

THE NEW

INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

A Fresh Lesson

*Leon Trotsky Analyzes the Character of
the Coming World War, the Position of
the Democracies and the Dictatorships,
and the Role Played by the Working
Class Parties*

Socialized Medicine

By William Harvey

Martov's Mysticism

By Albert Goldman

Reading from Left to Right

By Dwight Macdonald

Inquiry into Conditions of the Workers... By Karl Marx

TWENTY CENTS

DECEMBER 1938

At Home

NEW ORDERS and increases in the regular orders, but continued weakness in obtaining new subscriptions and renewals, featured the circulation side of the November number of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. The November issue was again completely sold out, with not even a handful remaining over. Due to general increase in circulation, 4,500 copies of the December issue are being published, but it remains to be seen whether this increase of 500 copies on the average previous runs is a permanent or only temporary increase. It can be permanent, and even improved upon quickly. That depends upon.

1. Greater and systematic attention to subscriptions—new and renewals by agents, branches and Y.P.S.L. units. 2. Prompt payment of bundle orders, so that party and Y.P.S.L. agents are not cut off on their bundles—representing both loss of circulation and revenue needlessly. In December and January particularly, hundreds of subscriptions are running out. There is every reason to expect 100% renewals, which means substantial revenue to the magazine. But renewals, like new subscriptions, require the aid of the party and Y.P.S.L. members. Renewal letters and promotion letters from the business office cannot suffice, as experience with all publications attests, to bring in renewals and new subscriptions. All agents have been furnished with the lists of expired subscriptions. Organize a subscription drive NOW!

NEW ORDERS: Syracuse, N.Y., H.L., agent, 5 copies; Seattle, Wash. (new branch), Charles E. Taylor, agent, a revolutionist of many decades, first order, 20 copies, increased quickly to 30 copies; Denver, Colo. (revival), J.T.M., agent, 3 copies, immediate increase to 5; Kansas City, Mo. (revival), 3 copies; and last, but not least, Flint, Mich. (new branch), Genora Johnson, Flint auto strike leader, the agent, 8 copies.

Increases in regular orders: Detroit, Mich., E.P., agent, from 35 to 40—steady improvement in Detroit; Youngstown, Ohio, Hess, agent, from 20 to 30; Cleveland, Ohio, John Depner, new agent, another increase, this time from 35 to 50; Tel-Aviv, Palestine, from 5 to 15; Washington, D.C., from 5 to 10; Boston, Mass., John Quinn, agent, after a slight summer weakness, up to 70 copies from 55, and expecting to increase again soon; Vancouver, also after a slight summer decline, up to 35 again; Toronto, up to 57 regularly now. New York City—disposed of 100 more copies than in previous months, due mainly to covering mass meetings. Other branches, circles and agents throughout the United States and other countries apparently are easily holding their average sales up.

Bundles stopped for non-payment, overdue, of bundles: San Francisco, Calif. agent has done best possible; branch negligence is responsible;

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME IV

DECEMBER 1938

NUMBER 12 (Whole No. 27)

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8847. 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 Editor's Comments.....	355
A Fresh Lesson, by Leon Trotsky.....	358
Martov's Mysticism, by Albert Goldman.....	366
What Is "Socialized" Medicine, by William Harvey... ..	369
Reading from Left to Right, by Dwight Macdonald... ..	373
The New Phantom: "Socialist Concentration", by Oscar Fischer	375
Footnote for Historians, by M. S.....	377
ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION:	
A Workers' Inquiry, by Karl Marx.....	379
BOOKS:	
China's Tragedy, by Max Shachtman.....	381
Gold Is Still Where You Find It, by Joseph Hansen... ..	382
Inside Front Cover: At Home.	

Philadelphia, Pa., reinstated, but must stay so. Louisville, Ky., still out. Bundles are stopped only after greatest effort to adjust matters with locals or branches.

Foreign agents, with one or two exceptions, do very well indeed on the matter of payments, but since special rates are given to some of them, foreign circulation represents large circulation, also revenue, but not a margin of profit necessary to maintain THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Still, it is a fact that without the foreign circulation and revenue, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL could not possibly have made the grade till now. But in view of the economic and political conditions prevailing abroad, it should be self-evident that it is up to the American organization to maintain the magazine: again, that means a drive for subscriptions and prompt bundle payments.

The most noticeable improvement in the past month has been in Los Angeles, Calif., where the agent, John Murphy, through systematic, hard work, now has both party and Y.P.S.L. members functioning much better. Only 125 copies are still ordered, but now every copy is actually sold, and an increase in the bundle order can be expected soon. Murphy writes: "Newsstand sales have picked up considerably; had to replenish all stands at least once and several twice; we now sell every copy of our bundle order. . . Utilizing back numbers for sales and subscriptions."

In New York the Y.P.S.L. comrades at City College have begun to work more systematically to sell the magazine. As a result, the Main Evening Circle sold 25 of the October and 31 of the November issue, and the Day Circle sold 20 copies. They have now started working for subscriptions. Milt Miller and Marty Diamond are directing the organiza-

tion of NEW INTERNATIONAL circulation. Good work. But what about Columbia U. and N.Y.U.? The college and university field in New York is wide and is really untouched as yet. . . Comrades at the University of Chicago and the University of California (Berkeley) continue to do a very good job in selling the magazine.

Readers of this column know that THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is accepted as the authority on revolutionary Marxism throughout the world. Dozens of letters from various countries reach us each month acclaiming the calibre—style and content—of our organ. For instance, J.T.M., from Denver, Colo., writes:

"We in Denver think it is the best magazine on current events that we have encountered. I was always an ardent supporter of the *Modern Monthly*, as a member of the Socialist party; but our NEW INTERNATIONAL is so far superior . . . there is no comparison." And says it with a donation and a bundle order. And that is what we are asking you! The magazine is deserving of much greater, and necessary, support through donations, subscriptions, bundle orders. The magazine's stability and security is still far from certain. More circulation and the development of a sustaining fund is the answer. All the members of the S.W.P. and Y.P.S.L. have to help build the circulation, instead of leaving the job, as is the case now, to a minority to do the work.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is to be found on more and more newsstands throughout the country, and this is encouraging. A few cities are concentrating on placing the magazine on newsstands and in bookshops. Among them are Seattle, Wash.; Allentown, Pa., Ruth Querio, agent; Worcester, Mass., P.M. agent; Vancouver, B.C.; Toronto, Ont.; New

Haven, Conn., M. Gandelman, agent; many cities have succeeded well, as the "Where To Buy" column shows. This kind of activity should be continuous.

All cities should push the campaign for SUBSCRIPTIONS, new and renewal. December is an excellent month. Renewals are due in abundance, and the holiday spirit can be capitalized for subscriptions. Chicago, with Harry Fishler sending in the most, has been working for subscriptions; in general circulation, Karl Shier continues his excellent work even though handling the Y.P.S.L. convention arrangements and other work. Minneapolis renewals, C.K. Johnson directing, are beginning to flow in. Allentown and East Oakland hope their efforts will bring in subscriptions. A few renewals have already come in from Greater New York, but the bulk still have to be obtained. Abe Miller, New York literature director, is organizing Red Sundays toward this end.

Is it in order to mention the holding of affairs for the benefit of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL? We think so. St. Paul, Minn., Jules Geller, agent, is the first to start the ball rolling, and sent in a donation of \$10.00 from the proceedings. Party branches, please copy!

Each month finds some changes in agents, but the work goes on. New agents reported are: A. B. Thisthly-wayth, Sydney, Australia, who reports the September issue all sold out; E. W., St. Louis, Mo., who placed an extra order for December—total 45.

Lack of space prevents mention of the comrades, adult and youth, who are working actively to build the circulation of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. But we know they find satisfaction in the results achieved and which are so roundly attested to everywhere. As Tom Gaddis, Minneapolis, prize sub-getter, says:

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is a magazine to be proud of, and it's opening the eyes of more than one person hereabouts. The so-called cultural front has yet to be extended in our movement in some parts of the country." Some readers there and elsewhere have suggested a glossary of terms, such as "Thermidorian reaction", etc., be printed for greater ease in reading. The editors have taken due note thereof.

"Great"; "splendid"; "best issue yet"; "marvel at high standard"; "constantly improving"; "like the magazine as is"; "the best ammunition against the Stalinist camps"; "want to add my acclaim"; "not a communist, but must get your magazine regularly"; "as a journalist and Marxist, have unqualified admiration for the magazine". And thus and more from all parts of the United States, Canada, England, Scotland, France, India, Australia, South Africa, Argentina, Panama, Chile, Brazil, China, etc. Good, of course; but, comrades and readers, we want more of you to:

SAY IT WITH A SUBSCRIPTION!

THE MANAGER

The Editor's Comments

WHY THE DIGEST POLL COLLAPSED IN 1936—THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FORTUNE AND GALLUP POLLS—
THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS DIFFERENTIATIONS AS SHOWN BY THE ELECTIONS—A NEW STAGE
IN UNITED STATES POLITICS—THE OLD NEW DEAL CLOSES AS THE NEW NEW DEAL
BEGINS—REACTION PREPARES ITS LINES FOR MORE SERIOUS DAYS AHEAD
—THE POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE FOR THE WORKING CLASS—LOVE-
STONE HITCHES ON TO THE ROOSEVELT APPLCART

FOR DECADES *The Literary Digest* was as much a fixture of American civilization as bathtubs, cocktails or peanuts; and for many years its prestige and circulation depended more and more exclusively upon the great Presidential polls whereby, in campaign after campaign, it correctly predicted the outcome of elections. The collapse of the *Digest* poll of 1936, which showed Landon carrying the country by a comfortable margin, and the subsequent burial of the magazine itself, when taken together with the rise to fame of the Gallup and *Fortune* polls, are events of by no means trivial significance.

The *Digest* poll depended for accuracy upon the great size of its sample, which totalled several million. But the method of conducting the poll—broadside, from lists drawn up largely from the *Digest's* own subscription records and from Telephone Directories—brought it about that the overwhelming majority of the sample was taken from the middle classes, a very substantial part from the upper middle classes. This method could yield accurate results so long as, and only so long as, the people as a whole divided in the elections in approximately the same percentages as the middle classes. The correctness of the *Digest* poll in the elections preceding that of 1936 was, in fact, a proof that this was just how the people were voting. Put it another way: the *Digest* method could allow for sectional differentiations in voting percentages, since the poll was calculated in terms of individual States, but it could not allow for class differentiations. It could predict the proletarian vote accurately only if the proletariat voted in the same way as the middle and upper middle classes voted.

The *Digest* poll failed in 1936 because the proletariat did not vote in the same percentages as the middle classes, and because the lower middle classes voted differently from the upper middle class. The voting in 1936 was, broadly speaking, along class lines.

The *Fortune* and Gallup polls use samples only a small fraction the size of the *Digest* sample. Nevertheless, the *Fortune* poll predicted the 1936 result with only a minute error; and the Gallup poll, though it did not indicate the full extent of the Roosevelt sweep in electoral votes, showed him winning by a substantial majority. Dr. Gallup, whose "Institute of Public Opinion" conducts his public polls, is the head of one of the largest and most successful advertising agencies in the country. His method of conducting polls was developed as a service to his clients; and they—huge and vigorous corporations—want to know the facts. *Fortune* is a magazine specifically designed for "business leaders".

Acquaintance with the *Fortune* and Gallup methods shows that

in order to get accurate results they have been compelled to postulate a modified Marxian analysis of society. Their results depend not upon getting millions of answers, but upon a careful selection and weighting of answers (gained by direct interview and not by mail) according to a number of categories—Negro and White, old and young, rural and urban, first voter and old voter, employed and unemployed—but especially according to economic divisions as established by income level. This last does not correspond exactly to the Marxian way of dividing classes; but when corrected by reference to such of the other divisions as rural and urban, Negro and White, employed and unemployed, it does so roughly.

There is no reason to believe that the Gallup and *Fortune* methods would have yielded different results from those of the *Digest* poll in, say, 1924, 1928 or 1932. The fact that they did in 1936, and that their results were far more accurate, is, precisely, convincing evidence that the voting in 1936 was divided along economic class lines. This evidence was further confirmed by independent analysis of the election returns themselves.

However, the 1936 experience was not by itself conclusive in establishing a major and enduring trend. The result might have depended upon special and temporary conditions. Secondly, the middle classes as a whole, as well as the working class, in 1936 voted for Roosevelt, though not by so overwhelming a percentage. A decisive test required a situation in which a large shift in one of the class votes would not be accompanied by a corresponding shift elsewhere. This test was provided in last month's elections.

Retaining and refining its 1936 methods, the Gallup survey predicted a Republican gain in the House of at least fifty and probably seventy-five or more Congressmen, about a dozen new Republican Governors, and the reelection of Lehman in New York (Gallup's was the only important poll to predict the last). The prediction was sufficiently accurate within plausible limits of error. The Republicans did slightly better than Gallup foretold (and it may be remarked that in general all the surveys seem to underestimate the strength of developing swings among large masses of voters).

The actual election returns this year leave no doubt at all about what happened. Disregarding the Solid South, which is a special problem, the middle classes swung over in substantial majority to the Republican column, while the working class remained by an even more decisive majority with the Democrats. The only exceptions to this national trend were New Jersey and to a certain extent Pennsylvania. In New Jersey the chief Democratic candidate was Mayor Hague's man Ely, and resentment against Hague split the proletarian vote; in Pennsylvania the

bitterness left over from Kennedy's unsuccessful fight in the Democratic Primaries and the revelations of the corruption of the Earle Administration had the same effect. Even in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, however, it is probable that a majority of the workers voted Democratic. In the South, where its one-party system obscures actual elections, a similar phenomenon took place in the Primaries. The middle-class vote in the South has undue weight because of the disfranchisement of the Negroes, whose ranks include a substantial number of the Southern workers. However it is clear that in such States as South Carolina and Georgia, it was the middle classes that defeated Roosevelt's "purge", and that the purge was supported by the bulk of the voting workers.

The Adolescence of the Classes

MARXISM DEFINES CLASSES according to property relations toward the major instruments of social production. This does not mean that at every given moment such classes actually function as differentiated and organized social groups, consciously pursuing their own aims and interests through adherence to an explicit program and recognized leadership. Marxism does, however, predict that under the pressure of the conflicts of capitalist society and through the spread of revolutionary propaganda, the classes will be separated out, will become differentiated and organized and "conscious" in the sense of accepting explicit programs and recognized leaderships embodying class aims, and that, further, the decisive social battles will in the long run be fought out roughly along such class lines.

Now what the 1936 and 1938 elections show is that the classes in this country are leaving childhood behind and are beginning to mature. More particularly, they show that this development is far more advanced than any political commentators of any camp have yet realized. The United States is compressing into a comparatively few years stages whose unfolding required, in the case of several of the European nations, generations.

The organization of the classes normally takes place first on the economic field, when the workers come to understand that their economic interests are not identical with those of the bosses, and that they must consequently band together to defend their special interests as workers. This began in the United States in the Nineteenth Century, but it was only during the past few years, with the rise of the industrial union movement called into action by the economic and social crisis that it reached major proportions. Overnight, the American working class went from infancy to childhood.

But this development of the class on the economic field under crisis conditions in turn had at once to move on toward the more advanced political development. This latter process was, moreover, additionally stimulated by the New Deal. The New Deal, in its program and to a considerable extent even its actions, contained a large part of traditional social-reformism. In Europe such programs and actions were taught and administered by Social-Democratic and Labor Parties and by Labor coalition governments. There were no such parties or governments in this country. The New Deal, in its own curious way, again compressed into a few years, thus serves as a kind of equivalent to the much longer, more drawn out stage of European social-reformism. Correspondingly, the phases of class development are compressed. The bourgeoisie has its experiment in the social-reformist administration of capitalist society at the very time when the world decline of capitalism and the world crisis are rapidly removing the underpinnings of reformism in all countries. The working class has its social-reformist experiences without having built a reformist party of its own.

The same points may be approached from another direction: In France the Popular Front took shape as the union on a reformist program of the working-class parties with the great

"middle-class" Radical-Socialist Party. There were no such parties in the United States, but the same social forces nevertheless operated under similar conditions, and the United States equivalent of the Popular Front was simply the New Deal Roosevelt Democratic Party. In France the bourgeoisie, faced with the continuing economic impasse and the approach of war, whips the middle class into line, out of alliance with the working-class parties, and thereby breaks up the Popular Front. In the same months, with the same problem, the middle classes in the United States are swung back into the Republican Party, and Roosevelt's Popular Front heads for collapse.

The general conclusion is that the political stage which the United States has reached is far more advanced than appears from any surface manifestation. In spite of the formal persistence of the old two-party framework, the failure of a new party or parties to take the field on a big scale, the apparent setback to the local Labor parties in Minnesota and New York, nevertheless underneath this framework the class political differentiation has set in, class lines are being ever more clearly and sharply drawn. It is an ironic reflection that it is the work of the experts hired by the same corporation executives who in every public speech assure us that "America is different from Europe", "The U.S. is not a country divided into classes", which furnishes some of the most unequivocal evidence for this conclusion. Once again we may observe that in the time schedule of American politics it is later than we think.

Pendulum into Spiral

IT HAS BEEN A COMMONPLACE much loved for generations by the political commentators to picture United States politics as swinging with a pendulum-like motion. After some years on the Republican side, the pendulum swings over to the Democratic; then back again, and so on, with nothing much really changing in the shifts. The wiseacres were gratified to be able to find a re-assertion of the old law of the pendulum in last month's election. They had been a little fearful that the New Deal was going to live forever. Now they could again believe that "the normal" was triumphant; the party in power was shifting out of power and things would get back to where they started from.

The pendulum metaphor was never very illuminating, but it is the grossest of falsifications when applied to what happened this year. An analogy from motion in an expanding spiral would be much more appropriate. In swinging around again toward the Republican side, the process has also been pushed forward, and there is not at all a return merely to the old position. This is shown unmistakably by all of the evidence.

It is shown, in the first place, by what we have already discussed. The pendulum motion meant that the people of the country as a whole, in all and each social strata, swung first to one side and then to the other. But this did not happen last month. The classes are now separating out, and function in politics as more or less autonomous forces. The middle classes swung over to the Republicans (the majority of the bourgeoisie voted Republican even in 1936), but the working class stayed with the Democrats. The pendulum conception can in no way represent this far more complex phenomenon.

Secondly, the inadequacy of the pendulum metaphor is shown by the fact that there was no return on the part of anyone to "traditional Republicanism". Traditional Republicanism, the one side of the old pendulum, is indeed gone forever. No one even mentioned tariffs; it is hard to remember that this was a major issue of every campaign until 1932. No one in any party any longer talks about old-style *laissez-faire*, or about the Harding-Coolidge brand of "normalcy". No one even bothered to complain very loudly about "abandonment of the gold standard" or abrogation of the gold clauses; though what has been

done by the New Deal to money makes William Jennings Bryan seem like an orthodox economist and would have dropped an old-fashioned Republican dead in his tracks with apoplexy. These matters belong to another epoch, back into which no pendulum-swing will ever return us.

Thirdly, we may observe the character of the campaign this year, not so much the avowed programs as the unofficial but decisive campaign that was carried on among the people. We find that in many crucial States the burden of the Democratic campaign was carried not by the old party machine and party bosses, but by labor and its organizations. This was the case in New York, Michigan, and Ohio outstandingly, and to a considerable extent in Pennsylvania, Illinois and the Far West. It was the A.L.P., not Tammany, that held the Madison Square Garden rally for Lehman. It was Labor's Non-Partisan League that made the speeches and got the vote out for Murphy in the Michigan cities.

On the Republican side we discover the emergence of a new type and generation of candidate (Dewey in New York, Taft in Ohio, Stassen in Minnesota) and, more important, prominence given to a new type of issue: pensions (in the West and New England), anti-unionism (the Far West, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio), anti-Semitism (New York, to a lesser extent Minnesota, to some extent nearly everywhere). These issues share two significant features: they are designed to appeal particularly to the middle classes; and they are reflections of conditions of growing social and economic crisis.

The law of the pendulum is consoling, because it leads its believers to imagine that things are pretty much what they always have been, that nothing is drastically changed, that we are headed back toward a political re-stabilization in the old manner. The facts, alas, are uncomfortable. They show that everything is profoundly changing, that things will never again be as they were, that American politics is headed not for re-stabilization but to deep and whirling turmoil.

The Forest and the Trees Ahead

THE NEW DEAL AS A major social experiment is now drawing to a close. Though its demagogy will continue in the mouths of Roosevelt, Hopkins, Ickes and their labor bureaucrat colleagues, and though it may still fight a few skirmishes, even win a minor victory or two, it is no longer capable of further serious advance. It has been spectacular while it lasted. It served its purpose, brought United States capitalism through an economic and psychological crisis that in 1932 and 1933 threatened to drive irrecoverably and immediately onto the rocks. But the old New Deal is now economically and politically stymied. Its recovery methods, which never touched the roots of economic decline but only plastered the surface with governmental deficit financing, are reaching an exhaustion of efficacy, like a powerful drug to which the organism, after repeated doses, has grown inured. Its political magic which by the strength of its mass appeal held Congress restive but bound within New Deal hands is losing its charm, and other incantations now come through more strongly to Congressional ears.

The close of the New Deal as a new and major social experiment is well understood by the shrewdest of the Washington correspondents. They express it in this way: We are now about to enter into "the Fourth New Deal". The Fourth New Deal is to be a program of national security or "hemisphere defense", which will involve not merely the question of armaments and diplomatic negotiations, but the correlated questions of the rearrangement and reorganization of national life and economy—industrial mobilization and coördination, alteration of taxes and the relief program, etc.

The old New Deal was designed to meet a crisis. Its departure does not signify that the crisis is over—rather is it intensified—but that that New Deal was not a lasting method for solving the

crisis. The conflicts continue; the unsatisfied needs and aspirations of all classes remain. Profits are still low in the eyes of the bosses. The middle classes are more than ever squeezed from every side. The workers continue and will continue to confront unemployment, insecurity, and lowering wage rates.

