaceman growls at the chiselers, including the parsons, but he still speaks confidently of Our Empire and doubtfully of women suffrage. Sure, he's a socialist too. The fireman knows he was led up the garden in the 1926 upheaval (he refers to it, excellently, as the *First General Strike*) and again by the L.P. in Parliament; he knows the labor aristocrat is still only "hired help", but he ends, like the others, waiting for the time when "we really are wanted" to help run things. The only one who gnaws free of the editorial mufflers is Stirling, the steel-man. He prophesies a revolution within a decade. "And the workers will take charge of it, and they will shape it the way they want to shape it. . . . I hope you will like it when it comes, damn your eyes."

For the lack of any voice from those who are actually trying to make this revolution, even in a nice peaceful Clement Attlee style, Editor Common bears responsibility. For other gaps in the record—for an almost complete obliviousness of anything outside the tight little isle, and for a drouth of any really good hating, any *saeva indignatio*, one can blame also an editor who is a propagandist for non-propaganda. But it is sadly true that not even Mr. Common is responsible for all of it. There is still something insidious about British imperialism, or British rains, or the fish-and-chip diet, which makes the average English worker learn socialism from his father's knee and yet continue to be fall-guys for both the *Daily Herald* and the multitudinous Royal Family.

E. ROBERTSON

## Halting Progress

INTELLIGENT INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY. By P. W. BRIDGMAN. 305 pp. New York. Macmillan Co. \$2.50.

The decline of a society is particularly marked by intellectual and moral crises, themselves expressions of the deeper, more terrible social crisis. The physicist becomes painfully aware of the shortcomings of traditional physical ideas and methodology; the moralist hews under traditional morality to reveal its rotten core of super-

stitution, its anti-moral, corrupting effects. Moral ills and the shortcomings of particular disciplines are often perceived with great clarity and deep, fine emotion; it may even happen that new ideas and a more adequate methodology will be found to solve the problems of a special discipline like physics; but as a whole, the underlying causes will not be sought and exposed to the sunlight. Few will think to search further than is required by the puzzles of their special domains. In science, it is its abstruseness, the difficulty of mastering its subject-matter, the frequent remoteness of its problems from the social scene, and equally important, the social class or group in which the scientist moves, the comfortable if not excessive amount of his reward, which prevent, even forbid a wider, more ramified investigation of the roots of the crisis. Thus it is rare for a scientist to observe that the crisis in his field is part—a reflection—of a more comprehensive social crisis; that the new ideas, the new approach and methodology which he so clearly visualizes as desperately necessary for the survival of his own science are equally necessary for the survival of society. The broader aspects of the technical crisis, of course, are usually more easily discerned when the scientist is unemployed.

Like most important physical investigators who have spent the greater part of their youth and maturity in the laboratory, Prof. Bridgman had no concern with the "crisis in society"—his own phrase, until after he had struggled manfully and sweatily to solve the "crisis in physics"—again his own words. His solution for the "crisis in physics", which was published in the now famous book, *The Logic of Modern Physics*, seemed to him the answer to every physical riddle—at least, in principle. It cut out, root and branch, all the major paradoxes which had hamstrung physicists since 1900; it appeared to him to open up an era of easy absorption of the new physical discoveries and of untroubled scientific investigation.

The sweaty labor of rethinking old ideas and revamping the whole machinery of physical theory, however, had additional, if unanticipated fruit. He came to the clear realization that socially he had not been living intelligently. The intelligence he exercised in the laboratory was negated by the irrationality of his life outside it. Undoubtedly the class struggle, disguised as befits a Harvard atmosphere, had rumbled into his study. The coming world war, the spread of political dictatorships, tyrannies, the prevailing moral hypocrisy, the general abuse or non-use of intelligence, his own included—awakened an appalled sense of imminent social disaster. The realization dawned that the intellectual revolution which began with physics could not end there, but had to be carried into society. Rethinking his traditional social ideas became an inevitable necessity.

What criteria, however, should be the touchstone of right and wrong ideas? Prof. Bridgman experienced no difficulty here. The criteria which it seemed to him he

had used so successfully in physics were particularly apt for this purpose. Not that he felt the physical world was the same as the social, but certainly the same procedure was applicable to the latter and ought to bring the same astonishingly successful results. At the least, it ought to go a long way towards clearing the rubbish of centuries from the path. That certainly would be significant!