The conflicts and the needs give rise to demands, and demands formulated in new terms, since the older formulations and answers, including the New Deal, have got nowhere. The bosses require higher profits, and to get them they must begin bearing down harder on labor and must cut down the expenses of relief. The workers have got to have more wages and relief even to maintain themselves adequately and humanly in existence. The middle classes scurry back and forth, and run breathlessly toward each new will-o'-the-wisp that lifts on the horizon.

The elections show that the bosses are beginning to strike out more sternly and with success. As yet the workers have given no answer. Labor remains, politically, still clinging to the New Deal. Such a policy, however, if it lasts much longer, will be fatal. The New Deal is a sinking ship; no amount of pumping can salvage it. For labor to remain aboard is the counsel of sterile and suicidal despair. It will mean, in the first place, that labor will lose all of its potential allies, who are showing sense enough to jump off while there is yet time—and who can be in any case held only by a firm and bold and courageous policy. It will mean, secondly, that the workers themselves will relapse into hopeless passivity. This is *already* proved by what happened in Pennsylvania especially and also in Minnesota, New Jersey and Michigan. In Pennsylvania, the workers last Spring fought a stirring though misguided and vain fight for Kennedy in the Democratic Primaries. This fight was *against* Earle and his New Deal machine. Then, in the election, they were told to fight *for* Earle and the New Deal machine. How could they be expected to take any loyal and devoted interest in such a proposal? And they did not. Some of them went over to the Republicans; the rest simply sat back. It will mean, finally, that reaction will march ahead unchecked, with the workers, in the straight-jacket of what will no longer be the New Deal but only the memory of the New Deal, deprived of any political instrument for effective resistance.

The New Deal experiment is closing; and, unfortunately, everyone knows it except the workers. The workers do not because they still believe the Lewises and Greens and Browders and Waldmans whose function it is to hide the truth from the workers. The experiment is closing and a new one has already begun. The summed up lesson of the election is clear enough: The workers must finish up with the New Deal, New Dealism and all its supporters; they must strike out on their own now, and enter a new stage of fully independent class politics, setting openly and boldly its class aims as its goal, and, this time, calling on others to follow labor rather than herding labor in to following those who are in reality labor's worst enemies. Strewn with obscuring obstacles as is the road toward independent labor politics, barred at every gate by labor's all too friendly friends, the time is nonetheless propitious. Economically, labor is now organized in this country on a scale not merely unprecedented here but seldom equalled anywhere else in the world. Even on the political field labor is now functioning and growing conscious as an organized class. Labor is in a position to achieve major and adult status in United States politics overnight, once the step is taken. The great barrier now is psychological, is in the mind; and if, as the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins wrote, the mind too has mountains, mountains can be scaled if resolve is strong and purpose unswerving.

A New Recruit to the Democrats' Left Wing

THE STORY OF THE elections would be incomplete without reference to the policy advocated by the Lovestone group. In the

Workers Age (Nov. 5, 1938) it gave editorial advice to the workers on how to vote. In New York, "support the A.L.P. and vote a straight A.L.P. ticket"—that is, including the representatives of Roosevelt's party who headed the ticket. But let that pass for a moment. What about Michigan and California, the second and third states mentioned by Lovestone? In the former, vote for Murphy, the Democratic candidate. Why? Because the attack on Murphy is an attack on labor itself and the Auto Workers Union and others are "conducting their own 'Murphy for Governor' campaign by means of their own committees, quite independent of the Democratic party and endorsing no other Democratic candidate but Governor Murphy". In California, labor should vote for the Democratic standard-bearer Olson, also because of the reactionary campaign of the Republicans.

In that case, what is left of the "independent working class politics" which Lovestone talks about from time to time? In that case, what was wrong with supporting Roosevelt as against Landon, since "labor", in the form of the A.L.P. and Labor's Non-Partisan League, also supported him? In that case, what would be wrong with voting for Roosevelt in the 1940 elections, provided "labor" gave him the same "independent" support? According to Lovestone's new line, the answer in all three cases is: Nothing!

A Fresh Lesson

On the Character of the Coming War

TWENTY YEARS AFTER the first imperialist world war which completely destroyed "democratic" illusions, the leaders of the Comintern are trying to prove that the capitalist world has radically altered its nature; that imperialism is no longer the decisive factor on our planet; that world antagonisms are determined not by the predatory interests of monopoly capital, but by abstract political principles, and that the new slaughter of peoples will be a defensive war on the part of innocent, peace-loving democracies against the "Fascist aggressors". Human memory must indeed be very short if, on the eve of a new imperialist war, the adventurists of the Third International dare to put in circulation the very ideas used by the traitors of the Second International to dupe the masses during the last war.

There is, however, more to it than mere repetition. Inasmuch as capitalism has, during the last quarter of a century, reached a very advanced stage of decay in economy as well as politics, the falsifications of the Third International assume an incomparably more obvious, cynical and debased character than was attained by the social-patriotic doctrines of the last war. The leaders of the Second International who had already lost faith in the virtues of "democratic" formulæ and were verging on utter despair, seized with astonishment and a new hope upon the unexpected assistance of the Comintern. Following them, a section of the imperialist bourgeoisie cast its eyes toward the Communist patriots. Such is the chief source of the rotten and infamous policy of "People's Fronts".

Every profound crisis—whether economic, political or military—has its positive side, in that it puts to a test all the various traditional magnitudes and formulæ, laying bare the rottenness of those that served to mask "peace-time" contradictions, and thereby spurring forward the general development. The diplomatic crisis over Czechoslovakia excellently performed this progressive task. It only remains for Marxists to draw all the necessary political conclusions from the recent experience.

Lovestone, sucked deeper into the muck by his policy of ingratiating himself with the conservative, pro-Roosevelt, anti-Stalinist trade union bureaucracy, has reached the position of *left wing-tip of the Democratic party*. Ten years ago he directed the expulsion of the Trotskyists from the Communist party as "agents of the bourgeoisie". Today, he brings up the rearguard of bourgeois politics in the labor movement, drumming up a vote or two for the "good man" candidate on a capitalist ticket, for the "progressive" bourgeois politician who is better, you know, than the candidate of "reaction".

A sardine, say the Japanese, always stinks at the head. But other parts are not immune from decay. Thus, while the editorial called for support of the S.P. in Massachusetts because Curley, the Democratic candidate, "is a reactionary of the deepest dye", it did not prevent the only known spokesman for the Lovestone group in Massachusetts, a small-time labor bureaucrat named Sam Sandberg, from speaking in public for Curley and from putting signed and paid advertisements in the press in behalf of the Congressional candidacy of Curley's henchman, Casey. We doubt if Sandberg's membership in the Lovestone group will be affected by his little exploits. If the leader can play bourgeois politics on a national scale, he can surely play them in a little corner of New England.

The Experience of the Last War

Let us begin with a brief backward glance. The war of 1914-1918 was, as is well known, a "war for democracy". The alliance of France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States enabled the social-patriots of the Entente to keep their eyes shamefully shut to the fifth ally, Czarism. After the February, 1917, revolution overthrew Nicholas II, the democratic front was definitely aligned. Only the incorrigible Bolsheviks could still clamor thereafter about imperialism. Was it really worth cavilling because the liberal Miliukov, and the quasi-socialist Kerensky wanted to grab Galicia, Armenia and Constantinople? In the end, Miliukov and Kerensky explained that the Bolsheviks were simply the agents of Ludendorff (the "Hitler" of that day).

The war ended with the complete victory for the democracies, although Soviet Russia, led by the Bolsheviks, had abandoned their holy camp. The result of that victory was the Versailles treaty, paid for, to be sure, by millions of lives, but designed to establish once and for all on this earth, the reign of democracy, the free development of nations and the peaceful collaboration of peoples on the basis of general disarmament. The League of Nations crowned the conquests of a war which was supposed to have been a war "to end all wars"—so promised Wilson and the Second International.

A paradise, however, did not materialize, but something rather which very much resembled hell. The peace of Versailles suffocated Europe. Economic life was suffocated by protectionism. The war "for democracy" ushered in an epoch of the final decline of democracy. The world became more poverty-stricken and confined. One state after another took the road to a fascist or a military dictatorship. International relations grew more and more menacing. Disarmament came in the form of programs of militarism which would have seemed like a nightmare on the eve of the last war. The first clashes of new and bloody conflicts began to take place in different parts of the world. This

very moment was chosen by the Comintern to abandon the last remnants of internationalism and to proclaim that the task of the new era was an alliance between the proletariat and the decaying imperialist democracies "against fascism". The greatest source of infection in the world is the heap of filth that remains of what was once the Communist International.

The Struggle For and Against a New Partition of the World

Certain theoreticians of the Second International, like Kautsky, who tried to envisage some sort of perspective, expressed a hope that the imperialists, having measured their forces in the great slaughter of the peoples, would be compelled to arrive at an agreement among themselves and to establish a peaceful rule over the world in the form of a corporation (the theory of "super-imperialism"). This philistine-pacifist theory—a social-democratic shadow of the League of Nations—tried to shut its eyes to two processes: first, the constant change in the relation of forces between the various imperialist states, with the utter impossibility of measuring these changes in practice except by force of arms; second, the liberating struggle of the proletariat in the metropolitan centers and of the colonial peoples, a struggle that is the most important factor in disrupting the equilibrium, and which by its very nature excludes the possibility of "peaceful" imperialist looting. Precisely for these reasons, the programs of disarmament remain miserable utopias.

The flagrant and ever-growing disproportion between the specific weight of France and England, not to mention Holland, Belgium, and Portugal, in world economy and the colossal dimensions of their colonial possessions are as much the source of world conflicts and of new wars as the insatiable greed of the "fascist" aggressors. To put it better, the two phenomena are but *two sides of the same coin*. The "peaceful" English and French democracies rest on the suppression of national-democratic movements of hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa for the sake of the super-profits derived from them. Conversely, Hitler and Mussolini promise to become more "moderate" if they obtain adequate colonial territory.

The United States, owing to her almost total possession of an entire continent with inexhaustible natural wealth, and owing to favorable historical conditions, has extended her sway over the world very "peacefully" and "democratically", if we disregard such trifles as the extermination of the Indians, the robbery of the choicest portions of Mexico, the crushing of Spain, the participation in the last war, and so on. This "idyllic" mode of exploitation, belongs now, however, to the past. The rapid and fearful decay of American capitalism poses before it the question of life and death in a more and more obvious military form. From Wilson's pacifist 14 points, Hoover's Quaker A.R.A. (the international philanthropic organization), Roosevelt's reformist New Deal, the doctrine of isolation, the laws of absolute neutrality, *etc.*, the United States is heading inevitably toward an imperialist explosion such as the world has never seen.

Hurled far back by the Versailles peace, Germany took the task of "national unification" as the basis of its imperialist program. Under this slogan, Fascism, the legitimate heir of Weimar democracy, was born and grew strong. What an irony of fate! In its period of historical rise (from the Napoleonic wars to the Versailles peace of 1871) the belated German bourgeoisie proved incapable of achieving national unification through its own strength. Bismarck only half-fulfilled this task, leaving almost intact the entire feudal and particularist rubbish. True, the revolution of 1918 abolished the German dynasties (only because the social democracy was powerless to save them!), but betrayed by the social democracy into the hands of the Junkers, the bankers, the bureaucracy, and the army officers, the revolution was incapable not only of assuring a centralized Greater

German Republic, but even of centralizing bureaucratically the Germany of the Hohenzollerns. Both these tasks fell to Hitler. The leader of Fascism came forward, in his own fashion, as the continuator of Bismarck, who in his turn had been the executor of the bourgeois bankrupts of 1848. But this is, in the long run, only the superficial aspect of the process. Its social content has radically changed. From the progressive factor that it was, the national state has long since been transformed in advanced countries into a brake on the development of productive forces. Ten million more Germans within the boundaries of Germany do not alter the reactionary nature of the national state. In their own way, the imperialists understand this very well. For Hitler it is not at all a question of "unifying Germans" as an independent task, but of creating a broader European drill-ground for future world expansion. The crisis over the Sudeten Germans, or rather over the Sudeten mountains, was an episode on the road toward the struggle for colonies.

A new partition of the world is on the order of the day. The first step in the revolutionary education of the workers must be to develop the ability to perceive beneath the official formulæ, slogans, and hypocritical phrases, the real imperialist appetites, plans, and calculations.

The Imperialist Quartet Replaces the "Front of Democracies"

The lamb-like docility of European democracies is the product not of love of peace, but of weakness. The cause of weakness is not the democratic régime as such, but rather the disproportion between the economic foundations of the metropolitan centers and the colonial empires inherited from the past. To this disproportion is added the liberating struggle of the colonies which threatens, especially in time of war, to flare into a revolutionary conflagration. In these conditions, decaying "democracy" really becomes a supplementary source of weakness for the old imperialist powers.

Open reaction in France undoubtedly profits from the capitulations of the People's Front. We can expect with certainty a strengthening of French Fascism, favored by the patronage of leading military circles. In England, where the conservative bourgeoisie is in power, the Labourite opposition will probably gain more in the next period than Fascism. But in view of the entire historic situation, the assumption of power by the Labour party can only be an episode, or more exactly, a stage on the road to more radical changes. Neither Major Attlee nor Sir Walter Citrine will be able to cope with the malignant spirits of our epoch!

Somehow, the "world front of democracies" promised by the charlatans of the "People's Fronts" found itself replaced by a Four-Power front of Germany, Italy, England, and France. After the Munich Conference, where England and France capitulated to Hitler, with the as-always equivocal mediation of Mussolini, the heads of the four states appeared before their respective peoples as national heroes: Hitler had unified the Germans; Chamberlain and Daladier had averted war; Mussolini—helped both sides. Long live the Big Four! The petty bourgeois fraternity which the G.P.U. usually mobilizes for all kinds of pacifist congresses is already beginning to turn toward the new messiahs of peace. The French socialists abstained on the question of voting special powers to Daladier, the hero of capitulation. The abstention was only a transitional step from the camp of Moscow to the camp of the Big Four. The isolation of the Stalinist prætorians in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate symbolized the complete isolation of the Kremlin in European politics.

But it can already be stated with certainty that the Munich quartet is as little capable of preserving peace as the "front of democracies" that was never realized. England and France

threw Czechoslovakia into Hitler's maw to give him something to digest for a time and thus postpone the question of colonies. Chamberlain and Daladier made very vague and uncertain promises that a common agreement on all controversial issues would be reached. On his part, Hitler promised to present no more territorial demands in Europe. Thereby he has in any case indicated his intention to present territorial demands in other parts of the world. As regards Alsace-Lorraine, Schleswig, etc., Hitler is at best postponing the solution of these questions until the new world war. Should fascism conquer France in the next year or two, and the Labour party in England, these political changes would alter very little the arrangement of the imperialist figures on the world chess-board. Fascist France would be as little inclined as the France of the "People's Front" to yield Alsace-Lorraine to Hitler, or to share its colonies with him. The Labour party, impregnated with the spirit of imperialism, could not mitigate the antagonism with Italy in the Mediterranean, nor check the development of the world antagonism between German and British interests. In these conditions, the Four-Power combination, if ever realized, will lead only to a new crisis, for which we have not long to wait. Imperialism is inevitably and irresistibly heading to a redivision of the world, corresponding to the changed relation of forces. To prevent the catastrophe, imperialism must be strangled. All other methods are fictions, illusions, lies.

The Meaning of the Governmental Turn in Czechoslovakia

The refusal by France and Britain to defend the imperialist interests of the Czech bourgeoisie not only led to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia but also to the collapse of its political régime. This experience revealed in a chemically pure form that Czechoslovakian democracy was not an expression of the "people's will" but simply an apparatus whereby Czech monopoly capitalism adapted itself to its patron states. No sooner did the military patronage fall away than the democratic machinery proved not only unnecessary but harmful in that it threatened to provoke needless friction with Hitler. The Czech bourgeois leaders immediately created a new apparatus of imperialist adaptation in the shape of a military dictatorship. This change of régimes was accomplished without the slightest participation of the people, without new elections, and even without any consultation of the old parliament. The president, elected by the people, the arch-"democrat", Benes, summoned the ranking general of the republic to power. This summons at first had some semblance of a concession to the people who were aroused, and who were protesting, demonstrating and demanding resistance to Hitler, arms in hand. Resistance? Here is a general as a national leader! Having performed this deed, the president withdrew. Whereupon the general, formerly at the head of the armed forces, and who was, so to speak, the shining sword of democracy, announced his intention, for the sake of amity with Hitler, of instituting a new state régime. And that was all!*

Generally speaking, democracy is indispensable to the bourgeoisie in an epoch of free competition. To monopoly capitalism, resting not on "free" competition but on centralized command, democracy is of no use; it is hampered and embarrassed by it. Imperialism can tolerate democracy as a necessary evil up to a certain point. But its inner urge is toward dictatorship. During the last war, 22 years ago, Lenin wrote: "The difference between the republican-democratic and monarchic-reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie is being effaced precisely because both of them are

*Immediately upon his arrival in England, the former Czechoslovakian president, Benes, declared to the press that the fate of Czechoslovakia was in "reliable hands". This dotted all the "i's". All distinctions between democracy and Fascism faded away when it became a question of the basic interests of capitalism. Benes, the democrat and Francophile, feels no shame in publicly recognizing General Syrový, the fascistophile and Germanophile, as a "reliable" guide of Czechoslovakia's destiny. In the last analysis, they are both stewards of one and the same master.

rotting." Further, he added: "Political reaction *all along the line* is inherent in imperialism." Only hopeless idiots can believe that imperialist world antagonisms are determined by the irreconcilability between democracy and Fascism. In fact, the ruling cliques of all countries look upon democracy, military dictatorship, Fascism, etc., as so many different instruments for subjecting their own peoples to imperialist aims. Moreover, one of these political régimes, *viz.*, democracy, includes within itself from the outset, in the shape, for example, of the General Staff, another régime—that of military dictatorship.

In Germany the imperialist bourgeoisie, with the active assistance of the social democracy, placed Field Marshal Von Hindenburg, as a defender against Fascism, in the presidential office. Hindenburg, in his turn, summoned Hitler to power, after which the Field Marshal did not, to be sure, resign, but died. This involves however, merely a question of technique and age. In essence, the overturn in Czechoslovakia reproduces the main features of the overturn in Germany, revealing thereby the main springs of the political mechanics of imperialism. The question of the Czechoslovakia régime was no doubt decided behind the scenes at conferences of magnates of Czech, French, British and German capitalism, together with the leaders of the General Staffs and of the diplomats. The chief concern in shifting the state boundaries was to cause as little damage as possible to the interests of the financial oligarchy. The change in orientation from France and England to Germany signified essentially an exchange of stocks, a new division of military orders for the Skoda plants and so on.

Nobody, by the way, concerned himself with the position of the social democracy and the ex-communist party, because in Czechoslovakia they were no more capable of resistance than were their elder brothers in Germany. Bowing before "national necessities" these utterly corroded organizations did everything in their power to paralyze the revolutionary resistance of the working class. After the overturn has been consummated, the financial clique will probably hold a "referendum", *i.e.*, provide the people, driven into a blind alley, with the precious opportunity of "approving", under the muzzle of Syrový's gun, the changes made without them and against them.

Should Czechoslovakia's "National Independence" Be Defended?

During the critical week in September, we have been informed, voices were raised even at the left flank of socialism, holding that in case of "single combat" between Czechoslovakia and Germany, the proletariat would be obliged to help Czechoslovakia and save her "national independence", even in an alliance with Benes. This hypothetical situation failed to arise. The heroes of Czechoslovakian independence, as was to be expected, capitulated without a struggle. It is impossible, however, in the interests of the future, not to point out here the gross and dangerous blunder of these out-of-season theoreticians of "national independence".

Even irrespective of its international ties, Czechoslovakia is an absolutely imperialist state. Economically, monopoly capitalism reigns there. Politically, the Czech bourgeoisie rules (perhaps soon we will have to say, used to rule) over several oppressed nationalities. A war, even on the part of isolated Czechoslovakia, would thus have been waged not for national independence but for the preservation and, if possible, the extension of the borders of imperialist exploitation.

Even if the other imperialist states were not immediately involved, it would be impermissible to consider a war between Czechoslovakia and Germany apart from the pattern of European and world imperialist relations of which such a war would have been an episode. Within a month or two, a Czecho-German

war—if the Czech bourgeoisie was desirous and capable of fighting—would almost inevitably have involved other states. It would therefore be an error for Marxists to define their position on the basis of episodic diplomatic and military groupings rather than on the basis of the general character of the social forces behind this war.

We have reiterated on hundreds of occasions the irreplaceable and invaluable thesis of Clausewitz that war is but the continuation of politics by other means. In order to determine in each given instance the historic and social character of a war, we must be guided not by impressions and conjectures but by a scientific analysis of the politics which preceded the war and conditioned it. These politics from the very first day of the formation of patched-up Czechoslovakia were of an imperialist character.

It may be argued that after separating the Sudeten Germans, the Hungarians, the Poles, and, perhaps, the Slovaks, Hitler will not stop before the enslavement of the Czechs themselves, and that in this case their struggle for national independence would have every claim upon the support of the proletariat. This manner of formulating the question is nothing but social-patriotic sophistry. What paths the future development of imperialist antagonisms will follow, we do not know. Complete destruction of Czechoslovakia is, of course, quite possible. But it is equally possible that before this destruction will have been accomplished, a European war will break out in which Czechoslovakia may be found on the victorious side, and participate in a new dismemberment of Germany. Is the rôle of a revolutionary party then that of a nurse to “crippled” gangsters of imperialism?

It is quite obvious that the proletariat must build its policy on the basis of a *given* war, as it is, *i.e.*, as it has been conditioned by the whole preceding course of development, and not on hypothetical speculation over the possible strategic outcome of the war. In such speculations everyone will invariably choose that variant which best corresponds to his own desires, national sympathies and antipathies. Obviously, such a policy would be not Marxist but subjective, not internationalist but chauvinist in character.

An imperialist war, no matter in what corner it begins, will be waged not for “national independence” but for a redivision of the world in the interests of separate cliques of finance capital. This does not exclude that *in passing* the imperialist war may improve or worsen the position of this or that “nation”; or, more exactly, of one nation at the expense of another. Thus, the Versailles treaty dismembered Germany. A new peace may dismember France. Social patriots invoke precisely this possible “national” peril of the future as an argument for supporting “their” imperialist bandits of the present. Czechoslovakia does not in the least constitute an exception to this rule.

In reality all speculative arguments of this sort and raising bogies of impending national calamities for the sake of supporting this or that imperialist bourgeoisie flow from *the tacit rejection of the revolutionary perspective and a revolutionary policy*. Naturally, *if* a new war ends only in a military victory of this or that imperialist camp; *if* a war calls forth neither a revolutionary uprising nor a victory of the proletariat; *if* a new imperialist peace more terrible than that of Versailles places new chains for decades upon the people; *if* unfortunate humanity bears all this in silence and submission—then not only Czechoslovakia or Belgium but also France can be thrown back into the position of an oppressed nation (the same hypothesis may be drawn in regard to Germany). In this eventuality the further frightful decomposition of capitalism will drag all peoples backward for many decades to come. Of course if *this* perspective of passivity, capitulation, defeats and decline comes to pass, the oppressed masses and entire peoples will be forced to climb anew, paying out their sweat and blood, retracing on their hands

and knees the historic road once already travelled.

Is such a perspective excluded? *If* the proletariat suffers without end the leadership of social-imperialists and communo-chauvinists; *if* the Fourth International is unable to find a way to the masses; *if* the horrors of war do not drive the workers and soldiers to rebellion; *if* the colonial peoples continue to bleed patiently in the interests of the slaveholders, then under these conditions the level of civilization will inevitably be lowered and the general retrogression and decomposition may again place national wars on the order of the day for Europe. But then we, or rather our sons, will have to determine their policy in relation to future wars on the basis of the new situation. *Today* we proceed not from the perspective of decline but that of revolution. We are defeatists at the expense of the imperialists and not at the expense of the proletariat. We do not link the question of the fate of the Czechs, Belgians, French and Germans as nations with episodic shifts of military fronts during a new brawl of the imperialists, but with the uprising of the proletariat and its victory over all the imperialists. We look forward and not backward. The program of the Fourth International states that the freedom of all European nations, small and large, can be assured only within the framework of the Socialist United States of Europe.

Once Again on Democracy and Fascism

All of this does not, of course, imply that there is no difference at all between democracy and Fascism, or that this difference is of no concern to the working class, as the Stalinists insisted not so very long ago. The Marxists have nothing in common with such cheap political nihilism. Only, it is necessary in each given instance clearly to comprehend the actual content of this difference, and its true limits.

For the backward colonial and semi-colonial countries, the struggle for democracy, including the struggle for national independence, represents a necessary and progressive stage of historical development. It is just for this reason that we deem it not only the right but also the duty of workers in these countries actively to participate in the “defense of the fatherland” against imperialism, on condition, to be sure, that they preserve the complete independence of their class organization and conduct a ruthless struggle against the poison of chauvinism. Thus, in the conflict between Mexico and the oil kings and their executive committee, which is the democratic government of Great Britain, the class-conscious proletariat of the world sides wholly with Mexico (this does not of course apply to the imperialist lackeys at the head of the British Labour party).

As regards advanced capitalism, the latter has long since outgrown not only the old property forms but also the national state, and in consequence bourgeois democracy as well. The fundamental crisis of contemporary civilization lies precisely here. Imperialist democracy is putrefying and disintegrating. A program of “defense of democracy” for the advanced countries is a program of reaction. The only progressive task here is the preparation of the international socialist revolution. Its aim is to smash the framework of the old national state and build up economy in accordance with geographic and technological conditions, without mediæval taxes and duties.

Again, this does not imply an attitude of indifference toward the current political methods of imperialism. In all cases where the counter-revolutionary forces tend to pull *back* away from the decomposing “democratic” states and towards provincial particularism, towards monarchy, military dictatorship, Fascism—the revolutionary proletariat without assuming the slightest responsibility for the “defense of democracy” (it is indefensible!) will meet these counter-revolutionary forces with armed resistance, in order, if successful, to direct its offensive against imperialist “democracy”.

This policy, however, is applicable only with regard to internal conflicts, that is, in those cases where the struggle really involves the issue of a political régime, as was for instance the case in Spain. The participation of Spanish workers in the struggle against Franco was their elementary duty. But precisely and only because the workers did not succeed in time in replacing the rule of bourgeois democracy with their own rule, "democracy" was able to clear the path for Fascism.

It is, however, sheer fraud and charlatanism to transfer mechanically the laws and rules of the struggle between *different* classes of *one and the same* nation over to an imperialist war, that is, the struggle waged by *one and the same class of different* nations. At present, after the fresh experience of Czechoslovakia, there is no necessity, it seems, to demonstrate that the imperialists are fighting one another not for political principles but for domination over the world under the cover of any principles that will serve their purpose.

Mussolini and his closest associates, so far as one can gather, are atheists, that is they believe neither in God nor the Devil. The King of Britain and his ministers are mired in mediæval superstitions and believe not only in the Devil but in the Devil's grandmother. Yet this does not mean that a war between Italy and England would be a war of science against religion. Mussolini, the atheist, will do all in his power to fan the religious passions of the Mohammedans. The devout Protestant Chamberlain will, for his part, seek assistance from the Pope, and so on. In the calendar of human progress, a republic rates above a monarchy. But does this signify that a war waged by republican France, say, against monarchist Holland for colonies would be a war of a republic against a monarchy? We shall not even dwell on the fact that in the event of a national war waged by the Bey of Tunis against France, progress would be on the side of the barbarian monarch and not that of the imperialist republic. Hygiene occupies an important place in human culture. But when a murder is involved, the question of whether the murderer washed his hands beforehand is not of decisive importance. To substitute political or moral abstractions for the actual aims of the warring imperialist camps is not to fight for democracy, but to help the brigands disguise their robbery, pillage and violence. This is now precisely the main function of the Second and Third Internationals.

The International Policy of the Bonapartist Kremlin Clique

The immediate blow fell this time on Czechoslovakia. France and England have suffered serious injury. But the most formidable blow was suffered by the Kremlin. Its system of lies, charlatanism and frauds has suffered international collapse.

Having crushed the Soviet masses and broken with the policy of international revolution, the Kremlin clique has become a toy of imperialism. In everything essential, Stalin's diplomacy in the last five years was only a reflection of and a supplement to Hitler's diplomacy. In 1933 Stalin strove might and main to become Hitler's ally. But the extended hand was spurned, inasmuch as Hitler, in search of England's friendship, presented himself as the savior of Germany and Europe from Bolshevism. Thereupon Stalin set himself the task of proving to capitalist Europe that it had no need of Hitler, that Bolshevism contained no dangers within itself, that the government of the Kremlin was a domestic animal, trained to stand up on its haunches and beg. Thus, in moving away from Hitler, or more exactly, in being repulsed by him, Stalin gradually became a lackey and hired assassin in the service of the countries of sated imperialism.

Hence, this sudden frenzy of genuflection before gangrenous bourgeois democracy on the part of the totalitarian Kremlin gang; hence, the idiotically false idealization of the League of Nations; hence, the "People's Fronts" which strangled the Span-

ish revolution; hence, the substitution for the actual class struggle of declamations "against Fascism". The present international function of the Soviet bureaucracy and the Comintern was revealed with especial impudence at the pacifist congress in Mexico (September 1938), where the hired agents of Moscow tried to convince the peoples of Latin America that they had to fight not against the all too real imperialism that threatened them but solely against Fascism.

As was to be expected, Stalin gained neither friendship nor trust through these cheap manœuvres. The imperialists have become accustomed to appraise society not by the declarations of its "leaders", and not even by the character of its political superstructure, but by its social foundation. So long as state ownership of the means of production, protected by monopoly of foreign trade is maintained in the Soviet Union, the imperialists, including the "democratic" imperialists, will continue to regard Stalin with no more confidence and incomparably less respect than feudal-monarchist Europe viewed the first Bonaparte. Surrounded by the aureole of victories and his suite of brilliant marshals, Napoleon could not escape Waterloo. Stalin has crowned the series of his capitulations, failures and betrayals with the wholesale destruction of the marshals of the revolution. Can there be the slightest doubt about the fate awaiting him?

The only obstacle in the path of war is the fear of the property-owning classes of revolution. So long as the Communist International remained true to the principles of proletarian revolution, it represented, together with the Red Army, with which it was closely bound, the most important factor for peace. Having prostituted the Comintern, and turned it into an agency of "democratic" imperialism; having beheaded and paralyzed the military power of the Soviets, Stalin has completely untied Hitler's hands, as well as the hands of Hitler's adversaries, and pushed Europe close to war.

The Moscow falsifiers are nowadays heaping cheap curses upon their former democratic friend Benes because he "capitulated" prematurely and prevented the Red Army from crushing Hitler, regardless of France's course. This theatrical thunder only illuminates all the more glaringly the impotence and duplicity of the Kremlin. Who then compelled you to believe in Benes? Who forced you to concoct the myth of the "alliance of democracies"? And, lastly, who prevented you in the critical hours when all of Czechoslovakia was seething like a cauldron, from calling upon the proletariat of Prague to seize power, and sending the Red Army to their aid? Apparently it is much more difficult to fight against fascism than to shoot and poison old Bolsheviks. . . . From the example of Czechoslovakia, all small states and especially all colonial peoples must learn what sort of help they may expect from Stalin.

Only the overthrow of the Bonapartist Kremlin clique can make possible the regeneration of the military strength of the U.S.S.R. Only the liquidation of the ex-Comintern will clear the way for revolutionary internationalism. The struggle against war, imperialism, and fascism demands a ruthless struggle against Stalinism splashed with crimes. Whoever defends Stalinism directly or indirectly, whoever keeps silent about its betrayals or exaggerates its military strength is the worst enemy of the revolution, of socialism, and of the oppressed peoples. The sooner the Kremlin gang is overthrown by the armed offensive of the workers, the greater will be the chances for a socialist regeneration of the U.S.S.R., the closer and broader will be the perspectives of the international revolution.

The Social Basis of Opportunism

In order to understand the present rôle of the social democracy and of the ex-Comintern, it is necessary once again to recall the economic foundation upon which opportunism in the world labor movement rests.

The flowering of capitalism which lasted, with inevitable oscillations, up to 1913, enabled the bourgeoisie on the one hand to raise slightly the living standard of certain proletarian layers, and on the other to throw rather juicy sops to the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labor, thus raising them above the masses. The trade-union and parliamentary bureaucracy, whose "social problem" appeared close to a solution, was in a position to point out to the masses the beginnings of a change for the better in their own lives. This is the social basis of reformism (opportunism) as a system of *illusions* for the masses and a system of *deceit* on the part of the labor bureaucracy. The reformist optimism of the Second International reached its most luxuriant flowering in the years of last economic boom prior to the war (1909-1913). For this reason, the leaders hailed the war and depicted it to the masses as an *external* calamity that threatened the bases of growing national welfare. Hence, the policy of "defense of the Fatherland" which was in actuality on the part of the masses an unconscious, and on the bureaucracy's part a conscious or semi-conscious defense of the imperialist interests of their respective bourgeoisies.

The war proved in reality to be not an "external" calamity which had temporarily disrupted national progress but rather the explosion of internal contradictions of the imperialist system at a moment when further progress on the basis of this system had become practically impossible. And since the war could neither enlarge our planet nor restore youth to capitalism, it ended by accelerating and aggravating in the extreme all the processes of capitalist decay. With the decline of democracy set in the decline of the labor bureaucracy. Fascism brought the workers "only" redoubled enslavement; to the reformist bureaucracy it brought utter ruin.

The political form of democracy, even if in an extremely mutilated condition ("emergency powers", immigration laws, abandonment of the right of asylum, etc.), has been preserved among the great powers only by Great Britain, France, and the United States, the richest, traditionally the most predatory and privileged capitalist countries which have long since concentrated in their hands a lion's share of the colonial possessions and the chief natural resources of our planet. It is not hard to find the explanation for this "natural selection". Democracy can be maintained only so long as class contradictions do not reach an explosive state. In order to mitigate social frictions the bourgeoisie has been compelled to provide feed for a broad layer of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, and the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labor. The bigger the feeding-trough the more ardent is social-patriotism. The reformist feeding-trough has nowadays been preserved only in those countries which were able in the past to accumulate vast wealth, thanks to the exploitation of the world market, and their pillage of the colonies. In other words, in the condition of capitalist decay a *democratic régime* is accessible (up to a certain time) only to the most *aristocratic* bourgeoisie. The basis of social-patriotism remains colonial slavery.

In countries like Italy and Germany, which have not inherited from the past vast accumulations of riches and which are deprived of the opportunity of obtaining super-profits from their colonies, the bourgeoisie has destroyed the parliament, dispersed the reformist bureaucracy and placed the workers in an iron vise. To be sure, the Fascist bureaucracy devours not less but more than the reformist bureaucracy; but, in return, it is not compelled to make concessions to the masses nor to issue drafts which decaying capitalism can no longer pay. Deprived of its feeding-trough, the retired social-democratic bureaucracy of Italy, Germany and Austria holds high the banner of defeatism—in emigration.

The chief source of the strength of the social-patriotic, or more exactly, the social-imperialist parties is the protection of

the bourgeoisie which through the parliament, the press, the army and the police, protects and defends the social democracy against all kinds of revolutionary movements and even against revolutionary criticism. In the future war, owing to the sharpening of national and international contradictions, this organic bond between the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie will be revealed still more openly and cynically, or to put it more exactly, it is already being revealed, especially in the treacherous policy of the People's Fronts which were absolutely inconceivable on the eve of the last war. However, the initiative for the People's Fronts originates not from the Second but the Third International.

Communo-Chauvinism

The monstrous and rapid development of Soviet opportunism finds its explanation in causes analogous to those which, in the previous generation, led to the flowering of opportunism in capitalist countries, namely, the parasitism of the labor bureaucracy which had successfully solved its "social question" on the basis of a rise of the productive forces in the U.S.S.R. But since the Soviet bureaucracy is incomparably more powerful than the labor bureaucracy in capitalist countries, and since the feeding-trough at its disposal is distinguished by its almost unlimited capacity, there is nothing astonishing in the fact that the Soviet variety of opportunism immediately assumed an especially perfidious and vile character.

As regards the ex-Comintern, its social basis, properly speaking, is of a twofold nature: on the one hand, it lives on the subsidies of the Kremlin, submits to the latter's commands, and, in this respect, every ex-communist bureaucrat is the younger brother and subordinate of the Soviet bureaucrat. On the other hand, the various machines of the ex-Comintern feed from the same sources as the social democracy, that is, the super-profits of imperialism. The growth of the communist parties in recent years, their infiltration into the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, their installation in the state machinery, the trade unions, parliaments, municipalities, etc., have strengthened in the extreme their dependence on national imperialism at the expense of their traditional dependence on the Kremlin.

Ten years ago it was predicted that the theory of socialism in one country must inevitably lead to the growth of nationalist tendencies in the sections of the Comintern. This prediction has become an obvious fact. But until recently, the chauvinism of the French, British, Belgian, Czechoslovak, American and other communist parties seemed to be, and, to a certain extent, was a refracted image of the interests of Soviet diplomacy ("the defense of the U.S.S.R."). Today, we can predict with assurance the inception of a new stage. The growth of imperialist antagonisms, the obvious proximity of the war danger and the equally obvious isolation of the U.S.S.R. must unavoidably strengthen the *centrifugal nationalist tendencies* within the Comintern. Each one of its sections will begin to evolve a patriotic policy on its own account. Stalin has reconciled the communist parties of imperialist democracies with their national bourgeoisies. This stage has now been passed. The Bonapartist procurer has played his rôle. Henceforth the communo-chauvinists will have to worry about their own hides, whose interests by no means always coincide with the "defense of the U.S.S.R."

When the American Browder deemed it possible to declare before the Senatorial committee that in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union his party would be found on the side of its passionately beloved Fatherland, he himself might have possibly considered this statement as a simple stratagem. But in reality, Browder's answer is an unmistakable symptom of a change from a "Moscow" to a "national" orientation. The "stratagem" arose out of the necessity of adaptation to imperialist "patriotism". The cynical grossness of this stratagem

(the turn from the "Fatherland of the toilers" to the Republic of the Dollar) reveals the profound extent of degeneration that has occurred and the full extent of the dependence of the sections of the Comintern on the public opinion of the bourgeoisie.

Fifteen years of uninterrupted purges, degradation and corruption have brought the bureaucracy of the ex-Comintern to such a degree of demoralization that it has become able and anxious to openly take into its hands the banner of social-patriotism. The Stalinists (we shall soon have to say, the ex-Stalinists) have not, of course, set the Thames on fire. They have simply picked up the well-worn banalities of petty-bourgeois opportunism. But in propagating them, they have injected into them the frenzy of "revolutionary" *parvenus*, who have turned totalitarian slander, blackmail and murder into normal methods of "defending democracy". As for the old classic reformists, washing their hands in innocence after every embarrassing situation, they have known how to use the support of the new recruits to chauvinism.

In that imperialist country which happens to be in the same camp with the U.S.S.R. during the war (if any such is found), the section of the ex-Comintern will, naturally, "defend" Moscow. This defense, however, will be of no great value, for in such a country all parties will "defend" the U.S.S.R. (In order not to compromise itself with its imperialist ally, Moscow would probably order the communist party not to shout too loudly, and might possibly try to dissolve it altogether.) On the contrary, in countries of the hostile camp, *i.e.*, precisely where Moscow will be in greatest need of defenders, the ex-communist parties will be found completely on the side of their imperialist Fatherland: this course will be infinitely less dangerous and far more profitable. The ruling Moscow clique will reap the just fruits of fifteen years' prostitution of the Comintern.

The Second and Third Internationals in Colonial Countries

The true character of the social democracy as a party whose policy rested and still rests on imperialist exploitation of backward peoples appears most clearly in the fact that in colonial and semi-colonial countries the Second International has never had any influence. The labor bureaucracy of imperialist countries feared either consciously or semi-consciously to set in motion a movement in the colonies that might have undermined the basis of its own prosperity in the metropolitan centers.

It was otherwise with the Comintern. As a genuinely internationalist organization, it immediately threw itself upon the virgin soil of the colonies and thanks to the revolutionary program of Leninism gained important influence there. The subsequent bourgeois degeneration of the Comintern transformed its sections in colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially in Latin America, into a left agency of European and American imperialism. Parallel with this, a change occurred also in the social basis of the colonial "communist" parties. Mercilessly plundering its Asiatic and African slaves and its Latin American semi-slaves, foreign capitalism is at present compelled in the colonies to feed a thin layer of aristocracy—pitiful, pathetic but still an aristocracy amid the universal poverty. Stalinism has in recent years become the party of this labor "aristocracy" as well as of the "left" section of the petty bourgeoisie, the office-holders in particular. Bourgeois lawyers, journalists, teachers, *etc.*, adapting themselves to the national revolution and exploiting the labor organizations to make careers for themselves, find in Stalinism the best possible ideology.

The revolutionary struggle against imperialism demands courage, resolution and the spirit of self-sacrifice. Where are the petty-bourgeois heroes of the phrase to find these qualities? On the other hand, adaptation to "democratic" imperialism permits

them to carve out placid and pleasant careers on the backs of the toilers. The best possible way of hiding this adaptation from the workers is provided by the slogan of "Defense of the U.S.S.R.", *i.e.*, friendship with the Kremlin oligarchy. This opens up an opportunity of publishing newspapers without readers, arranging pompous congresses and all sorts of international publicity. This corporation of professional "Friends of the Soviet Union", fake "socialists" and "communists" who by their noisy declamation against Fascism cover up their social parasitism and their subservience to the imperialists and the Kremlin oligarchy has become a veritable plague of the labor movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Stalinism—under all its masks—is the chief obstacle in the path of the liberating struggle of backward and oppressed peoples. The problem of colonial revolutions has henceforth become indissolubly linked with the historic mission of the Fourth International.

The International Association of Squeezed Lemons (No. 3¼)

The London Bureau of incurable centrists (Fenner Brockway, Walcher and Co.) jointly with Brandler, Sneevliet, Marceau Pivert, and with the participation of "sections that have split from the so-called Fourth International", have united in view of the war danger to create—please do not smile!—the War Emergency Fund. These gentlemen did not bother their heads about a "fund" of ideas. Thank Heaven, they are materialists and not idealists. It is open to doubt whether this new "unification" represents a danger to imperialism. But it does perform a great service to the Fourth International, for it brings together the shallowness, the hybridity and inconsistency of all varieties and shades of centrism, *i.e.*, that tendency which is in sharpest contradiction with the spirit of our epoch. Like all similar mechanical "unifications", it will become a source of new internal conflicts and splits and will fall to pieces at the very moment that the hour for action arrives.

Could it be otherwise? The organizations occupied with the heroic creation of the "Fund" did not arise on the basis of a common program, but have arrived from all the corners of the political map of centrism as the homeless splinters of old opportunist parties and factions, continuing even today to play with all the colors of the opportunist rainbow, and to evolve in different directions. All of them have steadily declined and grown weaker in recent years, with the exception of the newly-split party of Marceau Pivert, for which the same unenviable fate may be predicted. In no country in the world did the London Bureau succeed in creating a new organization, from young fresh elements on the basis of its own program. No revolutionary group will rally to this banner which has neither a past nor a future. In the colonial countries the London Bureau does not possess even a shadow of influence. It may be regarded as a law that the "revolutionary" organization which in our imperialist epoch is incapable of sinking its roots into the colonies is doomed to vegetate miserably.