What, then, is this method? Many Marxists have heard of it under other names: the unity of theory and practise; practise as the touchstone and judge of theory. Prof. Bridgman had previously arrived at the conclusion that an idea had no other meaning than that gained through physical manipulation. Thus an idea meant no more than what it involved in practise; and practise was the only way of defining its meaning. The idea of "length", for example, was no absolute abstraction, but the way in which a stick or any other measuring rod, employed as standard, was used actually. The truth of one's idea of "length" was determined by the results which were obtained by the use of some actual measuring rod. Did the results correspond to the idea, then the idea was true. If not, then it was false.

At first, Prof. Bridgman was unwilling to admit that there was any other kind of operation having meaning than that of the manipulation of things. In this new book, he admits the existence of "verbal" operations, i.e., operations which end only in some word or chain of words, and not in some non-verbal operation, the manipulation of things. These verbal operations, he thinks, play an important rôle in society, but they are also the root of most of the pseudo-problems or footless questions perpetually ensnaring the minds and emotions of men. The proper use of verbal operations so that they will lead into non-verbal operations therefore, is particularly important.

As a whole, however, he admits of no royal road to knowledge or infallible rule by which the operational method will be used properly except through continual watchfulness and care in the definition of procedures and ideas ultimately tested through manipulation, action.

Excellent! There is no better method of studying present society. Keen results ought to be expected; and where the method is properly applied, usually upon the less important questions, Professor Bridgman arrives at truths which have been accepted but stated more profoundly by Marxists since 1848. Thus duty is discovered to have no spiritual sanction, but to apply, in a puzzling and totally erroneous way to those types of actions which are considered to have beneficial results for oneself or others. Morality is discovered to be in essence social and subject to continual change. There is nothing sanctified about the State or Justice. The state is not a person, nor a superorganism, and its authority rises from the superior force possessed by a group of men strategically situated with reference to other men. There is no life

after death, either socially or spiritually; and no man, therefore, has obligations which last beyond the limits of his own life. Force is the only means capable of resolving conflicts between incompatible interests.

The conclusions, which seem to him most significant, are deeply disappointing. The life of intelligence is superior to any other kind of life. Freedom for thought is absolutely necessary. No privileges ought to be granted to anyone which result in an "undesirable" society. Society must serve the individual, not the individual society. Militarism and nationalism must be done away with. Society is essentially based on force. Finally, the need for critical thinking and perpetual observation is all-important.

These conclusions are not disappointing because they are all false; some of them are attested to by experience. No one ought to deny the destructive effects of nationalism and militarism. They are disappointing because nothing is done to show why society, as a whole, does not live differently; why privilege, militarism, nationalism, and irrationalism dominate the social organism. It is not shown why these ideals are preferable to those actually dominating society; and finally it is not shown by what manner of means they can be made actual in the lives of men.

These questions are of supreme importance, but they are not answered by Prof. Bridgman because he does not take "operationalism" seriously enough. How can he think that satisfactory results concerning society and the individual can be obtained by looking into his own attitudes only? If he had taken his own methodology seriously, his first question would have been: shall I begin my investigations with myself or society: which will give me the greatest insight and understanding? Operationally the answer to this question required, first, critical observation of himself and society, observation which necessarily involves reading economics, psychology, history, politics, and sociology. Unquestionably he would have found society the meatier subject. But his labors could not end there. Operationalism further demands the formation of some hypothesis based upon this observation and reading which could be subjected to testing by actual or ideal manipulation, i.e., by bringing verbal operations back to their non-verbal base: in this case, the dynamic process or movement of society itself.

This procedure was followed by that most "backward" of scientific thinkers, Marx. Engels, in the preface to the third edition of the *18th Brumaire* points out that Marx formulated his hypothesis that historical struggles are "more or less clear expression of struggles between social classes", way back in 1845, and only first successfully tested its correctness by analyses of the social struggles in France from 1848 to 1870. Marx also suppressed the publication of his entire hypothesis concerning social development, written about 1857, simply because important formulations had not yet been verified by his accu-



mulating data. But even before developing their own explanation of social change, Marx and Engels first examined and tested the theories of their predecessors. Prof. Bridgman, had he been a true operationalist, would have done likewise. But did he? He never even thought of it!

Disregarding essentially the rigid requirements of his own methodology, he proceeds in general to develop his ideas by purely verbal analysis, a method which he warns against again and again as leading to error and confusion; he tests only some of his minor ideas operationally. He does not answer major questions: how to prevent war and political dictatorships; how to end starvation and poverty; how to make intelligence, *i.e.*, science, the guiding spirit of social organization.

His concern mostly with his own feelings and attitudes—important though they are when properly correlated and integrated with the large problems—prevents him from being “operational” about the important questions which he does manage to discuss. His discussion of the state is lacking in important concreteness. To say that the state is based upon force is unquestionably true, but that is just the beginning. Who exercises the force? In whose interests? Why should force be necessary at all? Why has the state this rather than any other form of organization? What relation have the different sections or classes of the population to it? Is the state homologous with society, or has it a history, a historical beginning and a historical end? Should it (the state) be maintained?

He deplors the existence of nationalism and militarism. But why did he not use the operational method to determine the causes for their existence, to answer such questions as: What connections have nationalism and militarism with the state? with the various classes in the state? or, more generally, with the economic and political structure of our present social order? Finally, as an operationalist, what means would he suggest capable of ending both? What about “pacifist societies”? the League of Nations? the Second International? the Third International? or the Fourth International? We have a right to demand an answer in operational terms, but Prof. Bridgman is strangely silent. We assume the reason is: he is ignorant that these questions exist and must be answered.

Even concerning questions where he attempts feebly to be operational, he arrives at conclusions which possess no meaning operationally. One example will suffice. Society, he says, should exist to satisfy the needs of the individual, not the individual society. What can such an assertion mean operationally? Does it mean that all individuals shall sacrifice their own interests for a particular individual—myself? But is not the same demand made by other individuals of others for themselves? And does this not mean that I must sacrifice my interests in the interests of society, *i.e.*, other individuals? The assertion, therefore, that society should serve the individual is operationally meaningless: I can not sacrifice my own interests to everyone and yet at

the same time demand that everyone sacrifice his interests to me. Operationally, it must be either one or the other. The opposing idea “that the individual must serve society, *i.e.*, the individual must sacrifice his own interests to those of society”, is operationally equally meaningless, for it is impossible for each individual to sacrifice his interests to others, while others sacrifice their interests to him. Operationally, no one could sacrifice anything, because there would be nobody to sacrifice to.

Thus another conception, the Marxist, must be substituted, which is an operational explanation of the relationship between society and the individual. It assumes a reciprocity as well as a differentiation of interests and functions. These relationships of interests and function have historical roots, undergo change, involve themselves in destructive antagonisms which lead ultimately to revolutions, economic, political, cultural, social. In other words, the individual serves society or a section or group of men who represent themselves as society and, at the same time, serves himself. Under specific social conditions, the service he receives himself is considerably less than the service he renders others. Whether or not he will allow such a situation to continue depends upon a whole series of factors: his ideals, his character, the general social set-up. But with large groups of individuals, *i.e.*, classes, who find themselves in such a situation, it is shown historically that they seek some way of remedying their situation, more or less consciously, through the class struggle.

The Marxist conception, therefore, makes sense operationally. Prof. Bridgman's does not.

Prof. Bridgman has been sufficiently impressed by the irrationality of the present order to begin seriously questioning his own beliefs. We hope, however, that he will concern himself hereafter with really important questions. We hope, therefore, that he will begin reading seriously in the literature of the social sciences, of which he professes himself ignorant,\* in order to furnish himself with the necessary data for arriving at significant conclusions.

### Rubin GOTESKY

\*Most American social “scientists” are abysmally ignorant of the actual text of Marxism as well as grossly misinformed about it. They acquire their misinformation by the academic grapevine. They read someone who has read someone who has read someone who, it is rumored, has read Marx. A little knowledge of Marxism is a dangerous thing; and few professors desire to live dangerously. Therefore, it is not news to learn that Prof. Bridgman who admits his ignorance of bourgeois social “science” should also be not only abysmally ignorant of Marxism but also grossly misinformed. In one place, he states—to use Marxian terminology—that a society organized on the principle that each shall be paid according to the contributions he makes or service he renders to society—the principle of the first stage of communism—that such a situation he could “contemplate with equanimity”. He then goes on to inform socialists that a system in which everybody enjoys the same “privileges” may be all right with them, since they like that sort of thing, but not right with him, since he does not like it. “Superior physical force”—Prof. Bridgman thinks socialists believe in superior physical force *vs.* superior intellectual force—ought not to have the same rewards as “superior intellectual force”. And this, in its entirety, is the whole of his critique of socialism.