Each of these outlived groups holds together by force of inertia and not by the strength of ideas. The one organization with a more serious revolutionary past in this quarter, the P.O.U.M., has to date proved incapable of courageously revising its centrist policy, which was one of the main reasons for the collapse of the Spanish revolution. The remaining members of the group are even less capable of criticism and self-criticism. The spirit of senile diletantism hovers over this whole enterprise.

Assuredly not a few "remnants" had gathered in the beginning around the banner of the Fourth International. But the enormous work of selection, cleansing and re-education was accomplished here on the basis of a scientific theory and a clear

program. This work, the meaning and importance of which philistines have never understood, has gone on and is still going on in an atmosphere of free, open and patient discussion. Whoever has failed to pass *this* test has proved in action his organic inability to contribute anything to the building of a revolutionary International. It is these winnowed, worn and rejected "remnants" that have been incorporated today into the "fund" of international centrism. This fact alone places on the entire enterprise a stamp of hopeless disability.

In a lucid moment Marceau Pivert declared a few years ago that any tendency in the working class conducting a struggle against "Trotskyism" thereby characterizes itself as a reactionary tendency. This did not, we notice, prevent Pivert, as a congenital centrist whose words are always contrary to his deeds, from joining the London Bureau which seeks to create a physiognomy of its own by convulsively shying away from "Trotskyism".

It is not hard, however, to forecast that the bourgeoisie, the reformists and the Stalinists will continue to label these creators of the "Fund" as—"Trotskyists" or "semi-Trotskyists". This will be done in part out of ignorance but chiefly in order to compel them to excuse, justify, and demarcate themselves. And they will actually vow, with might and main, that they are not at all Trotskyists, and that if they should happen to try to roar like lions, then like their forerunner, Bottom the weaver, they succeed in "roaring" like sucking doves. We know them: they are no fledglings. The Fenner Brockways, the Walchers, the Brandlers, the Sneevliets, the Piverts, as well as the rejected elements of the Fourth International have managed in the course of many long years—for some, decades—to evince their hopeless eclecticism in theory and their sterility in practise. They are less cynical than the Stalinists and a trifle to the left of the left social democrats—that is all that can be said for them. That is why in the list of the Internationals they must therefore be entered as No. 3 $\frac{1}{8}$ or 3 $\frac{1}{4}$. With a "fund" or without one, they will enter into history as an association of squeezed lemons. When the great masses, under the blows of the war, will be set in revolutionary motion, they will not bother to inquire about the address of the London Bureau.

Perspectives

All the forces and mainsprings of the last war are again being set in motion but in an incomparably more violent and open form. The movement follows well-worn grooves and consequently proceeds at a swifter pace. Nobody believes at present, as they did on the eve of 1914, in the inviolability of frontiers or the stability of régimes. This is an enormous advantage to the revolutionary party. If on the eve of the last war, the sections of the Second International themselves did not know as yet what their conduct would be on the morrow, and adopted super-revolutionary resolutions; if the left elements only gradually freed themselves from the pacifist swamp and groped for their road, then today *all the starting positions have been occupied with precision prior to the war*. Nobody expects an internationalist policy from the social-democratic parties which themselves do not promise anything but the "defense of the Fatherland". The departure of the Czech social-patriots from the Second International is the beginning of the latter's official disintegration along national lines. The policy of the Third International is fixed in advance almost as distinctly; the prognosis in this case is only slightly complicated by an element of adventurism. If the German and Italian social democrats and ex-communists will be platonic defeatists, it is only because Hitler and Mussolini forbid them to be patriots. But wherever the bourgeoisie still continues to feed the labor bureaucracy, the social democrats and ex-communists will be found completely on the side of their General Staffs, and, what is more, the first fiddle

of chauvinism will be in the hands of the musicians of the Stalin school. Not only the fiddle, but also the revolver aimed at the revolutionary workers.

At the beginning of the last war, Jean Jaurès was assassinated, and at the end of the war, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. In France the assassination of the leader of the French socialist party did not deter other leaders from entering the government of imperialist war. In Germany the murder of two great revolutionists was accomplished with the direct participation of the social-democratic government. The actual murderer in France was an obscure petty-bourgeois chauvinist, while in Germany counter-revolutionary officers did the killing. The situation today even in this respect is incomparably clearer. The work of exterminating the internationalists has already commenced on a world scale prior to the outbreak of the war. Imperialism no longer has to depend on a "happy accident". In the Stalinist Mafia it has a ready-made international agency for the systematic extermination of revolutionists. Jaurès, Liebknecht, Luxemburg enjoyed world fame as socialist leaders. Rudolf Klement was a young and as yet little known revolutionist. Nevertheless the assassination of Klement because he was the secretary of the Fourth International is of profound symbolic significance. Through its Stalinist gangsters imperialism indicates beforehand from what side mortal danger will threaten it in time of war.

The imperialists are not mistaken. If they succeeded, after the last war, in maintaining themselves everywhere except in Russia, it was only because of the absence of revolutionary parties. Freeing themselves with difficulty from the web of the old ideology, with its fetishism of "unity", most of the oppositional elements in the social democracy did not go further than pacifism. In critical moments such groupings proved more capable of checking the revolutionary mass movement than of heading it. In this sense, it is no exaggeration to say that the "unity" of the parties of the Second International saved the European bourgeoisie.

At present, sections of the Fourth International exist in thirty countries. True, they are only the vanguard of the vanguard. But if today, prior to the war, we had mass revolutionary organizations, then revolution and not war would be on the order of the day. We lack this, of course, and we hold no illusions on this score. But the position of the revolutionary vanguard is far more favorable today than it was 25 years ago. The main conquest is that before the war there already exist in all the most important countries of the world tested cadres, numbering hundreds and thousands of revolutionists in growing numbers, welded together by the unity of a doctrine, and tested in the school of cruelest persecutions by the imperialist bourgeoisie, the social democracy, and, in particular, the Stalinist Mafia. The Second, the Third, and the Amsterdam Internationals cannot at present convene their congresses, because they are paralyzed by their dependence on imperialism and because they are torn asunder by "national" contradictions. On the contrary, the sections of the Fourth International, despite their extremely meager resources, the difficulties of obtaining visas, the murder of their secretary and the hail of repressions, were able in the most critical moment to convene their international congress and adopt unanimous decisions in which the tasks of the present titanic struggle are formulated precisely and concretely, on the basis of all historic experience.

These precious cadres will not be swerved from their road by any wave of chauvinism, nor intimidated by Stalinist Mausers and knives. The Fourth International will enter the next war as a tightly-welded unit, whose sections will be able to follow one and the same policy, irrespective of the boundaries and trenches dividing them. It is quite possible that at the beginning of the war, when the blind instinct of self-preservation combined with chauvinist propaganda will push the popular masses towards

their governments, the sections of the Fourth International will find themselves isolated. They will know how to withstand nationalist hypnosis and the epidemic of patriotism. In the principles of internationalism they will find a bulwark against the herd panic below, and the terror from above. They will view with contempt the oscillations and vacillations of philistine "democracy". On the other hand, they will listen closely to the most oppressed sections of the population and to the army pouring out its blood. Each new day of war will work in our favor. Mankind has become poorer than it was 25 years ago, while the means of destruction have become infinitely more powerful. In

the very first months of the war, therefore, a stormy reaction against the fumes of chauvinism will set in among the working masses. The first victims of this reaction, along with Fascism, will be the parties of the Second and Third Internationals. Their collapse will be the indispensable condition for an avowed revolutionary movement, which will find for its crystallization no axis other than the Fourth International. Its tempered cadres will lead the toilers to the great offensive.

Leon TROTSKY

COYOACAN, D.F., Oct. 10, 1938

Martov's Mysticism

THE PUBLICATION IN English of a number of essays by the late Menshevik leader Martov under the title of *The State and the Socialist Revolution* is intended by its publishers, the semi-syndicalist, semi-anarchist, semi-socialist *International Review* group, to furnish theoretical arguments for all those who behold in Stalinism a necessary and inevitable product of Leninism. The social-democrats anxious to justify the treacherous rôle of their Menshevik brothers during the Russian Revolution, the intellectuals disheartened and disillusioned by the ugliness of Stalinism and yearning for democracy, peace and righteousness, the pseudo-scientific Marxists eager to defend their passivity by quotations from Marx, will all utilize Martov's arguments against Bolshevism to assail the movement which accepts the essentials of the Bolshevism of Lenin and rejects Stalinism as the very antithesis of that Bolshevism.

It was not a bad move to choose Martov as the theoretical champion of the various groups and tendencies hostile to Bolshevism. His long history in the revolutionary movement, his knowledge of the works of Marx and Engels, his internationalist position during the World War enable him to play a comparatively effective rôle as an opponent of Bolshevism on moral and intellectual grounds. And besides, he can be transformed into something of a prophet. For did he not, even during the life of Lenin, condemn the lack of democracy in the Soviet Union and is that not sufficient proof that he foresaw the development of Leninism into Stalinism?

No serious Marxist can have the slightest objection to any attempt to reëvaluate Bolshevism in the light of the experience of the last decade and a half. If Bolshevism has been tried and found wanting it is necessary to recognize that fact and proclaim it throughout the world. The interests of the working masses transcend all considerations of prestige and he would indeed be disloyal to those interests who would cling to an ideology which in practise has brought nothing but harm to the working-class movement. But it is equally bad to throw a system of ideas overboard merely because of unexpected and disappointing results. With the intellectuals who have reached the conclusion that Stalinism is the natural outgrowth of Leninism it is a case not of a reasoned analysis but of an emotional reaction to an admittedly terrible situation. If they are looking for a solid theoretical basis to justify their emotional reaction they will have to find something more substantial than the arguments offered by Martov.

"Soviet Mysticism"

Beginning his pamphlet with an attack on what he calls "soviet mysticism" Martov falls into a mysticism just as bad, if not worse, than that which he attributes to the Bolsheviks. According to Martov the Bolsheviks invested the soviets with a magic power. They conceived of them as perfect instruments for the realization of the victory of the proletariat, applicable at

all times and under all conditions. It is undoubtedly true that in the days of Lenin when the revolutionary Marxists were compelled to defend the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviets as against the dictatorship of the capitalists through parliamentary forms of government, the stress was laid on the superiority of soviets as against a parliamentary régime with the inevitable result of some exaggerations due to over-emphasis. Not having had any experience with Stalinism the proponents of soviets, in the early days of the revolution, did not discuss the problem of their possible or probable degeneration and the causes for such degeneration. By and large they conceived of them as democratic instruments affording the proletariat a far greater opportunity for initiative and self-expression than that offered by a parliamentary régime and therefore far more suitable to the needs of proletarian democracy.

If nothing else, the constant attempts by Lenin and other prominent Bolsheviks to rid the soviets of bureaucratic distortions prove that Martov has created a straw man in attributing to any responsible Bolshevik thinker the idea that soviets contain something in their very nature which guarantees the victory of the proletariat.

If any one is guilty of mysticism it is Martov who evidently is of the opinion that, once having taken over state power, the soviets are destined to function as the instrument for the dictatorship of a minority. No matter what the conditions may be when the soviets assume power, no matter what takes place afterwards, it is inevitable that they should serve as a means used by a minority to dictate to the majority. Martov's criticism of the functioning of the soviets in the days of Lenin may or may not be justified but it remains an intricate puzzle why any one should consider that the manner in which the Russian soviets functioned is something inherent to soviets as such regardless of time, place and conditions. It is difficult to see how Martov in criticizing the practises of the Russian soviets should have failed to discuss the problem whether the soviets functioned as they did because of specific Russian conditions or because soviets by their very nature are incapable of functioning in a democratic manner.

The question of course is not whether the mere existence of soviets absolutely guarantees the victory of the proletariat. The destruction of the Russian soviets by the Stalinist régime is sufficient proof that such is not the case. Assume for a moment that the soviets, immediately after the October Revolution, could and would have functioned in the most democratic manner imaginable, it still remains true that the continued existence of soviet democracy and of the soviets themselves would be determined, in the last instance, by social and economic factors and not by the mere existence of democracy, or by the degree of education possessed by the proletariat or by the good will and intentions of the party leading the soviets.

As pointed out by Trotsky in his *Revolution Betrayed*, the political safeguards described by Marx, Engels and Lenin as essential to a workers' state are not sufficient to prevent its degeneration. Economic and social conditions are far more powerful factors in determining the development of a soviet régime than any political measures taken to guard against a bureaucratic degeneration. Against adverse economic conditions the best intentions in the world and the greatest number of political safeguards are helpless. Under favorable conditions democracy within the soviets is absolutely essential to assure the building of a socialist society. But it cannot prevail over unfavorable conditions.

Martov's treatment of the whole subject necessitates a discussion of the relative merits of soviets and parliament for the exercise of working-class rule. We can readily accept his definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat as "the power used by the proletariat to crush all resistance which the exploiting class might oppose to the realization of the socialist and revolutionary transformation", but that still leaves the question open as to the state form through which that dictatorship can be exercised most effectively.

Theoretically there is nothing to prevent the exercise of the dictatorship of the proletariat through a parliamentary régime. Just as theoretically it is possible to conceive of the working class gaining power by getting a majority in a bourgeois parliament. Parliament could be reformed to a point where those characteristics which Marx noted as belonging to the Paris Commune and which Lenin considered essential for soviets would also be part of the parliamentary system. Establish a unicameral system, place the executive branch of the government under the complete control of the legislature, give the right of election and recall at all times, establish the principle that the remuneration of the representatives should be no higher than the average wage of a worker and you have a parliament through which the dictatorship of the proletariat can easily express itself. We can go further and say that the feature which most sharply distinguishes soviets from parliament and which affords the greatest opportunity for the industrial workers to dominate the state, that is, the establishment of the factory as the basic electoral unit, can also be made part of the parliamentary system. But then there could be no further argument, for the parliamentary system would be transformed into a soviet system. We would leave the realm of historical reality and enter into the domain of pure abstraction.

History offers no proof whatever that parliaments can be reformed so as to assume all of the characteristics of what we deem to be essential to soviets. On the contrary, the indisputable fact is that even in the most liberal period of capitalist domination the parliamentary system did not offer a great deal of democracy. It was only when the Paris Commune and the soviets came into being that we saw a recognition, in principle at least, of the necessity of completely democratizing the state.

The most decisive factor, however, in raising soviets or workers' councils to the dignity of a state apparatus is the fact that in the period of revolutionary crisis they constitute the organizations that unite the masses in the struggle for power. In the course of the final struggle against the capitalist ruling class, organizations are created which include and are capable of mobilizing the vast majority of the exploited masses. It is then no longer a theoretical question of the relative merits of soviets and parliament. The latter represents the capitalist ruling class and the former expresses the desire of the proletariat to achieve power. Even prior to the actual seizure of power the soviets assume to function in certain respects as a state and what is more natural than that the successful outcome of the struggle should invest them completely with state powers. The parliamentary régime representing the interests of the capitalist class having

been defeated, the organizations of the working masses take its place.

Democracy and Soviets

In accepting the thesis that economic and social factors were primary in determining the manner in which the Russian soviets functioned in the early period of the revolution and the course of their development after Lenin's death, we do not ignore the necessity for and the influence of democratic procedure and of the conduct of the party in the leadership of the soviets. It cannot be too frequently repeated, and the fate of the Soviet Union under Stalin makes it obligatory upon us to do so, that socialism cannot be achieved without the completest soviet democracy. But he leaves the firm ground of Marxism who would make a fetish of democracy, something more than a means to achieve socialism. We can and must enunciate general rules of democratic procedure but not to recognize that there may possibly arise situations (necessarily, they must be extraordinary) when it would be justifiable to deprive a minority group of its rights is to forget that there is such a thing as a class struggle.

Martov's labored argument on behalf of universal suffrage assumes that under soviets there would necessarily be a restriction of suffrage. The suffrage would of course be broadened by granting the right to vote to a great number of people who are not permitted to vote under capitalism. And under normal conditions there should be no necessity for depriving bourgeois groups of the right to vote. The proletariat does not make its revolution with the intention of depriving any one of any right except the right to exploit labor. Universal suffrage must be recognized as essential to soviet democracy and only the most compelling reasons would justify a temporary violation of that rule.

Together with universal suffrage there must exist under a soviet régime the right of groups to organize and adhere to their own parties in opposition to the dominant party; freedom of press and of assembly; the protection of the individual against arbitrary acts of government officials; a fair and impartial trial for everyone accused of a violation of any law. In other words all the democratic rights which a bourgeois democratic republic boasts about but limits in actual practise should prevail in a soviet republic. And not only for workers but also for members of the former ruling class. A proletarian government under normal conditions has nothing to fear from any bourgeois group.

Unfortunately the proletarian revolution first occurred in economically and culturally backward Russia. That backwardness together with the fierce civil war that followed the revolution left their mark upon the character of the soviet régime. Opponents of proletarian revolutions in more advanced countries confuse themselves and try to confuse others by transferring the specific characteristics of the Russian Revolution and the Russian soviets to all future revolutions and soviet régimes. There are many innovations introduced by the Russian Revolution which will be adopted by the working classes of more advanced countries but there are just as many features which the American workers, for instance, would never think of copying.

It would have been perfectly legitimate for Martov, and it is now for any one else, to argue that certain tactics followed by the Bolsheviks were wrong. That it was wrong, for instance to give the factory workers five times the electoral power granted to the peasants, that it was wrong to arrest enemies or alleged enemies of the revolution without first obtaining a warrant, *etc., etc.* One would be compelled to examine the particular feature under dispute with reference to the situation existing at that time. As it is Martov and his present followers want everybody to believe that all of the tactics followed by the Bolsheviks were and are considered matters of principle applicable to all revolutions and under all conditions.

As revolutionary Marxists we shall defend the democratic rights of all groups under soviet rule but we must reject the idea that democratic rights are so sacred that they can never be violated even as against enemies of the revolution. The interests of the revolution transcend all other considerations and in normal times those interests can be furthered by the utmost democracy for all groups, including the enemies of the proletariat. To deprive any group of its democratic rights involves the possibility of dangerous consequences, just as injecting a powerful drug into a sick body is involved with danger. But in the world of reality one has to take some chances of making even dangerous mistakes. Only members of the Civil Liberties Union can fight for democracy for all peoples at all times.

It can be admitted that here and there there may have been and probably were needless restrictions on the democratic rights of groups and individuals but for that not only were the civil war and famine conditions to blame but also the attitude of the parties who were opposed to the Bolsheviks and now howl about the "Bolshevik dictatorship". It is quite certain that had all the parties that were represented in the soviets submitted to the soviets after the Bolsheviks obtained a majority, there would have been a great deal more of democracy than there actually was. The decision of the Right factions and of the Martov group to leave the soviets and the subsequent defense of the counter-revolution by some of the Right Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists created a situation where it was impossible for the soviets to function in as democratic a manner as was desirable.

If the Bolsheviks under great stress at times violated soviet democracy, the social-democrats would have nothing to do with working-class democracy. They clung to democracy only when it meant their right to control the soviets and with it the right of the capitalists and landlords to control the nation. In their desire to assure the victory of the working class the Bolsheviks may have made mistakes, but in their attitude of hostility or passivity to the revolution the social-democrats of all varieties were guilty of crimes against the working masses.

Marxism, Blanquism and Passivity

According to Martov all the errors of the Bolsheviks can be traced to their failure to understand the necessity of waiting for the proletariat to be completely educated to the realization that socialism is desirable and necessary. The Bolsheviks, if we believe Martov, represent the tradition of Blanquism which stood for the idea of an active minority gaining power during a period of revolutionary ferment when the uneducated majority is willing to follow the extreme faction. Having achieved power this minority would change the capitalist psychology of the majority by education. The Bolsheviks, in other words, are metaphysical materialists in contrast to Martov and others who were anxious to postpone the revolution to some future date and are therefore justified in classifying themselves as dialectic materialists.

No revolutionary Marxist will quarrel with the general propositions enunciated by Martov to the effect that the social consciousness of the proletariat is determined by its social life; that the conditions of capitalist society compel the proletariat to enter on the road of struggle against those conditions and in the course of the struggle both the environment and the consciousness of the proletariat emancipates itself mentally and culturally.

But Martov's formulation, correct in a general way, cannot solve a single serious problem, let alone the problem of problems, the question of the social revolution. While he does not forget to mention that the conscious will of the revolutionary vanguard has something to do with the process of educating the proletariat, his whole attitude can be correctly described as a passive one, hoping for a well-mannered revolution to occur in the far-distant future.

It has been explained over and over again that Marxism dif-

fers from Blanquism not because the latter believes in the decisive action of a minority but in that it considers the necessity of having the action of the minority depend upon prevailing social factors, including amongst them the degree of education and the state of mind of the working class and the lower middle class.

What heights of education must the proletariat reach? What is the degree of understanding that it must have of the socialist outlook? Martov would have agreed that the possibility for examining the masses to test their knowledge of socialism is excluded. He would have agreed even that all that the masses can be expected to comprehend, under the adverse conditions of capitalism, is that the present system is unbearable and that it is necessary to take over the factories and produce for the welfare of the people. The world of reality does not permit the working class to acquire knowledge gradually. Under conditions of capitalist decay the proletariat is confronted with the choice: take power or suffer the consequences of fascism and decades of ruthless oppression. The pedantic approach of Martov has nothing in common with revolutionary Marxism and can only serve the reformists with an excuse for their betrayals.

Martov's emphasis on the abstract proposition that there must be an educated proletariat leads him to underestimate completely the effective rôle of the vanguard. Granting the overwhelming importance of objective conditions, it is senseless to think that the workers can achieve victory without a leadership formulating correct tactics and strategy. The masses do not come together on their own initiative and decide when and how to take power. They who loudly proclaim that the workers require no leadership are in reality against any leadership but their own.

The existence of an active minority is part of the general environment, and its activities have a bearing both on the change of the environment and the transformation of the mental attitudes of the masses. Were we to agree with Martov we would have to conclude that the educational activities of the minority leading a class that is in power are without any effect. But what an unreasonable conclusion that would be. If the capitalist minority can and does mould the thinking of the masses through control of all educational and propaganda facilities why can not the party placed in power by the workers utilize the means at its disposal to teach the workers the ideas and practises of socialism?

The intellectuals who are in mortal fear of a disciplined party will do us a great favor if they will figure out how the proletariat can emancipate itself without any leadership. We must unfortunately admit that dangers of bureaucratic development exist in every party, but the fact still remains that to reject the necessity for a party means to reject the proletarian revolution and to invite fascism.

Measured by every standard and even taking into consideration the actual results of Stalinist degeneration, the action of Lenin and his party are more than justified before history. The present Martovs can sit back and bemoan the fate of mankind; the revolutionists will build the Fourth International and follow in the footsteps of Lenin.

Albert GOLDMAN

A nation-wide campaign, petitioning Congress to repeal all laws restricting freedom of immigration, has been inaugurated by the American Fund for Political Prisoners and Refugees.

The petition calls for Congressional abrogation of all laws abridging the right of immigration in order to permit the victims of Nazi persecution to enter this country.

Copies of the petition are available at the national office of the American Fund, Room 1609, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

This petition campaign is endorsed by THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and we call upon all our readers and friends to support it.

What is "Socialized" Medicine?

Movement Afoot

"SOCIALIZING" MEDICINE has been a topic of newspaper comment ever since the beginning of the economic crisis ten years ago. Even before that, there was enough dissatisfaction with medical service to have necessitated the studies of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care from 1928 to 1931. Recently, every periodical from the *New York Times* to the pulp magazines such as *True Story* has discussed the subject over and over again. Most publications appear to be in substantial agreement that some change is necessary, except those representing the Manufacturers Association of American Medicine—the American Medical Association. Upon deeper examination one finds many differences of opinion as to the extent and type of "socialization" that should be undertaken, but the fact remains that there is today more of a popular interest in health and medical care than at any time since the early years of the century, when the most outrageous abuses of quacks and patent medicine manufacturers were curbed as a result of popular demand.

The interest of all classes in these problems is due to several causes: for one thing, people of widely different incomes may have identical health needs; moreover, even the richest cannot feel secure about his health unless at least the infectious diseases are reasonably well checked among all classes. Employers have learned, too, that they lose money by high rates of sickness among workers, with the rapid labor turnover and the constant discontent which they produce. But the most important reason for this sudden, unprecedented concern of the bosses over the health of the workers is that reforms in medical service constitute one of the few important concessions that capitalism can now offer the working class without directly affecting its own interests. As there is a genuine need for such changes, the initiative could safely be left to the spontaneous demand of the people. Naturally, members of the working class, who feel the direct effect of the woefully inadequate health services far more than others, are pressing for new benefits with more insistence than any other group.

It was in fact largely due to the political pressure of various labor and farm organizations that the administration finally called the National Health Conference in July of this year, after postponing any such definite action month after month because of the violent reactionary opposition of the A.M.A. The central offices of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. were represented at the conference as well as a number of their constituent unions, such as the Amalgamated, the S.W.O.C., the Cannery and Packing Workers, the U.A.W., the I.L.G.W.U., and the U.M.W. In addition, there were the Railway Brotherhoods, the Farm Bureau Federation and other farm organizations. But the Conference also included many organizations from other classes as, for instance, the American Legion, women's clubs, church groups and large corporations.

All this is evidence of a wide interest in better medical care, but the tendency to cut across class lines has produced the greatest confusion among workers (often encouraged by specially interested persons) as to what constitutes a truly progressive program. There is serious danger that measures designed to increase the dependence of the workers upon the state machinery through bureaucratically controlled health services will almost certainly be instituted unless the demands of the masses are vigorously put forward upon a strictly class basis.

Is There a Need?

It is idle to tell readers of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL that there are untreated medical needs in every section of the working class in every part of the country, without including the questions of preventive care (which exists, if at all, only among the most privileged classes). Reactionary elements constantly belittle the problem, however, arguing that the small existing needs do not justify a major change in the system of care, and for this reason the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of present facilities has become an important issue in itself. One needs only to be reminded of a few facts to realize how false the claims are of those who defend the *status quo**: the maternal mortality rate in the U.S. is (1936) 57 per 10,000 live births—more than twice that of Sweden; there are 40,000 deaths a year from tuberculosis, half of which are preventable; nearly one adult in ten is infected with syphilis; there are 60,000 new cases of congenital syphilis every year—*ninety-eight percent of which are preventable*; there is urgent need for nearly 50,000 public health nurses, for 70,000 dentists, and for 400,000 hospital beds if even minimum health standards are to be met. Most revealing of all from the workers' standpoint are the facts which indicate what groups of the population are the ones who suffer the most from this appalling inadequacy of service:

Family income	Annual days of disability per person	Annual physician calls per sick person
Under \$1,200	8.9	1.9
\$1,200 - 2,000	5.7	2.0
2,000 - 3,000	5.0	2.3
3,000 - 5,000	3.0	2.7
5,000 - 10,000	3.0	3.6
10,000 and over	3.0	4.7

From this table we see that the lowest income group has a disability rate nearly three times that of the well-to-do but at the same time receives less than half as much medical attention. Put in another way, it is found that nearly thirty percent of serious disabling illnesses among relief families and families just above relief level received no physicians' care whatsoever, while in families with more than \$3,000 income the figure is only 17 percent. These figures are a dramatic answer to the old saw that the very rich and the very poor receive fine service while only the middle classes suffer! The highly touted "gifts" of free medical service by government, philanthropy, industry, and doctors all told amount to little more than one-fifth of the \$3,500,000,000 spent in this country annually for all forms of medical care—the rest comes directly out of the pockets of the sick people themselves. This represents about four percent of the entire national income, and reliable studies show that in each income group almost exactly four percent of the family income, on the average, is spent on health—quite contrary to the self-righteous claims of those who would have us believe that the rich pay for the sicknesses of the poor. There is little doubt that working class families bear the brunt of the inadequacies and inefficiencies of all the health services.

Some reactionaries argue that poorer people could have more medical care if they were not so ignorant and superstitious about doctors, hospitals, and clinics and would seek their services more freely. There is some truth in this: how could it be otherwise with the woeful lack of health education in these classes and their experiences with the crowded conditions of public clinics? More important than ignorance, however, is the simple fact of the worker's meager wage and his need to spend it first

*Statistics are from the reports of the President's Technical Committee on Medical Care, and from publications of the Julius Rosenwald Fund.

for the daily necessities of food and clothing, leaving little over when illness strikes. To add to the seriousness of the situation is the fact that when a worker is sick his wages stop at once and his family is left with nothing whatever. For all but the most dramatic emergencies and the most advanced illnesses, therefore, he is afraid to call the doctor because of the expense, and if one visit can be stretched, by taking a chance, to cover a whole sickness, he will take that chance and not ask for a second call. Unfortunately, he is more apt to try a patent medicine or a druggist's recommendation, partly in ignorance, perhaps, but much more in the hope that a ten cent bottle of medicine may prevent a ten dollar doctor's bill.

Worst of all, what little the worker is able to spare for health is spent for an inefficient system of care which is as antiquated as the ox-cart. This country, with a ratio of one doctor per 815 persons, ranks highest in the world in numbers of medical men. Far more satisfactory medical care than this country has ever had, however, is given regularly in the Scandinavian countries, with a ratio of one physician per 2,156 persons. It is obviously not a question merely of the number of licensed doctors. What are the causes of such glaring inefficiency? For one thing, the system of medical private practise, with its reduplications of equipment, office space, technical assistance, *etc.*, is wasteful in the extreme. This overhead alone eats up, on the average, forty percent of a doctor's income. In addition, no one doctor can possibly keep up with all the ramifications of modern medical science; extensive laboratory tests and consultations with specialists are essential for the proper care of a very high percentage of cases today. What chance has the worker of getting these services for his small payments so long as practitioners are isolated in separate offices with no access to other men or to laboratories? But the "overhead" can be strikingly reduced and the ease of consultation and laboratory work much increased by the assembling of many doctors into a single group where they can pool their knowledge and share the expenses of equipment, *etc.*, for the benefit of the patient. That such groups are more efficient both medically and financially is amply testified by the success of such institutions as the Mayo Clinic, and the Ross-Loos Clinic.

In another way, the inefficiency of the present system is exemplified by the relatively small expenditure on preventive medicine. Of the \$3,500,000,000 annually spent on health, only about three percent goes for any kind of prevention—the other ninety-seven percent is used in trying to cure those already sick, many times with entirely preventable diseases. How can the worker possibly take advantage of modern knowledge of preventive medicine, no matter how much he has saved for medical care, with such a meager program of public health education? If he could go regularly for physical examination, if he could send his wife for proper prenatal care, if he could have his children vaccinated against infectious diseases, the same amount of money he now spends would bring in many times its present returns in increased health. In fact, it is reliably calculated that if the total now expended on medical care in this country were put to really efficient use through group clinics, periodic health examinations, enlarged public health services, training much needed public health nurses and dentists and the like, it would be more than sufficient to furnish adequate care for every man, woman, and child in the country. In this respect, the problem of medical care under capitalism is no different from those of food and clothing—there are resources enough to provide plenty for all, but utilization of the resources is wasteful, inefficient, and unequally distributed, all to the disadvantage of the workers who produce them.

There is another aspect of the need for medical care, and it is one in which it differs from needs for other necessities. While needs for most things are quite predictable, illness strikes for

the most part without warning as to time, place, or duration. If the medical expenses of a given family are added up for a full generation they usually come to about the average amount for its income group—approximately four percent of the family income for the whole period. But year by year, the costs of illness fall very unevenly and may be so severe as to ruin altogether some families while others escape without paying anything. Statistically, this works out to mean that ten percent of the families of a given income group bear forty-one percent of the medical costs of that group for the year, while fifty-eight percent of the families in the same group bear altogether only eighteen percent of the costs. But statistics tell little of the real story; through them it is hard to see the hopeless burden of misery and debt that an illness costing \$1,000 can put upon a family which earns at most \$2,000 all told. Obviously, there is only one way of dealing with such catastrophes—the application of the insurance principle, either through general taxation or through periodic prepayments directly into health insurance funds.

Proposals

To meet the need indicated above there have been a great number of proposals which must be briefly outlined. All of them have been called "Socialized Medicine" at one time or another. The most prominent and, for the immediate future, the most important of these is the program presented at the National Health Conference which the next Congress will be asked to enact. It envisages the expenditure of gradually increasing sums until, by the tenth year, a total of \$850,000,000 per year is to be spent, half to be obtained by the Federal government and half by local and State authorities. This money would be used for five purposes: 1. expansion of the public health, maternal, and child welfare services; 2. expansion of hospital facilities; 3. medical care for relief and very low income groups; 4. a general program for "self-supporting persons of limited means", including subsidies to health insurance plans; 5. insurance against loss of wages during sickness. This is a fully progressive program, so far as it goes, and should be supported by all labor groups, together with demands for a more rapid increase of the size of the appropriations and for a larger total expenditure. It remains to be seen whether or not Congress will enact the necessary legislation, but the most vigorous support will be needed for there will be violent and well-paid opposition from many groups of reactionaries.

Complete State Medicine, with every doctor a salaried officer of the government, is the second important method of "socializing" medicine now being seriously proposed. This is supported by the Medical League for Socialized Medicine, and to a certain extent, by the famous "Committee of 430" which is leading a revolt within the A.M.A. From a working-class point of view, this would be dangerous because it would remove all possibility of workers' control of their own doctors and leave their health needs at the mercy of the capitalist state. Strikers in Flint and in Minneapolis, for example, had great difficulties in obtaining medical aid from ordinary private practitioners during labor crises and, judging from their experiences, a state-controlled medical service might prove a powerful weapon against militant workers.

Compulsory Health Insurance, on either a Federal or State basis, is widely proposed and has received the official endorsements of both the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. If the premiums could be obtained from employers without wage reductions, and if, at the same time, workers' control of the services rendered could be assured, this would be a very valuable means of obtaining certain benefits. These two conditions are not likely to be fulfilled, however, and if they are not, the compulsory insurance method might well become as dangerous a weapon of the state

as complete State Medicine itself. Unfortunately since the leaderships of both the large labor groups are themselves not interested in direct workers' control, they are ready to believe that the whole system can be put down paternalistically on their members and made to work willy-nilly. Moreover, compulsory health insurance in itself does not make any provision for health education or preventive medicine and without these features is at best only a sort of crutch. Another difficulty is that unless provision is made for the rendering of medical service by physicians in group clinics, rather than in private practise, the method would be wasteful in the extreme and prohibitively expensive if anything approaching proper care were given. Finally, any compulsory insurance scheme which does not include hospitalization, consultation with specialists, and benefits for dependents as well as the worker himself will be worth next to nothing. Nevertheless, if all these precautions can be observed, there is a great deal to be gained from giving the benefits to so large a number of persons as would naturally be included. Its soundest application, from the working-class point of view, would be in connection with powerfully built, self-controlled trade union health associations.

Such associations can be built upon the principle of voluntary health coöperatives, such as have been so successful in the Scandinavian countries and have been started in a few places in this country. If such organizations are to be truly progressive, certain fundamental requirements must be strictly observed: 1. the units must be relatively small and geographically unified to insure close supervision by the membership; 2. there must be unqualified democratic control; 3. medical service must be rendered by well-integrated groups of doctors and laboratories; 4. the insurance method of periodic prepayments must be used; 5. a continuous program of education for the membership in preventive medicine and health needs must be instituted; 6. hospitalization, consultations, laboratory tests, and dental care must be included, and the benefits must be for the whole family and not simply for the working members; 7. the organization should avoid duplication of effort by working with the public health authorities of the community and taking advantage of all the services they can provide. Such groups can now be built by trade unions in most localities without coming into conflict with existing laws regarding insurance. They would foster the consciousness of independence and self-reliance among workers instead of leading them to await concessions from their employers or the government. There are, however, serious objections to voluntary health associations as a solution for the widespread need for better medical care. For one thing, the payments do not include support by the employers or the government, and they do not compensate in any way for the inequalities of income in different parts of the country. Moreover, the membership will tend to rise and fall with economic circumstances, often leaving the individual without benefits just at the time he needs them most. Finally, the lack of centralization of control leaves the way open for great variation in the quality of service given as well as for local racketeering and political interference. For these reasons, voluntary associations can be widely useful only as integral parts of a larger program.

So far as actual steps toward "socialization" are concerned, the hospital insurance plans have proceeded much farther than any others. To the extent that these plans offer real benefits workers should be encouraged to join them, but it must be pointed out clearly that at best they are no more than a stop-gap and offer none of the advantages of a continuous, all-inclusive health service. Furthermore, these plans were originally instituted to save the privately owned hospitals from bankruptcy, and even today the membership has no voice in their management and no control over the budgets of the hospitals to which the funds are eventually paid. As nuclei about which genuine,

democratic health associations can be built, they may in many instances prove to be of great value.

The A.M.A.

The American Medical Association, as the official organization of the country's 110,000 private practitioners, has consistently opposed all forms of change in the present system of fee-for-service medical care. This does not mean that the rank and file of the Association's membership really supports such a completely reactionary position. In fact, a large majority of the doctors are themselves having the greatest difficulty making a living and would welcome regular salaries from government or insurance sources. But the Association's tricky electoral system is such that virtual control of the organization is assured for the wealthy big-shot consultants who are rightly afraid that any change toward "socialization" would threaten their lucrative practises. The Association exercises autocratic control over the rank and file by means of its power to expel unruly members and thereby deprive them of the right to admit patients to most hospitals. It is by using this power that the A.M.A. has been fighting the Group Health Association in Washington and similar organizations in other places. The only hope for such organizations at present is the building of hospitals under their own control. Fortunately, the A.M.A. cannot directly threaten the license of a physician to practise, although in the case of the Elk City (Oklahoma) Coöperative, for instance, it has attempted to use its influence to force the state authorities to revoke licenses. Another powerful weapon of the central officialdom of the A.M.A., represented by Dr. Morris Fishbein, is its control of the advertizing in medical journals throughout the country. If a certain journal becomes rebellious, Dr. Fishbein puts on a financial squeeze-play by warning advertizers to withdraw from it or face the cancellation of their contracts with the *Journal* of the A.M.A.—their chief means of contact with the medical profession at large. When the Milbank Fund, which is financed by Borden's Milk Co., showed too much interest in socialized medicine the A.M.A. told its members to advise their patients to avoid Borden's products. The boycott was so effective that the Milbank Fund found it advisable to withdraw from the field to save Borden's from ruin.

Recently, a special meeting of the House of Delegates of the A.M.A. was held to discuss the Government's health program. The plans to extend public health services, build hospitals, and to insure against wage loss during sickness were heartily endorsed, but any form of insurance which would provide actual medical care in sickness was denounced as "bureaucratic, costly, and political." In the happy phrase of the *New York Times* correspondent, "The doctors expressed alert reservations to any plan which might tend to separate them from any patients other than those unable to pay." At this same meeting, approval was given to "cash indemnity" sickness insurance, by which cash benefits are paid to the sick subscriber who then pays his own doctors' and hospital bills. Adequate medical care, if purchased on such an individual basis for minimum fees, would cost approximately \$310 annually per family (exclusive of dentistry)—obviously a prohibitive figure for most families. The same service, purchased through group practise plans, would cost less than \$100 annually. It is at once apparent that the A.M.A.'s approval of cash indemnity insurance is an empty gesture intended merely to give the appearance of progressive action while diverting public attention from the real issues at stake.

Trade Union Activity to Date

Both the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. have, up to the present, confined themselves to the support of compulsory health insurance mentioned above. Possibly the C.I.O. convention will offer a more complete program. Certain unions, however, have made

attempts to deal with the situation individually. The oldest effort is the Union Health Center of the I.L.G.W. This is merely an out-patient clinic which is partially supported by union funds but which charges in addition a small fee for each visit. The service is excellent and the union members show a considerable pride in having their own medical service, but it is clearly a very limited effort. The U.A.W. has been running a Medical Research Institute (recently suspended for lack of funds) with one full-time doctor and several part-time doctors, but this has so far devoted itself almost entirely to the pressing problems of Workmen's Compensation. Minneapolis Teamsters Local 544 has been trying out a plan for the retention of a physician on a part-time basis; the Food Workers in New York have a somewhat similar plan but it is practically limited to periodic health examinations. Some of the best plans now in operation are those of various Railroad Brotherhoods—the Trainmen in particular have gone so far as to take care of their own tuberculosis members under private physicians at Saranac Lake, N. Y. Except for these and some smaller attempts such as the Wage Earners Health Association of St. Louis, little is being done by labor organizations as yet. Perhaps the most hopeful sign for the future was the announcement last August that the U.M.W. is contemplating an all-inclusive health service for its members. If this attempt is successful on a large scale, it may well serve as a model for other working class groups.

Transitional Demands of a Revolutionary Party

The task of a revolutionary party with respect to medical care is to help workers everywhere to obtain the greatest possible concessions without ever losing sight of the fact that these will be at best merely temporary gains on the road towards socialism. In particular, the largest possible support must be sought from federal, state, and local government funds together with obligatory employers' contributions. Equally important is the retention of direct control of the services by the workers themselves. Probably these two ends can best be achieved by urging a large Federal Health Program but at the same time insisting that any program, whether compulsory or otherwise, should allow full autonomy for all voluntary health associations which may be formed. Such a plan will benefit from federal aid in equalizing to a certain extent the economic differences in various sections of the country and in maintaining a uniform standard of excellence in the service. Employer's contributions should be made through general taxation rather than through direct dealings with individual groups, thus avoiding as much as possible the passing on of the burden to the workers through wage cuts as well as employer intervention in the workings of a health association, especially in times of strikes or other militant action. Federal and State subsidies to the voluntary groups should be as large as possible and in the form of regular grants-in-aid given without conditions other than those guaranteeing a high standard of service. Members of health associations would thus retain the responsibility for their own organizations which would promote at the same time the development of independence and the confidence in their own physicians without which no system of medical care can be successful. If labor organizations are to urge such a plan, they must cease at once their unhealthy dependence on the government to take care of them and begin immediately to build their own health associations into powerful groups which can demand autonomy and subsidies when Federal action is finally taken.

Workers' Health and Socialism

The achievements of medical science in the past seventy-five years have been almost unbelievable. It is not necessary to

repeat in detail the horrors of the days before Pasteur, before anaesthesia, before Lister, before the discovery of X-rays, salvarsan, insulin, or sulphanilimide to be assured that we are now living in an age of extraordinary technical advance. But the brilliance of these discoveries (and they have been well publicized) has tended to obscure a less pleasing side of the picture: the failure of capitalist society to distribute these benefits to any except the most privileged classes. Laboratory workers continue to search for new methods of cure, but they are studying details and refinements now—the magnificent sweep of the years from 1860 to 1920 has faded away. While medical science is still far from being able to solve all the problems of health, there are many diseases today which could be entirely wiped out if the knowledge already available were to be applied for improvement of the millions who need it so desperately.

To name but a few examples of the ever-widening gap between technical resources and social usefulness, consider the failure to control syphilis, maternal mortality, and the nutritional diseases, especially pellagra. Many details of these conditions are not yet understood, yet all the fundamental information for stamping them out is already at hand. It is safe to say that there is no disease about which our knowledge is so complete as it is about syphilis. The causative organism, the methods of infection, excellent means of testing for its presence, and a nearly certain cure for it have all been known for twenty-five years. And yet the syphilis rate in this country is among the highest in the world! Obstetricians have shown repeatedly in small communities that they can cut present maternal mortality figures in half whenever they have the opportunity to use their knowledge to the utmost advantage. The cause of pellagra and effective means for its prevention and cure were discovered over twenty years ago, and yet starvation wages and tenant farm conditions continue to take their toll in pellagrous insanity and death. Further research on these conditions may be valuable to abstract science, but the crying need in these and many other fields today is not for more research but for wider use of the knowledge we already have.