Behold a modern David who thinks a tiny puff of æsthetic arrogance can slay the colossus of scientific socialism, which has withstood nearly a century of intellectual hacking, “scientific” dissection, ante-mortem autopsy, innumerable burials, literary frame-ups, political censorships, governmental prohibitions and burnings at the stake!

# At Home

(Continued from page 226)

versity, Jerusalem, Palestine, takes time to write us:

“The people over here, workers and intelligentsia, have read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL with the greatest enthusiasm. The articles as well as the ideas, theoretical and tactical, have drawn the interest of many English-reading persons. Especially in these days, in which science and literature have become means in the hands of the bourgeoisie and their lackeys . . . in which Stalinism, the agent of Soviet bureaucracy and bourgeois cretinism, has become a yoke and a brake on revolutionary Marxist thought—it is most encouraging to see that there are yet in the international working class groups which boldly hold up the banner of revolutionary Marxist thought and struggle. We are especially glad that the problems of the colonies and the imperialist policy of the European and American bourgeoisie have found a considerable expression in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.”

A traveling book salesman, writing from the State of Washington, comments: “I have a rather wide reading experience in the radical press, but I think THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is incomparably superior to anything else I have ever seen.”

A reader and agent in Aberdeen, Scotland says that “THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is of a very high standard, a journal greatly needed in these days, when so much reactionary political tactics are in the world”.

And there it is. It's up to our party and Y.P.S.L. members to intensify their efforts for the magazine. First, of course, to ensure its existence, which right now is *truly precarious* (it costs a lot to get out a magazine like the N.I. these days); and second, to speed up the issuance of a 48-page magazine. Let's get going!

THE MANAGER

## Where to Buy THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

### NEW YORK CITY

MANHATTAN: Fourteenth St. at University Place, S.E.; at Broadway, S.E.; at Fourth Ave., S.W.; at Fourth Ave., N.E.; at Fourth Ave., S.E. (1 and 2); at Third Ave., S.W.; at Third Ave., N.W.; opp. Jefferson Theatre; at Second Ave., N.W.; at Sixth Ave., N.E.; Band Book Store, 7 E. 15th St.; 12th St. and University Pl., N.E.; Candy Store, 75 Greenwich Ave.

Forty-second St. at Fifth Ave., S.W.; at Sixth Ave., S.E.; at Sixth Ave., S.W.; at Seventh Ave., S.W.; opposite Sterns; 103 W. 44th St.; 46th St. and Broadway, S.E.; Times Bldg. Newsstand, 42nd St. and Broadway; Columbia University Book Store; Brentano's Book Store; N. Y. U. Book Store, 18 Washington Pl.; Store, 58 West 8th St.

Essex and Delancey Sts.; Bookstore at Grand and Attorney' Sts.; Candy Store, S.E. 9th St. and Second Ave.; Biederman's Book Store, 12th St. and Second Ave.; Wigerson, 145th St. and St. Nicholas Ave.; 110th St. and Columbus Ave.

BRONX: Jerome Ave. and 170th St.; Jerome Ave. and 167th St. (opp. Loew's Theatre); Sorkin, 206th St. and Bainbridge Ave.; Jerome and Burnside Aves.; 160th St. and Prospect Ave.; Allerton Ave. Station; Freeman Ave. and Southern Boulevard; 174th St. and Boston Road.

BROOKLYN: Grand and Union Aves.; Havemeyer Ave. and South 4th St.; Marcy and Broadway; Pitkin and Douglas Aves.; Sutter and Pitkin Aves.

### OUT OF TOWN

Modern Book Store, 509½ West 5th St., Los Angeles, Calif. S.W.P., 232 So. Broadway, Rm. 312, Music Arts Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.

McDonald's Book Store, 65—6th St., San Francisco, Calif.

Post Office News Co., 37 West Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.

S.W.P., 160 No. Wells St., Rm. 308, Chicago, Ill.

Ceshinsky's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St., Chicago, Ill.

Randolph Book Store, 63 W. Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

R. Zetlemeyer, 637 Hamilton St., Allentown, Pa.

Andelman's, Tremont St. (opp. Hotel Bradford), Boston, Mass.

Felix's, Massachusetts Ave. at Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass.

Friendly Variety, Warren St. (Grove Hall), Roxbury, Mass.

S.W.P., 54 Central Sq., Rm. 12, Lynn, Mass.

Sam's Corner, Olympia Sq., Lynn, Mass.

Labor Book Shop, 919 Marquette Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

S.W.P., 147 West 5th St., St. Paul, Minn.

Shinder's, Sixth and Hennepin, Minneapolis, Minn.

Kroman's, Fourth and Nicollet, Minneapolis, Minn.

Foster Book Co., 410 Washington Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.

The Book Nook, 24A Meremac, Clayton, Mo.

### ABROAD

Modern Books, Ltd., 12 Church St., Cape Town, South Africa.

Advance Book Shop, 10 Campbell St., Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

Mrs. M. Brodney, Bookstall, Trades Hall, Melbourne, Australia.

Workers Party, Foster Lane, off Foster Street, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

Clapham Socialist Book, 79 Bedford, S.W. 4, London, England.

W.I.N., 14A Chichester Rd., Paddington, W. 2, London, England.

M. Johns, 7 Southwark St., London, S.E. 1, England.

E. Fitzroy, 45 Athlone Rd., Battersea, S.W. 11, London, England.

H. Cund, Book Shop, 1, St. Hilda St., Liverpool, England.

T. Mercer, Book Shop, 52 Auldhouse Ed., Glasgow, C. 3 Scotland.

# JOURNAL OF OPINION? OR OPEN FORUM REVIEW?

There are numerous journals of opinion in the United States, in which the political views of an individual or a movement are systematically presented.

There are also numerous reviews which lay claim to no political views of their own but, as "open forums", present the conflicting opinions of divers individuals.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, however, has a point of view which it presents frankly and defends vigorously, without closing its pages to those of different, critical views who take issue with it. On the contrary, it invites serious and important controversy, without yielding its identity as a militant organ of revolutionary Marxism.

In its first eight numbers, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL has offered and given space to prominent representatives of the anarchist movement, like T. H. Bell and Guy A. Aldred; to radical critics of the Bolshevik policy in the Kronstadt uprising of 1921; and to criticisms of the philosophy of Marxism by Dr. John Dewey and Max Eastman.

We welcome debate, and try to give as good as we get. You—or the friend for whom you subscribe—will welcome the regular receipt of our review in the month's mail.

One year: \$2.00 — 6 months: \$1.00

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE  
NEW YORK, N. Y.

## The Most Persecuted People in Europe

THE POLITICAL REFUGEES  
FROM FASCISM  
APPEAL TO YOU FOR AID

### What Your Contribution Can Do

- \$1 will keep one refugee alive for three days
- \$2 will maintain one refugee for one week
- \$5 will support a family of three for one week
- \$10 will pay the rent of a family for a month
- \$25 will pay for medical care of a sick refugee
- \$50 will enable a refugee to live until he secures a working permit
- \$100 will enable a refugee to secure a visa and transportation to another country and escape from the hands of the fascists.

HELP THEM THRU  
THE AMERICAN FUND FOR POLITICAL  
PRISONERS AND REFUGEES

*George Novack, Secretary,  
American Fund for Political Prisoners  
and Refugees, 100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.  
I am enclosing.....to help with  
your work.  
Name .....  
Address .....*

## RUSSIAN OPPOSITION BULLETIN

featuring the "DEATH AGONY OF CAPITALISM AND THE TASKS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL"

Subscription: \$2.00 per year Single Copy: 20 cents

Address:  
RAE SPIEGEL, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

## PARTISAN REVIEW

Coming in August—

"ART AND POLITICS" BY LEON TROTSKY

Other Features—

*The Soviet Cinema 1930-1938 (Part II)* by Dwight Macdonald;

*The English Literary Left* by F. W. Dupee;

*Marxism—Limits and Possibilities* by Victor Serge;

Stories by Melos Most and James Agee.

PARTISAN REVIEW 22 East 17th St., New York City  
\$2.50 a year.