Such tragic failures to utilize scientific information for the benefit of all are only conceivable under the chaotic wretchedness of capitalism. Already the example of the early years of the U.S.S.R. has given a hint of what can be done when medical knowledge and medical research are used for the improvement of society instead of for the profit of the practitioner. The achievements of the Soviet Union in public health work amazed the entire world and were long the envy of physicians everywhere. Such solid accomplishments remained intact long after other Soviet institutions gave way under the plunderings of Stalinism. But scientific leaders could not escape forever the disasters which befell their comrades in other walks of life, and one by one they too have now fallen victims to the increasing ferocity of the purges. Demands for favors from the privileged officialdom have undermined the usefulness of workers' health centers and sanatoria. Scientific work has deteriorated, cramped by an ideology which insists upon results that suit its momentary whims. If medical science in the U.S.S.R. is to fulfill its early promise, it must be freed from the totalitarian yoke.

But, no matter how easily accessible the best medical techniques might be made, the fundamental problems of workers' health cannot be solved under capitalism. The best imaginable health program cannot be more than a feeble palliative so long as mass unemployment, crowded slums, low standards of living, chronic malnutrition, mutilation and death from war are the expected lot of most of mankind. Only through the final victory of world socialism can the vast stores of available scientific knowledge really be put to work for the full benefit of humanity. "Socialized medicine" is a meaningless phrase except in a socialized society.

William HARVEY

Reading from Left to Right

By Dwight Macdonald

FOR WEEKS NOW, the New Deal's war drive has been marching along in black headlines: "ARMY MOBILIZES INDUSTRY FOR WAR", "ROOSEVELT WARNS NATION MUST ARM IN WORLD OF FORCE", "ROOSEVELT ORDERS DEFENSE SURVEY". Much is said of "defense", but very little of who and where is The Enemy against whom we must defend ourselves. A recent issue of *Time* lifts the veil a bit: "The Army's present guesses rate future wars in the following order of likelihood: (1) civil uprisings on the U.S. mainland—some sort of trouble in the social order; (2) war in South America in case fascist economic penetration rubs the U.S. past endurance; (3) war in Europe or Asia for any reason; (4) least likely of all, invasion of the U.S. mainland. . . . Surprising to most U.S. citizens would be the contents of the General Staff 'White Paper'—a thorough plan for suppressing civil disorder in the U.S. In it every large city is divided into possible battle zones. Paved highway intersections are marked down for airplane runways. . . . U.S. Army officers mull over their 'White Paper' a great deal of the time and talk about it none of the time." Thus the bourgeoisie, as well as the proletariat, can act on Liebknecht's slogan: "The main enemy is within our own country."

Even the editors of the *Nation* would presumably deplore a Class 1 war. But let us assume that the war comes under categories 2, 3, or 4—what then? The hosts of democracy would be led by a former corporation lawyer and National Commander of the American Legion named Louis A. Johnson, the real power in the New Deal's War Department. He has been "notably successful" in persuading big industrialists to go along with the New Deal's war plans. His eloquence has been reënforced by the fact that government contracts, in the next war as in the last war, will be on the scandalous 'cost-plus' basis, which makes cheating the government almost obligatory. As for the rest of us, Mr. Johnson points out that in the next war, "The civilians will be fighting, too." Every one will be mobilized, either to fight or to work. The middle classes and the workers will be conscripted to a man for military or labor service. "The Social Security Board's list of some 40,000,000 U.S. citizens, identified by age, residence, and occupation," drily comments *Time*, "will be very useful for this purpose."

Definitions, No. 1: "A radical is one whose inclinations and beliefs are liberal but whose methods are badly thought out and if put into practice would not work." Franklin D. Roosevelt (*N.Y. Times*, Oct. 16, 1938).

The Communist party is supporting the LaGuardia administration in New York City under an inspiring banner: BUILD SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTY!

When a "liberal" employer is losing money, he acts just like any other employer who is losing money. This axiom is being currently demonstrated by J. David Stern, the only 100% New Dealer among the big newspaper publishers. Mr. Stern has made quite a good thing out of liberalism, expanding his operations

from the *Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post* to the *Philadelphia Record*, which he made into that city's first liberal paper since Ben Franklin died. In 1933, he bought the old *New York Post* and grafted fresh liberal glands into it. But of late Mr. Stern has run into difficulties, especially with the *Post*: he has had to borrow \$3,000,000, to cut the *Post's* budget by \$5,000 a week, and to chisel on wages. He was the first big publisher to sign a contract with the Newspaper Guild. But that was when the New Deal, and Mr. Stern's investment in liberalism, were in full summer. Now, as autumn draws in, the Stern papers are clashing openly with the Guild. An attempt is being made on the *Camden Courier-Post* to form a company union. And on the *N.Y. Post*, Mr. Stern, balked for months by the Guild in his efforts to slash wages, has discovered a most ingenious detour around union contracts. Not long ago, he asked his employees to "lend" him 10% of their paychecks, the loans to be repaid at 2% when the paper makes money again. "You would lend money to your grandmother," he argued, "why not to your boss?" He also argued that the transaction was a purely personal matter between him and each employee, and so no affair of any trade union. The old-line A.F. of L. mechanical unions on the *Post* agreed to this interpretation readily enough, but the Newspaper Guild was obstinate. Mr. Stern said he would close down the *Post* in forty-eight hours. The Guild was still firm. Mr. Stern denies he called up President Roosevelt and asked for help. But he *did* call up John L. Lewis, who then called up Guild officials in Manhattan and urged them to accept the proposition "the way Stern wants it". This the Guild did. It is now preparing its forces to put up a better fight in Philadelphia.

It is odd that very little of all this has appeared in the public prints. The Stalinists in control of the Newspaper Guild are said to be reluctant to expose publicly the staunchest journalistic ally of the New Deal. Partly for this reason, partly from sheer journalistic anæmia, the *Nation* and the *New Republic* have said nothing about Mr. Stern's recent activities. The story goes that the *Nation* a year or so ago accepted an article debunking Stern's liberalism, but lost its nerve when the manuscript was branded unfair and untrue by . . . J. David Stern.

Sensational rumors are going about that Chiang Kai-shek has joined the Communist party. They may be traced to the headline in the *N.Y. Times* a few days after the loss of Canton and Hankow: "CHIANG SEES GAINS IN EVERY RETREAT."

A Washington news service, circulated confidentially among business men, gives the best summary of the Wages & Hours Law: "Much room for wiggling and quibbling."

This Is the Way the World Ends. Obituaries are generally printed on the inside pages of American newspapers, but the November 3 issue of the *N.Y. Times* devoted most of its front pages to death notices. The deceased was that system of world society which existed between the battle of Waterloo and the Munich conference. There were three major death notices. (1) *The "Open Door" in China*: Japan announced "the establishment of a new order that will insure the permanent stability of East Asia" and added, "Japan is confident that other powers will adapt their attitude to the new conditions prevailing in East Asia." (2) *The Franco-British Hegemony in Europe*: the German and Italian foreign ministers met in Berlin and gave Hungary 4,000 square miles of Czech territory, without consulting either the League of Nations or the four-power consortium solemnized a month earlier at Munich. (3) *The British Empire*: a

third front-page item reported the approval by a landslide vote in the House of Commons of the Anglo-Italian treaty, giving Italy a free hand in Spain and the Mediterranean. Several hours earlier, a Spanish rebel trawler had shelled and sunk a British-owned freighter within sight of the Norfolk coast. "The news," reported the *Times*, "had not the slightest effect upon the debate in the Commons."

A few years ago, T. S. Eliot wrote:

This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.

Definitions, No. 2: "Marx and Engels were German high-brows who sat at the feet of Hegel." Jerome Frank in *Save America First*.

Due Process of Law. Section 7-a of the N.I.R.A. gave legal sanction to labor's right to organize. So does the Wagner Act. When the employees of the Weirton Steel Co. tried to form a union, E. T. ("Shoot-a-Few") Weir defied the N.R.A. labor board, took the case into the courts, and won a victory, after two years of litigation. All the liberals shook their heads and said, Tsk! Tsk! And now the comedy is being played over again, almost line for line. The *second* Weirton case is now rounding out its second year. In May 1937, the Steel Workers Organizing Committee filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board against the Weirton Steel Co. The Board got around to serving a complaint on the company three months later, and hearings began August 16, 1937. By February 28, 1938, the Labor Board had completed its case. The company began its defense on April 5, 1938, and has been at it, off and on, ever since. To date, 473 witnesses have given 31,919 pages of testimony in 180 trial days. The record now contains 3,721 exhibits and 7,435 objections and motions (of which 6,044, almost all of them made by counsel for Weirton, were overruled). Once more the liberals are clucking with indignation and surprise.

Suggested name for the *nouveaux-Marxist* Park Avenue radicals, whose forbears were immigrants on the Mayflower: Plymouth Reds.

The American Russian Institute is a most respectable organization "to promote cultural relations between the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union". In the October issue of its *American Quarterly on the Soviet Union*, Major George Fielding Eliot published an article on the Soviet army which was so frank that, a few weeks later, the editorial board had to print a lengthy and abject apology for the article, practically repudiating it and promising to be good little boys in future. And indeed the Major's piece was not very tactful: he expressed doubt as to the Red Army's morale after recent heavy executions of its commanders, and he criticized, from a purely military viewpoint, the subordination of Red Army officers to Kremlin agents, placed at their elbow in the guise of "political commissars". Worse yet, the article appeared during the Czech crisis, when Russia's military strength was an especially tender subject. And worst of all, some demon inspired the Major to make a single exception to his criticism, namely, the Special Red Banner Far Eastern Army. "This force, 400,000 strong," he wrote, "has been very little if at all affected by the Tukhachevsky affair. . . . The political commissar system is here perhaps more

honored in the breach than in the observance. Thousands of miles from Moscow, commanded—apparently with a free hand—by the most capable of all Soviet generals . . . the Far Eastern Army is easily the most efficient and the most formidable military force at the command of the Soviet government." Shortly after Major Eliot's article appeared, it became evident that the commander of the Far Eastern Army, Marshal Vasili Galen-Blücher, "most capable of all Soviet generals", had fallen into disgrace and perhaps had even shared the fate of Marshal Tukhachevsky. The political exigencies of the bureaucracy had once more clashed with the needs of the Soviet Union, and with the usual result.

Some engineers of the Republic Steel Corporation who are laying a pipe-line in Venezuela have sent Tom Girdler, chairman of the company, a perfect gift: Marguerita, a 120-pound jaguar. No mention is made of a cage being included.

The C.P.'s of today will be the M.P.'s of the next war.

Not long ago, Justice Salvatore A. Cotillo of the New York Supreme Court issued a sweeping injunction against picketing in the Busch jewelry stores strike. When the strikers violated its terms, as they had to do if they were to continue the strike, he handed out heavy jail sentences and fines, and also cited their lawyer for contempt of court. The interesting thing about Judge Cotillo is that he was elected to his present position, which pays some \$20,000 a year, with the endorsement of the American Labor Party.

I was shocked by the "message to the future" which Albert Einstein wrote to be deposited in the New York World's Fair 5,000-Year "Time Capsule". (A rather vague message from Thomas Mann was also included, along with such objects as a lipstick, a baseball, and a newsreel of the bombing of Canton.) There was nothing vague about Einstein's message. He began with a few words on this century's progress in applied science, and went on to point out that "the production and distribution of commodities is entirely unorganized" and that "people living in different countries kill each other at irregular intervals". Then, as calmly and soberly as though he were setting down the inescapable final terms of an equation, Einstein concluded: "This is due to the fact that the intelligence and character of the masses are incomparably lower than the intelligence and character of the few who produce something really valuable for the community." It is hard to accept the fact that a man may be a great scientist and at the same time, in political matters, as much the unconscious dupe of his class prejudices as lesser men. And it is depressing to think that Dr. Einstein is a refugee from that very fascism whose ideology he here expresses.

Definitions, No. 3: "The advance guard of human thought is everywhere weighed down with useless Marxist baggage." (Editorial in the September issue of the well-known *avant-garde* magazine, *Common Sense*.)

The forces of Democracy won a close victory in the recent Chilean elections. It was the first Popular Front coalition in South American history, and it carried that peculiar form of political life far beyond anything yet seen in Europe. (The law

of combined development may have had something to do with it.) The champion of Democracy, Pedro Aguirre Cerda, was a millionaire landowner and a member of the "Radical" party, which is about as radical in Chile as in France. He made it clear immediately that there will be no farcical Blum Interlude: the velvet glove will be peeled off the iron hand the day the Popular Front government takes office. "Left-wing governments which have been in power during recent years," Señor Aguirre told reporters, "could have accomplished much more if they had been assured two assets: discretion on the part of the rulers and discipline among the masses." Asked whether his communist supporters might not insist on "extreme policies", Aguirre replied: "The communists and socialists have asked for no pledges, for no places in my cabinet. Their demands have been limited to the platform which we adopted." He also pointed out that, while the Radicals moved slightly to the left in joining the coalition, "the socialists and the communists made an even greater shift to the right". The final comedy touch came when the Chilean *Nacistas*, or Nazis, angry because the present conservative government suppressed their attempted coup last month, joined the Popular Front coalition.

Who dragged whom how many times around the walls of what? To commemorate Chamberlain's aerial visits to Hitler, John Masefield, the Poet Laureate, published the following quatrain in the *London Times*:

As Priam to Achilles for his son,
So you into the night, divinely led,
To ask that young men's bodies, not yet dead,
Be given from the battle not begun.

But I can't help remembering what Achilles did to the body of Priam's son before handing it back to the father. Mr. Chamberlain, too, received a somewhat damaged piece of goods.

Alfred A. Knopf announces for early publication a book

entitled, *The Rise of European Civilization*. I suggest Mr. Knopf put this on his printer's RUSH! list.

The *Spanish Labor Bulletin* for October 14 reports that a joint manifesto has been issued by the Socialist and Communist parties, the C.N.T., U.G.T. and F.A.I. calling for "the unity of the world proletariat" in defense of . . . "liberal Spain".

Practically every one with a radio heard the glad tidings, sent out from the President's fireside shortly before the elections, that Prosperity was once more abroad in the land. Very few people, on the other hand, saw a report issued by the Federal Reserve Board at about the same time, which stated: "The country's volume of deposits is near the all-time peak, while the turnover of these deposits is at the slowest rate on record." In New York City, for example, the volume of checks cashed is normally eighty times the average of deposits. Today, it is only twenty-five times deposits. This means, of course, that capital is piling up in the banks without being able to find outlets for profitable investment. It is true that corporation earnings are reviving, that the automobile companies are rehiring men by the tens of thousands, that the steel industry has pulled itself up to over 60% of capacity operations. But these are superficial indices. It is precisely in the most crucial sector—the stimulation of new capital investments—that the New Deal has broken down most disastrously. Today, as in 1932, investors just aren't investing—despite the housecleaning and fumigating of the S.E.C. Banks just aren't lending—despite the periodical exhortations of Jesse Jones of the R.F.C. to "cease frightening potential borrowers away". (New Dealers, like their friends of the C.P., seem to think of capitalists as wilfully and perversely refusing to make money.) Since bank loans and new—as against refunding—security issues show no signs of coming back to pre-1930 levels, the President's words of cheer are to be taken no more seriously than his famous smile.

The New Phantom: "Socialist Concentration"

NOT A SINGLE stone has been left standing of what was once called the "German People's Front". The flood of appeals, declarations, resolutions and letters that gushed forth for months on end from this Front of Bureaucrats without People, now runs along the gutter in the form of viscous, murky squabbings of the "prominent". Mutual disclosures and exposure-maneuvres are the shabby remnants of what was originally to be or to become the mighty lever for the overthrow of Hitler fascism. Indeed, if the elimination of fascist barbarism depended upon such "fronts" and "levers", then Hitler, Göbbels, Rosenberg and Consorts would not have exaggerated in proclaiming that the Third Reich was founded for thousands of years.

The single practical result that remains of the People's Front specter is a recent sharpening of the antagonisms between Stalinist bureaucrats plus their lackeys and the remaining partners in the People's Front. This development is not without its irony: the "People's Front" leaves behind it as a result precisely that which it sought to bridge and eliminate. The result char-

acterizes retrospectively once more the whole "Front". As in all the preceding years of the Weimar legality and of the emigration, the balance-sheet of every one of the old bureaucracy's undertakings ends with an awful flop. Only, the latest flop of the People's Front is the most harmless. There is nobody to lament its passing, now that the German proletariat has paid with the blood and freedom of its best sons for the preceding adventures of the bureaucratic bankrupts.

It would be underrating (better: overrating) the old bureaucrats to assume that now, after the lamentable end of the People's Front, a period of reflection and political self-criticism will ensue. The bureaucratic apparatuses have their own mechanics: they continue to turn round and round like squirrels in a cage. It is scarcely worth mentioning the summits of the whilom Communist Party of Germany; this crew even continues to play politics with the *cadaver* of the "German People's Front". It turns out open letters, articles of exposure and protest resolutions ("from the Reich"—not produced, as is known, by the old swindlers themselves) by the

bushel. After all, stipends and honorariums must be earned somehow. . . .

The other non- (or: not quite) Stalinist partners of the People's Front have meanwhile found another possibility of giving free rein to their yearning for activity. If they hoped originally to achieve political and organizational unity, that is, the *unity party*, through the "German People's Front", nothing is left to them now but to seek "unity" on a different basis. And this new basis is—the old social democracy.

ON THE "CLAIM TO LEADERSHIP". The condition of what could be salvaged from the S.P.G. in the emigration, certainly offers opportunities for all kinds of bureaucratic combinations. Apart from the old Party Board [*Parteivorstand*] which is, not least of all because of its control of the old apparatus and the cashbox, the dominant factor of the social-democratic emigration, there is no lack of factions and tendencies. The political differences of opinion of the various social-democratic groupings are entirely of a secondary nature: they all move strictly within the confines of the Second International. The *basic question* around which the dispute re-

volves is a narrowly bureaucratic one: *the claim to leadership*. The arguments over this point are as old as the emigration itself. Up to now, however, the old Party Board has been able, by and large, to retain the apparatus firmly in its hands.

The narrowly-limited bureaucratic character of the social-democratic factional fight is a very clear example of how little the remnants of the German labor movement have to do with politics. It is a question of purely apparatus interests—just as in the fat years before Hitler. In contrast to the old days, however, the apparatus today, fortunately, is completely suspended in mid-air. The rôle of the old bureaucracy of all shadings is played out; what it now does and practises boils down to one thing: to preserve its own highly esteemed political corpse.

Are we not perhaps underestimating, with this judgment, the importance of the tendencies and groupings within the social-democratic camp? Not at all. In the first place, these discussions do not reach further than narrow bureaucratic circles, which represent nothing but themselves and a minimal following of people largely dependent upon them (a very important phenomenon precisely in the emigration!). Matters are still worse with regard to the political platform. Just try to discover differences between the *Deutsche Freiheit* and the *Neue Vorwärts*. . . . Always and everywhere the old social-democratic narrow-mindedness, mediocre and below-the-average feuilletons in place of politics. The social-democratic office managers are tossed between events like wreckage among the reefs. That is how it used to be and it is certainly so today. But therewith is answered the question of the significance of the struggle of the social-democratic groups over the "claim to leadership". It is simply a question of narrow apparatus interests, which do not become a hair's breadth more important when they are given the stamp of "unity endeavors". If one seeks a serious political characterization of this situation, there is only one formula: All these internal discussions of the bureaucrats, cloaked as unity endeavors, are in reality the manifestations of decay of the remnants of the old apparatus.

ENTER THE AUSTRO-MARXISTS. After Austria's annexation by the Third Reich, there was automatically posed the question of the fate of the Austrian social democracy. From the theoretical conception of the "Revolutionary Socialists" of Austria follows inevitably the unification with the German social democracy. In practise, however, there first arise certain difficulties. The Austrian social democracy, after its defeat in February 1934, still had the possibility for a few years to build up an illegal organization on a fairly large scale. However, the destruction of the Vienna workers' quarters brought with it the crumpling of the old Austro-Marxian phraseology. Austro-Marxism was driven to the left in the wreckage of the February days. The phraseology of the epoch of

legality no longer suited illegality. This evolution was expressed outwardly in renaming the party "Revolutionary Socialists", with the illegal organization enjoying a certain measure of independence from the emigrated old party leadership of the Austrian social democracy.

Now the question of organization rises for the R.S. What is to become of them? What about the unification with the Reich-German S.P.G.?

This is the point at which the Austrian party intervenes in the German "concentration" debate. The official Austrian standpoint is made known by Gustav Richter in the *Sozialistische Kampf* (No. 1): According to it, there is no hurry about unification, for "the splitting up of the German socialist movement stands in the way of a simple organizational unification of the socialists of Austria and Old-Germany". The old German Party Board in no way represents the German party, so far as the R.S. are concerned, but only one of its groupings, which must first unite with other groupings. As such groups Richter mentions, among others, the tendency around Max Braun (*Landesverband der deutschen Sozialdemokraten in Frankreich*—National Alliance of German Social Democrats in France), the *Neu-Beginnen* [New Beginning] group, and finally also—the S.A.P. [Socialist Workers Party]. Only after the German concentration has taken place, can concentration with the Austrian party be put on the order of the day. A decision of the R.S. says "that the unification can take place only when the German movement has created the political and organizational premises for it".

The position of the spokesman of the R.S. concludes with a number of *organizational* proposals according to which the concentration can be directed, for "the Austrian socialist movement is greatly interested in a speedy advancement of the All-German concentration. It faces the danger of having the splitting up of the German movement transferred also to the Austrian movement. Hence, it will not stand in the future on the standpoint of non-intervention with respect to the problems of the German labor movement." And: "Those who have understood that the German working class needs a new socialist party must be determined to come forward resolutely against all obstacles standing in the way of the 'concentration'."

The article of G. Richter brought new life into the old concentration debate. The Austrians had now, so to speak, formulated their positions, or rather, put an ultimatum. Stampfer, Max Braun, Paul Hertz, *Neu-Beginnen* and—Jacob Walcher expressed themselves on the Austrian conditions in the following numbers of the *Sozialistische Kampf*. Friedrich Stampfer hammered especially upon Richter's formulation that "the German working class needs a new socialist party". Stampfer is in no way of this opinion and he "knows of no Reichs-German social democrat who has associated himself openly or half-openly with this thesis".

The further course of the discussions seems to have proved Stampfer right. Not another word was said about a "new socialist party". Gustav Richter had allowed himself to be carried away too far by the phraseology of illegal Austro-Marxism. And after all, the R.S. themselves are not at all a "new party" but rather the highly legitimate continuation of the old Austro-Marxian party under the conditions of illegality. A partly renovated bureaucracy is still far from being a new party. And Gustav Richter has to this day made no further effort to defend his remark about the "new socialist party".

What is really the content of the "concentration" was formulated most typically and clearly by Max Braun: "*The renaissance of the German social democracy*." However, the words of the bureaucrats need not be overestimated. "Renaissance" means in this case quite simply: the continuation of the old social democratic course with a re-division of the bureaucratic positions. Not even the entrance of the Austrian R.S. has caused the slightest change in this real content of the debate. The R.S. inject themselves only into the game of apparatus diplomacy and the conditions formulated by Gustav Richter speak only too plainly of the fact that they are dictated by the interests of the new R.S. bureaucracy, which is seeking guarantees for itself.

For this fact, there is an exceptionally characteristic circumstance: In all the discussions on the concentration, political problems are spoken of only quite incidentally. And why political problems? After all, it is only the bureaucracy discussing among itself. Paul Hertz even said so openly: "Common action failed up to now not because of objective differences of opinion, but because of the lack of any common organizational relationship." And these organizational relationships—are in reality the apparatus and the bureaucracy.

How long the concentration debate will last, cannot be foreseen. It is taking place in a vacuum. But even if the bureaucratic manoeuvres should finally conclude with an agreement, things will not have changed in the slightest. It is a matter of complete indifference to the destiny of the German and European working class whether a couple of old or a couple of young social-democratic prominent figures "concentrate" or not. The vital interests of the working class are, on the contrary, concentrated today on quite different questions.

THE S.A.P. SEEKS ASYLUM. The S.A.P. plunged into the "German People's Front" with great hopes. Long without any political principles and already fallen into wooden isolation, the S.A.P. hoped for a saving way out by participating in bureaucratic top combinations. It fled from its own hopelessness into the People's Front, making use of a pseudo-radical phraseology in order to justify a separate existence which had long ago become superfluous. But the hopes placed in the 7th World Congress of the Comintern, in Dimitroff and in the People's Front, were all too

speedily shattered. The S.A.P. faced the danger of having to follow its own path again as a result of the collapse of the bigger bureaucrats. Towards this end a whole theory of the "unity party" was elaborately contrived. Jacob Walcher bent all his efforts against being hurled out of the path he had chosen. The S.A.P. clutched convulsively at the *Landesverband deutscher Sozialdemokraten in Frankreich* (Max Braun), as soon as the palmy days of the People's Front came to an end, and thus slipped into the commending social-democratic concentration. Jacob Walcher was permitted to attend the national convention of the Max Braun German social democrats as a guest—and now the S.A.P. received acknowledgment in writing even from the Austrian R.S. that it must not be forgotten in the social-democratic concentration.

In the *Sozialistische Kampf*, Jacob Walcher developed the standpoint of the S.A.P. on the "concentration". In essence, this "standpoint" is an offer of subservience to the R.S. which, according to the S.A.P., "is especially qualified to exercise an active influence upon the re-formation of the socialist movement of Greater-Germany". The S.A.P. dressed itself, by way of change, Austro-Marxistically. The next aim of the concentration cannot be the restoration of the old S.P.G.—yet the revolutionary unity party also "still stands in the far distance". Thus the S.A.P. winds its way between the problems only to land in the end at a concentration which should be consummated on a basis "which is acceptable from the standpoint of revolutionary socialists, who possess the necessary self-confidence and are clear about the tendencies of development". Here Walcher is no longer even original: empty phrases about "self-confidence" and "development" have already given him the possibility more than once of doing some very gingerly dances of demagoguery. The position of the S.A.P. becomes ever more repulsive and fraudulent. It does not want to miss the opportunity of having itself "concentrated" and at the same time looks about for a "revolutionary" mantle. As if cheap phrases could conjure away the fact that the S.A.P. today leads only a politically parasitic existence. As a political organization, it has been dead for some time; it continues to "live" only by bureaucratic combinations. It squirms painfully around all political questions. To be sure, a political platform for the concentration is necessary—but, Walcher adds worriedly, "such a platform will not have to contain everything that corresponds to the doctrines of revolutionary Marxism, for at the present stage, that would mean to narrow down too sectarianly the framework of the concentration". So the concentration ought not to collapse because of political questions and a deal can always be made over revolutionary Marxism. . . .

In the *Neue Front* of August 1938 the S.A.P. defends itself from the suspicion that it is for the restoration of the old S.P.G. The S.A.P. casts off all such sus-

picion and spouts forth a spray of phrases on the complete renovation of German socialism. A shabby play of words. The same thing that Walcher calls "renovation" was called "renaissance of the German social democracy" by Max Braun. And from the position Walcher has taken in the question of the "political platform" and of revolutionary Marxism, it follows clearly that the S.A.P. is painfully avoiding any possibility of coming into conflict with Stampfer, Wels and Hilferding. Finally, the question is not decided by the cheap words but by the political attitude of the S.A.P. But it is precisely politically that the S.A.P. has long ago fallen into the most unprincipled opportunism. What *political* reasons could stand in the way of the unification of Walcher with Stampfer and Max Braun? None—if only Stampfer was willing. The S.A.P. is at all events ready (there is nothing else left for it to do) to dissolve into the social-democratic concentration—not, mind you, into the "old" but into the "concentrated, renovated" S.P.G.

FOR THE NEW PARTY! The social-democratic "concentration" is just as little a politically important factor as the "German People's Front". The events have passed beyond the old bureaucracy and no bureaucratic manoeuvre can turn back developments. Whether the social-democratic groups now concentrate or not, their importance is becoming ever smaller. And if tomorrow the great unity-apparatus from Stampfer to Walcher were to be created, it

would be born only to rot away. The closer they move to the concentration, the more swiftly they approach the next collapse. The consummated concentration would be the clique fight in permanence, which would decompose the last remnants of the social democracy.

No matter how much the bureaucratic cliques squabble among themselves, they are speedily united when it is necessary to combat the idea and the formation of the new German revolutionary party. That is when they take up the cry of "splitting". Another form of the struggle against the new party consists in pasting the label of "new" on the old apparatuses—as the S.A.P. is trying to do with the old S.P.G. But therein lies the confession that the position of the old and shattered organizations is hopeless and that they can never recover by their own forces. The bureaucratic bluff of polishing up again the old ruins will not, however, bring about their recovery.

Our task is clearly marked out: the creation of the new revolutionary party of Germany together with the revolutionary vanguard of the Austrian proletariat. The exposing of the manoeuvre of the old bureaucrats in palming off "People's Fronts" or "concentration" as new political life or a "renaissance", is an indispensable step in preparing the road for the new revolutionary party of Germany.

Oscar FISCHER

PARIS, October 1938

Footnote for Historians

WE DO not envy the future historian of the American revolutionary movement when he faces the problem of tracing the course of the ephemeral sects. Out of consideration for him, we give here a brief factual outline at least of those sects that broke away from our movement. We preface it with the fact that in virtually every case, those who split away proclaimed themselves the only "genuine Trotskyists" and unlike us, whom they doomed to disintegration, the possessors of sure-fire recipes for "mass activity".

Not falling into the above-described category, but first to separate from us were three Italian followers of Bordiga, since constituted as the New York group of their "Italian Left Fraction of Communism". Like their separation from us, their subsequent existence has been quiet, dignified, passive, fruitless and unruffled either by the departure of an old adherent or the acquisition of a new one. Score: no hits, no runs, no errors.

Next, chronologically, was Albert Weisbord, upon the size of whose hats the Passaic strike of 1926 had a most distressing effect. Although he never carried out his threat actually to join our organization, he broke conclusively all relations with it on March 15, 1931—the historic date of the formation of his Communist League of

Struggle. In the heraldic announcement of its birth, he wrote: "Not an isolated sect, but a two-fisted hard group of communists is what we are forming." Its seven years of existence were all lean; each one ended with the loss of another member, the last to go joining the Marxist Workers League (*q.v.*), leaving Weisbord in unchallenged charge of what he now calls the "Friends of the Class Struggle". The plural in "Friends" has the same numerical significance as in the imperial "We". Rewards offered by relatives for information leading to the whereabouts of the Weisbord group having gone unclaimed for years, the money has recently been placed in escrow.

Of the 8 original founders of the Field group, only 3 are left. It would be exaggeration to say that B. J. Field has been strikingly successful in his favorite activity: uniting with other groups. In May 1933, the Workers Communist League was formed by Ben Gitlow and Lazar Becker, two Lovestoneite dissidents. Immediately after the New York hotel strike in 1934, the Fieldites had their first unity—with Gitlow *et al.* (*et al.*—Lazar Becker), under the name of "Organization Committee for a Revolutionary Workers Party". The two ex-Lovestoneites did not tarry long in the O.C.F.A.R.W.P., but sped to the greener

pastures of the Socialist party, where Becker became a henchman of Altman and from which Gitlow retired later to voice his unique theory that "Lenin was the first fascist". A sadder but not wiser Field thereupon reduced the length of his group's name to "League for a Revolutionary Workers Party" and proceeded to "unity negotiations" with Weisbord. These broke down with Field concluding indignantly that "it is impossible to see how such a group with such policies and leadership can contribute anything toward building a genuine revolutionary International". Weisbord reciprocated with a description of Field which only further reduced the latter's faith in the sweetness of the former's lacteal glands. Whereupon Field tried his luck again, this time with the patient Bordigist trinity, themselves worn out by just finished luckless unity negotiations with Weisbord. In January 1936, Field twittingly announced that he had "held a series of joint discussions with the Italian Left Fraction of Communism during the month of November. Eight fundamental questions of the revolutionary movement were discussed and complete political agreement has been arrived at." It goes without saying that just because the two groups were in "complete political agreement" does not mean that there was the slightest reason for uniting. Nor did they. Two months later, that man was at it again, announcing that "negotiations have been proceeding between the Oehler group (R.W.L.) and the L.R.W.P. of the U.S. and promise to result in the fusion of the two organizations". Naturally, the promise was not kept and the fusion died in the egg. But, as the old adage says, unlucky at fusions—lucky at splits. The last fusion attempt broke down right after the May 1936 split of the Field group in New York, when a majority of the membership outvoted the leader and joined with us. Since then, Field's first lieutenant succeeded in effecting a fusion of a more personal kind, the fruits of which he has been enjoying in a Greek villa overlooking the restful, jewelled Mediterranean. Sadder than ever, considerably aged, but not yet wiser, Field sends periodic letters to us for more "unity negotiations", which we are deterred from entering into by his none-too-alluring experiences. Ditto for his counsel on how to win friends and influence masses.

Originally the most numerous of the sects, the Oehler-Stamm group broke from the then Trotskyist Workers Party around November 1935 because of chaste opposition to our proposal to enter the Socialist party and unite with its revolutionary wing. The splitters formed the Revolutionary Workers League whose dire predictions of our impending degeneration and absorption by reformism all but frightened us. Differing only in degree of virulence, the R.W.L., all its offspring and all its predecessors have decayed to the level of Trotsky-baiting sects, hurling at us all the imprecations familiar since the days of "Third-Period" Stalinism. That so far as

their political evolution goes. Organizationally, a no less dismal picture of splits and disintegration must be painted.

Barely split from us, the New York Oehlerite caucus chief, a turncoat named Mendelsohn, left his friends, joined the S.P., and in it became the right wing's anti-Trotskyist finger-man. A few months after his defection, a whole series of leading Oehlerites, typified by Gordon and Gunta, returned to our ranks. In the period following, one Oehlerite after another came back to our movement, was expelled by Oehler for one heresy or another, or retired completely from activity (Kogan in California, Giganti and Garber in Chicago, Pierce in Cleveland, Hirsch in Philadelphia, Gaynor in Newark, Simmons in Kansas City, etc.). In addition to individual defections, the last three years have seen one splitlet after another.

First, early in 1936, came the "Marxist Workers League" in New York which, after a sensational existence of both its members for 19 days, rejoined our movement. Then the R.W.L. recorded the loss of its trade-union "specialist", Joseph Zack, who openly abandoned Marxism to form a new sect, or rather two at a clip: the "One Big Union Club" and the "Equalitarian Society"; in the latter enterprise he is associated with the eminent scholar, S. L. Solon, whose theoretical innovations have thrilled the readers of that political parasites' paradise, the *Modern Monthly*. Following this it lost a group around its theoretical Nestor, Paul Eiffel, adventurer in the movement and dubious figure in general, who advocated the sabotage of the Loyalist struggle against Franco.

Then came a dramatic breathing spell in the series of splits. An Oehlerite stooge group was formed in our ranks in Chicago by a young man named Beckett, who discovered that we were capitulating to Norman Thomas just at the time we were being expelled from the S.P. He called himself the "Marxist Policy Committee". After making his bow with an apostolic denunciation of another ultra-leftist sect in our ranks, led by one Joerger, he announced to a trembling world, in his August 24, 1937 bulletin: "Salemme-Joerger group fuses with M.P.C. on Marxist basis," adding that "in the course of negotiations the M.P.C. found that the S.-J. group did not hold the position criticized in M.P.C. Bulletin No. 2." Hardly had the proletariat finished cheering itself hoarse at the momentous news, than it learned from Beckett, on October 1, 1937, that Salemme-Joerger were knives after all and their line was "not in essence different from that of Cannon, Shachtman, Abern, Glee, Glotzer, Goldman, Heisler, Most, Curtis and all the other herdsmen of *Khvostism*". The tragically disconcerting atmosphere created by this declaration was only partly cleared by the heartening communiqué that Beckett—after the proper and necessarily exhaustive negotiations—was joining the Oehler group.

The R.W.L., meanwhile, had not stood

breathlessly still while waiting for its first recruit. Alarmed at the prospect of the resultant over-expansion, a furious struggle broke out between Oehler and Stamm, perhaps the greatest dispute since the churchmen gathered for the Council of Nicæa in 325 A.D. to work out what became the Nicene Creed of Catholicism. One faction held that the description of Christ, or God the Son, should read "*homo'ousias*", or a being of identical substance with God the Father; the other faction held that the Greek word in question properly had another letter, making it read "*homoï'ousias*", or a being of similar substance with God the Father. Result: the split between the Roman Catholic and the Eastern (Greek Orthodox) churches. Of no less importance was the fight between Oehler and Stamm, the former holding, at the R.W.L.'s historic 3rd Plenum in October-November 1937, that Trotsky, "after a sojourn of 17 years in the Marxist movement, reverted to Trotskyism" and degenerated in 1934, while the latter insisted that Trotskyism degenerated along about 1928 (month not given). It seems that Oehler won, after assailing the rebels for their "false position on democratic centralism [which] has its leader in Stamm, who combines errors of bourgeois democracy with bureaucracy", to say nothing of "his ultra-left and false evaluation of Marxism". But when he sought to put a cap marked "Heresiarch" on Stamm's bloody but unbowed head, Stamm promptly upped and formed his own group, using the old name but with a new little paper which, if it does not differ from Oehler's organ in committing just as many sins of *lèse*-sanity, at least is not as guilty of *lèse*-grammar and *lèse*-syntax.

The idea of the schismatics proved contagious and the splits began all over again. First came another "Marxist Workers League", led by a young soloist named Mienov, who announced in the initial issue of his inevitable bulletin that "to be wrong on the Spanish war means to open the door wide open to social-patriotism in the coming world imperialist war. That is exactly what the Oehler group is doing. . . . We are proud that we split from such a centrist group." All is not, however, what it should be in the M.W.L. Although the majority of the leadership, in its resolution on The Party, writes (Sec. VIII, Part D, Point 1a, §e): "Trotskyism cannot be reformed but must be smashed," we learn that there is a minority of Stonne and Spencer which replies: "In 20 years of history, these comrades of the majority have learned nothing," to which the majority annihilatingly retorts: "We were just informed that Spencer has joined the Trotskyists. Truly, there is no limit to degeneration."

Second Oehlerite split-off (Series II) is the Lennist League, also formed at the beginning of the year. It is led by George Marlen and is unique also in other respects. While definitely anti-gynaicocratic, and taking no formal position on exogamy or endogamy, it is based fundamentally on the primitive gens in so far as one must be

a blood relation of the immediate family, or at least related to it by marriage, in order to qualify for membership. This has the unfortunate effect of somewhat reducing the arena of recruitment, but it does guarantee against contamination. Marlen is so exhausted by his literary efforts to prove that Trotsky is an agent of Stalinism, that he is able to do nothing else. His cool, balanced judgment is sampled by what he says of Field: "The L.R.W.P. is an enemy of the international working class. It is a sabotaging agency in the struggle of exposure and destruction of the Stalinist reaction." Oehler, Stamm, Mienov, Smith, Jones and Robinson—all are contemptuously and severally dismissed as "left Trotskyists". Reminding one irresistibly of the story of the monkey and the elephant is the report current that Marlen is writing a book that will annihilate Trotsky politically. *Sic iur ad astra!* Or, freely translated, that's as good a way as any of getting into the headlines.

The last Oehlerite splinter to pierce the surface is composed of the remnants of the R.W.L. in Philadelphia, led by a lad

named Fleming who is followed by a membership not exceeding one. After a self-imposed novitiate in a "Social Science Circle", it climaxed its liberation from what it calls "ululating Oehlerism" by proclaiming the "Revolutionary Communist Vanguard"—not of Philadelphia, not of the United States, not of the Western Hemisphere, but of the World. Its statutes insist on it. No new members, unfortunately, can be admitted, for the statutes require a two-thirds approval of applications and there are but two members now; however, a congress of the organization is possible, even now, for it "can be assembled by determination of at least half the membership". The R.C.V. is the *reductio ad absurdum* of all the absurd and infantile ultra-leftist sects. The boys are having a fine time playing Revolution. They write in their bulletin (naturally, they have one) under ever so funny pseudonyms: Don Quickshot, Obadiah Fairfax, Robin Redbreast, Jerome Rembrandt and Esther Paris. Just like Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn playing Pirates.

Finally, simple justice demands mention

of the latest and most ferocious group, founded, built, led and staffed by the somewhere-above-mentioned Joerger. His public name is the thumping "Revolutionary Marxist League" and he announces bellicosely in his initial literary production: "We cannot emphasize too much our position that we have nothing in common with the Trotskyite brand of Stalinism or any other inverted form of Stalinism. The various types of Trotskyites (Oehler, Field, Marlen, *et al.*) . . ." Stamm, Mienov, *et al.*, to say nothing of Robin Redbreast, are apparently to be let off with a lighter sentence.

* * *

There are undoubtedly others, which have not come to our attention, but these will suffice to focus the ludicrous picture of sterility and futility to which ultra-leftist sectarianism condemns itself. In making the record, moreover, we have the feeling of pious satisfaction with a good deed done in easing the research-pains of tomorrow's biographer of the movement.

M. S.

Archives of the Revolution

DOCUMENTS of the HISTORY and THEORY of the WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

A Workers' Inquiry

This little work, a product of Marx's last years, first appeared in France, in 1880. It attained a comparatively wide circulation at that time, but subsequently disappeared from sight for fifty years. It has never before been published in this country. It retains, we believe, a variety of interests for us today. In the first place, it is a convincing commentary upon the neo-revisionists now flourishing who try to tell us and the world that Marx was a rabbinical metaphysician spinning out a deductive picture of society from the depths of an Hegelian imagination. We see from this series of questions how Marx's decisive point of reference was not a set of abstract categories but the concrete incidents in the daily lives of the workers. "Exploitation", "surplus value", "rate of profit", are here traced to their living source. Secondly, we may observe the simplicity and directness of Marx's approach to the actual problems confronted by the workers; again, a comment upon those who today find Marx a "great theorist" but so lacking in "an understanding of

psychology". Thirdly, the indirect effect of the questions indicates what Marx meant when he said that the emancipation of the workers must come from the workers themselves. The whole aim of the questions is to make the worker aware of his own predicament in capitalist society, to cut through the fog of illusions and habitual responses and fictions which prevent the worker from understanding his social world, and by thus making the worker conscious of his predicament giving him a chance to solve it. With the changes in industrial production during the past half-century, certain of these questions in their given form have, of course, become archaic. But no one would find difficulty in modifying them in such a manner as to bring them up to date. And no one will doubt what the truthful answer to them would reveal, more shockingly and brutally today by far than fifty years ago: the incalculable, hideous cost that the masses of humanity pay for the continuance of the rule of capitalism.—THE EDITORS.

disposal. We hope to meet in this work with the support of all workers in town and country who understand that they alone can describe with full knowledge the misfortunes from which they suffer, and that only they, and not saviors sent by Providence, can energetically apply the healing remedies for the social ills to which they are a prey. We also rely upon socialists of all schools who, being wishful for social reform, must wish for an *exact and positive* knowledge of the conditions in which the working class—the class to whom the future belongs—works and moves.

These statements of Labor's grievances are the first act which socialist democracy must perform, in order to prepare the way for social regeneration.

The following hundred questions are the most important. In replies the number of the corresponding question should be given. It is not essential to reply to every question, but our recommendation is that replies should be as detailed and comprehensive as possible. The name of the working man or woman who is replying will not be published without special permission, but the name and address should be given, so that if necessary we can send a communication.

Replies should be sent to the Secretary of the *Revue Socialiste*, M. Lecluse, 28, Rue Royale, Saint-Cloud, nr. Paris.

The replies will be classified and will

NOT A SINGLE government, whether monarchy or bourgeois republic, has yet ventured to undertake a serious inquiry into the position of the French working class. But what a number of investigations have been undertaken into crises—agricultural, financial, industrial, commercial, political!

The blackguardly features of capitalist exploitation which were exposed by the official investigation organized by the English government, and the legislation which was necessitated there as a result of these revelations (legal limitation of the work-

ing day to 10 hours, the law concerning female and child labor, etc.), have forced the French bourgeoisie to tremble even more before the dangers which an impartial and systematic investigation might represent.

In the hope that maybe we shall induce a republican government to follow the example of the monarchical government of England, by likewise organizing a far-reaching investigation into the facts and crimes of capitalist exploitation, we shall attempt to initiate an inquiry of this kind with those poor resources which are at our

serve as material for special studies, which will be published in the *Revue* and will later be reprinted as a separate volume.

I.

1. What is your trade?
2. Does the shop in which you work belong to a capitalist or to a limited company? State the names of the capitalist owners or directors of the company.
3. State the number of persons employed.
4. State their age and sex.
5. What is the youngest age at which children are taken on (boys or girls)?
6. State the number of overseers and other employees who are not rank-and-file hired workers.
7. Are there apprentices? How many?
8. Apart from the usual and regularly employed workers, are there others who come in at definite seasons?
9. Does your employers' undertaking work exclusively or chiefly for local orders, or for the home market generally, or for export abroad?
10. Is the shop in a village, or in a town? State the locality.
11. If your shop is in the country, is there sufficient work in the factory for your existence, or are you obliged to combine it with agricultural labor?
12. Do you work with your hands or with the help of machinery?
13. State details as to the division of labor in your factory.
14. Is steam used as motive power?
15. State the number of rooms in which the various branches of production are carried on. Describe the specialty in which you are engaged. Describe not only the technical side, but the muscular and nervous strain required, and its general effect on the health of the workers.
16. Describe the hygienic conditions in the workshop; size of the rooms, space allotted to every worker, ventilation, temperature, plastering, lavatories, general cleanliness, noise of machinery, metallic dust, dampness, etc.
17. Is there any municipal or government supervision of hygienic conditions in the workshops?
18. Are there in your industry particular effluvia which are harmful for the health and produce specific diseases among the workers?
19. Is the shop over-crowded with machinery?
20. Are safety measures to prevent accidents applied to the engine, transmission and machinery?
21. Mention the accidents which have taken place to your personal knowledge.
22. If you work in a mine, state the safety measures adopted by your employer to ensure ventilation and prevent explosions and other accidents.
23. If you work in a chemical factory, at an iron works, at a factory producing metal goods, or in any other industry involving specific dangers to health, describe the safety measures adopted by your employer.

24. What is your workshop lit up by (gas, oil, etc.)?

25. Are there sufficient safety appliances against fire?

26. Is the employer *legally* bound to compensate the worker or his family in case of accident?

27. If not, has he ever compensated those who suffered accidents while working for his enrichment?

28. Is first-aid organized in your workshop?

29. If you work at home, describe the conditions of your work room. Do you use only working tools or small machines? Do you have recourse to the help of your children or other persons (adult or children, male or female)? Do you work for private clients or for an employer? Do you deal with him direct or through an agent?

II.

30. State the number of hours you work daily, and the number of working days during the week.

31. State the number of holidays in the course of a year.

32. What breaks are there during the working day?

33. Do you take meals at definite intervals, or irregularly? Do you eat in the workshop or outside?

34. Does work go on during meal times?

35. If steam is used, when is it started and when stopped?

36. Does work go on at night?

37. State the number of hours of work of children and young people under 16.

38. Are there shifts of children and young people replacing each other alternately during working hours?

39. Has the government or municipality applied the laws regulating child labor? Do the employers submit to these laws?

40. Do schools exist for the children and young people employed in your trade? If they exist, in what hours do the lessons take place? Who manages the schools? What is taught in them?

41. If work takes place both night and day, what is the order of the shifts?

42. What is the usual lengthening of the working day at times of good trade?

43. Are the machines cleaned by workers specially hired for the purpose, or do the workers employed on these machines clean them free, during their working day?

44. What rules and fines exist for late-comers? When does the working day begin, when is it resumed after the dinner-hour break?

45. How much time do you lose in coming to the workshop and returning home?

III.

46. What agreements have you with your employer? Are you engaged by the day, week, month, etc.?

47. What conditions are laid down regarding dismissals or leaving employment?

48. In the event of a breach of agreement, what penalty can be inflicted on the employer, if he is the cause of the breach?

49. What penalty can be inflicted on the worker if he is the cause of the breach?

50. If there are apprentices, what are their conditions of contract?

51. Is your work permanent or casual?

52. Does work in your trade take place only at particular seasons, or is the work usually distributed more or less equally throughout the year? If you work only at definite seasons, how do you live in the intervals?

53. Are you paid time or piece rate?

54. If you are paid time rate, is it by the hour or by the day?

55. Do you receive additions to your wages for overtime? How much?

56. If you receive piece-rates, how are they fixed? If you are employed in industries in which the work done is measured by quantity or weight, as in the mines, don't your employers or their clerks resort to trickery, in order to swindle you out of part of your wages?

57. If you are paid piece-rate, isn't the quality of the goods used as a pretext for wrongful deductions from your wages?

58. Whatever wages you get, whether piece or time rate, when is it paid to you: in other words, how long is the credit you give your employer before receiving payment for the work you have already carried out? Are you paid a week later, month, etc.?

59. Have you noticed that delay in the payment of your wages forces you often to resort to the pawnshops, paying high rates of interest there, and depriving yourself of things you need: or incurring debts with the shopkeepers, and becoming their victim because you are their debtor? Do you know of cases when workers have lost their wages owing to the ruin or bankruptcy of their employers?

60. Are wages paid direct by the employer, or by his agents (contractors, etc.)?

61. If wages are paid by contractors or other intermediaries, what are the conditions of your contract?

62. What is the amount of your money wages by the day and week?

63. What are the wages of the women and children employed together with you in the same shop?

64. What was the highest daily wage last month in your shop?

65. What was the highest piece wage last month?

66. What was your own wage during the same time, and if you have a family, what were the wages of your wife and children?

67. Are wages paid entirely in money, or in some other form?

68. If you rent a lodging from your employer, on what conditions? Does he not deduct the rent from your wages?

69. What are the prices of necessary commodities, for example:

(a) Rent of your lodging, conditions of lease, number of rooms, persons living in them, repair, insurance, buying and repairing furniture, heating, lighting, water, etc.

(b) Food—bread, meat, vegetables, potatoes, *etc.*, dairy produce, eggs, fish, butter, vegetable, oil, lard, sugar, salt, groceries, coffee, chicory, beer, wine, *etc.*, tobacco.

(c) Clothing for parents and children, laundry, keeping clean, baths, soap, *etc.*

(d) Various expenses, such as correspondence, loans, payments to pawnbroker, children's schooling and teaching a trade, newspapers, books, *etc.*, contributions to friendly societies, strikes, unions, resistance associations, *etc.*

(e) Expenses, if any, necessitated by your duties.

(f) Taxes.

70. Try and draw up a weekly and yearly budget of your income and expenditure for self and family.

IV.

71. Have you noticed, in your personal experience, a bigger rise in the price of immediate necessities, *e.g.*, rent, food, *etc.*, than in wages?

72. State the changes in wages which you know of.

73. Describe wage reductions during bad trade and industrial crises.

74. Describe wage increases during so-called prosperity periods.

75. Describe any interruptions in employment caused by changes in fashions and partial and general crises. Describe your own involuntary rest periods.

76. Compare the price of the commodities you manufacture or the services you render with the price of your labor.

77. Quote any cases known to you of workers being driven out as a result of introduction of machinery or other improvements.

78. In connection with the development of machinery and the growth of the productivity of labor, has its intensity and duration increased or decreased?

79. Do you know of any cases of increases in wages as a result of improvements in production?

80. Have you ever known any rank-and-file workers who could retire from employment at the age of 50, and live on the money earned by them as wage workers?

81. How many years can a worker of average health be employed in your trade?

82. Do any resistance associations exist in your trade, and how are they led? Send us their rules and regulations.

83. How many strikes have taken place in your trade that you are aware of?

84. How long did these strikes last?

85. Were they general or partial strikes?

86. Were they for the object of increasing wages, or were they organized to resist a reduction of wages, or connected with the length of the working day, or prompted by other motives?

87. What were their results?

88. Tell us of the activity of courts of arbitration.

89. Were strikes in your trade ever sup-

ported by strikes of workers belonging to other trades?

90. Describe the rules and fines laid down by your employer for the management of his hired workers.

91. Have there ever existed associations among the employers with the object of imposing a reduction of wages, a longer working day, of hindering strikes and generally imposing their own wishes?

92. Do you know of cases when the government made unfair use of the armed forces, to place them at the disposal of the employers against their wage workers?

93. Are you aware of any cases when the government intervened to protect the workers from the extortions of the employers and their illegal associations?

94. Does the government strive to secure the observance of the existing factory laws against the interests of the employers? Do its inspectors do their duty?

95. Are there in your workshop or trade any friendly societies to provide for accidents, sickness, death, temporary incapacity, old age, *etc.*? Send us their rules and regulations.

96. Is membership of these societies voluntary or compulsory? Are their funds exclusively controlled by the workers?

97. If the contributions are compulsory, and are under the employers' control, are they deducted from wages? Do the em-

ployers pay interest for this deduction? Do they return the amounts deducted to the worker when he leaves employment or is dismissed? Do you know of any cases when the workers have benefited from the so-called pension schemes, which are controlled by the employers, but the initial capital of which is deducted beforehand from the workers' wages?

98. Are there coöperative guilds in your trade? How are they controlled? Do they hire workers for wages in the same way as the capitalists? Send us their rules and regulations.

99. Are there any workshops in your trade in which payment is made to the workers partly in the form of wages and partly in the form of so-called profit-sharing? Compare the sums received by these workers and the sums received by other workers who don't take part in so-called profit sharing. State the obligations of workers living under this system. May they go on strike, *etc.*, or are they only permitted to be devoted servants of their employers?

100. What are the general physical, intellectual and moral conditions of life of the working men and women employed in your trade?

101. General remarks.

Karl MARX

BOOKS

China's Tragedy

THE TRAGEDY OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION. By HAROLD R. ISAACS. Introduction by Leon Trotsky. xxv+457 pp. London. Secker & Warburg. 18s.

In his introduction to this book Leon Trotsky rightly points out that one would "seek in vain in the library of the Communist International for a single book which attempts in any way to give a rounded picture of the Chinese revolution". The reason for this striking failure to give an account of the revolution or to sum up its lessons is not that it lacks importance or that the Comintern did not participate in its unfoldment. Rather does it lie in the fact that it is a political impossibility for the Stalinists to write a history of the Chinese revolution—an even greater one than would face a Fundamentalist charged with writing a scientific textbook on the evolution of man.

This is demonstrated beyond dispute by the book of Harold Isaacs, who shows in its pages that the most rigid objectivity in giving the history of the events which opened up a new epoch for the whole Oriental world is not adversely affected but is on the contrary only made possible by a revolutionary Marxian analysis. It is entirely natural and understandable that while no social democrat or Stalinist has

produced a history of the Chinese revolution worthy of the name—and it is the most important occurrence of our times since the seizure of power by the Russian proletariat—an absorbing, perspicacious, solid and enduring (one is tempted to add: the definitive) history has been written by one whose views are identical with those of the Fourth International.

The prevailing theory in the pre-war (and post-war) Second International declared that it was at once utopian and inadmissible for the young and not very numerous proletariat in the colonial or semi-colonial countries, where feudal relationships existed to one extent or another, to have as its next goal the establishment of working class rule. These countries were doomed to pass mechanically and uniformly through all the stages traversed by the modern capitalist lands. Some of the more knavish "Marxists" of this school enunciated the doctrine that since capitalism was a higher social and economic form than feudalism, the imperialist penetration of the backward colonies was progressive and needed only the elimination of its "excesses" to acquire the support of the socialist movement. The less avowed agents of imperialism merely insisted that the native colonial bourgeoisie would have to come to power in the form of an independent democracy, and after long years

of "normal" rule train up an industrial proletariat before the latter could lay claim to the execution of its historic socialist mission.

Lenin's great contribution to the movement, both in the practise of the Bolshevik revolution with regard to the semi-colonial and backward peoples of the old Czarist empire and in the theories he formulated at the Second Congress of the Comintern in 1920, was to demonstrate the possibility and necessity of a "non-capitalist" road of development for the nations, the peoples, and specifically the proletariat, of the East—in general for the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Basing himself upon the theory of the permanent revolution worked out more than a decade before the Bolshevik revolution, and upon the concrete evidence of that revolution itself, Trotsky elaborately expanded, enriched and concretized Lenin's concept to the point where, in its first application on the grand scale of the Chinese Revolution, it was able to pass every scientific political test to which a theory, which is but a guide to action, can be submitted.

The tragedy of the Chinese revolution, as Isaacs shows with a crushing yet never tiresome or repetitious mass of evidence discerningly assembled from original sources—his studies of the Chinese situation continued for years after his long residence in China—lies in the fact that the movement which led the Chinese proletariat and a large section of the peasantry and was guided by the Kremlin with all the authority of the Russian Revolution and the Comintern behind it, pursued not the policy of Lenin but, fundamentally, the classic policy of the social democracy, or more exactly, a debased version of that policy. In a word, the tragedy of the Chinese revolution was the crime of Stalinism.

Animating Trotsky's theory of the law of combined development with the living realities of Chinese social and economic relationships, Isaacs presents a picture which in no way resembles the old social-democratic abstractions. Because of its unique combination of backwardness and modernity, China was confronted with the need of fulfilling its democratic tasks—national independence, uprooting of feudalism, establishment of representative democratic institutions, etc.—without having any other class to make possible the consistent achievement of these aims save the modern proletariat. At the same time, the national bourgeoisie, unlike its Western prototype of a century ago, was so bound up with feudalism on the one side and decadent imperialism on the other, that it could not even play its "classic" rôle of leader of the bourgeois democratic revolution. The "non-capitalist" road of which Lenin spoke meant in China that the democratic tasks of the country could be solved only under the independent leadership of the proletariat but only as a by-product of its socialist struggle for power. The crime of the Stalinist leadership consisted in deliberately subordinating the

proletariat and peasantry to the Kuomintang, that is, to the party of the Chinese national bourgeoisie which was, in turn, only a subordinate of one or another imperialist group. The result of this policy was that *both* the socialist tasks *and* the democratic task of the Chinese revolution remained—and remain—unfulfilled. The entire Chinese working class was horribly disoriented; and countless thousands of truly heroic revolutionists were turned over to the sadistic slaughterers of the native bourgeoisie and its chief, Chiang Kai-shek.

A review, if it were twice as long as this one, could only begin to deal adequately with the book. To summarize it would be almost as difficult a job as was the writing of it, and when it was done it would be no substitute for the original. It should be read and read again. The Chinese proletarian revolutionary movement will rise again strong and victorious only on the basis of carefully studying the record which this book makes and the lessons it indicates, and an early translation into Chinese will prove to the movement there that it is even more indispensable a textbook for it than for us. But it is more than a textbook. It is a story, a gripping, dramatic story, told without superfluous flourish or windy agitation.

The reader of this review should not leave it with the impression that the book concludes with the defeat of the first big revolutionary movement in 1927. It is much more timely than that. Its chapter on the so-called "Soviet China" movement could stand by itself as a monograph. Certainly, it is the best, most thorough, most revealing and most scrupulously documented work on that movement that I know of in any modern language, and I am not unacquainted with what has been written on the subject in recent years. The concluding chapter of the book is as up-to-date as today's newspaper, but how much superior it is to the superficial journalese of so many appointed and self-appointed Chinese experts! It deals with the Japanese invasion of China, the dissolution of "Soviet China" and the second edition of the Stalinist policy of subjecting the working class and peasantry to the domination of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

Unhesitatingly and most ardently, this book is recommended to every militant in the movement; for that matter, to everybody who has an interest in or is concerned with the situation in China. It is deplorable that the publisher found it necessary to put so steep a price on the book—not everyone can afford 18 shillings; the American edition, let us hope, will make this indispensable work more accessible to those who want it most by putting a more modest price-tag on it.

Max SHACHTMAN

The January issue will contain, among other features, an article by Max Shachtman on the life of Karl Kautsky, who recently died in Amsterdam.

Gold Is Still Where You Find It

IN SEARCH OF SOVIET GOLD. By JOHN LITTLEPAGE and DEMAREE BESS. 310 pp. New York. Harcourt, Brace & Co. \$2.75.

No one had ever heard of John D. Littlepage until he broke out in the well-paying columns of the *Saturday Evening Post* shortly before the Third Moscow trial with an attack against the leaders of the October Revolution. He affirmed that sabotage and wrecking in the Soviet Union were common and carried on in an organized manner. In proof of his assertion he declared that he had spent ten years in the Soviet Union, that he knew all about gold mining, that one day he had accidentally laid his hand on a hot bearing and discovered it running in an amalgam of oil and powdered emery and that therefore all the Bolsheviks who had led the October Revolution were guilty of wrecking and sabotage except Joseph Stalin, for is it not well known that Bolsheviks commonly use sabotage and wrecking as part of their methods in capitalist countries?

Despite Littlepage's attack against communism and open defense of capitalism, the *Daily Worker* front-paged the story, declaring Littlepage just a little "naive" about "communism in general" but really an expert in his own field of mining and therefore an expert on sabotage and wrecking as practised by the leaders of the October Revolution. Corliss Lamont, Wall Street patron of the Stalinist International, followed up the *Daily Worker* story with a mimeographed letter and a clipping of the story from the *Post* for all the members of the Trotsky Defense Committee, urging them on the basis of Littlepage's assertions to sever immediately all connection with any attempt to find out the truth about the charges levelled against Leon Trotsky.

With the help of Demaree Bess, ex-Moscow correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*, Littlepage has now cashed in again on his gold mining experience by expanding his *Saturday Evening Post* story into a full length book, *In Search of Soviet Gold*.

This search began in Alaska where Littlepage was earning good money as a slave driver in the gold mines. A visit from Serebrovsky, then studying mining conditions in the United States, the alluring prospect of "saving a lot of money", and Littlepage decided to at least try out the racket of being a "friend" to the U.S.S.R. Perhaps he could make his dreams of gold come true in short order in Stalin's land of Utopia.

A rude awakening awaited him in Utopia. Already in 1928 the police were quietly cutting into the ranks of the specialists and the sudden disappearance of many of Littlepage's assistants without trial, reason, or pretext made it extremely awkward to achieve production records similar to those which had made the capitalist companies proud of him in Alaska. Still more grievous was the extreme difficulty in breaking the workers from the "theories

laid down by their Communist prophets" when it should have been "obvious to a smart twelve-year-old that they didn't make sense". Littlepage found Marx, Engels, Lenin his greatest enemies. However, he quickly found a congenial mind in Stalin and under his patronage he succeeded in introducing the piece-work system, the speed-up, and many other capitalist forms of production directly opposed to "the exploded theories of nineteenth-century communists". At the same time like the communist party bureaucrats he very happily gilded the feathers in his own nest.

Littlepage and Stalin nevertheless did not succeed in one day in their drive upon the forms and base of the workers' society in the Soviet Union. The struggle was profound, involving the very structure and direction of the development of the economy. As Littlepage puts it, "looking back at it now, I can see that the events of 1929 and the years following were just as much a revolution as the years following 1917".

Littlepage devotes not a few pages to wrecking and sabotage in the Soviet Union. Aside from the occurrence in which he burned his hand, he recounts several incidents where his plans for introducing the speed-up or the piecework system or a reorganization of a mine upon capitalist lines were changed to the great detriment of the industry by mysterious "higher-ups" (of course, not Stalin or his followers who will buy Littlepage's book). In 1931 he went with the Pyatakov Commission to Berlin to buy machinery and wondered if there wasn't some attempt at petty graft in this commission. When he read the report of the Second Moscow Trial he was immediately convinced that what was really involved was . . . wrecking. Before, Littlepage had only suspected that something was just a trifle shady among the members of the Commission; but Pyatakov's confession immediately peeled the blinders from his eyes. The first frame-up convinced him a little bit, the second frame-up still more, but the third frame-up clinched everything. Littlepage, despite the front-page hopes of the *Daily Worker* has absolutely nothing to contribute to the Stalinist case for the trials. He bases himself almost entirely upon the confessions at the trials themselves and not upon what he has himself experienced. Indeed he admits that in the Gold Trust he encountered not a single case of sabotage or wrecking.

Especially ludicrous is Littlepage's attempt to explain away the fate of his chief, Serebrovsky. Apparently the book had been written before Serebrovsky's disappearance; in page after page he lauds Serebrovsky, the head of the Gold Trust, as the ideal Stalinist. No matter how prevalent wrecking and sabotage might be in the other trusts, as can be found from listening to the "confessions" in the Moscow frame-ups, in the Gold Trust not a single case occurred. Not a single case—expert witness Littlepage emphasizes this. No doubt that ubiquitous Satan—Trotsky contaminated all the rest of the industries in Russia, but Serebrovsky kept him exorcized before he got started. In a *postscript* to his book Littlepage tries to explain why

Serebrovsky has now been arrested. He makes a big stab at doing a little reasoning and almost achieves the level of a *Daily Worker* editorial. The charge "enemy of the people", he points out sapiently, is a bit vague. It is too bad we don't know the real reason for Serebrovsky's disappearance, especially since there was absolutely no sabotage or wrecking under him. The arrest is very hard to understand, since Serebrovsky was a pet of Stalin for his preternatural, almost capitalist skill at developing that most beloved of all Stalin industries, gold-hunting. But in true *Daily Worker* fashion he comes through with a flashing conclusion: perhaps Serebrovsky, like all Communists, was conditioned to conspiracy in youth and even after so many years of clean life working for Stalin and being his gold star yes-man, he just couldn't keep his nose out of plotting.

But as that master Wall Street politician, Corliss Lamont of the millionaire Lamont family, points out, Littlepage is politically naïve and cannot be trusted in political affairs such as purging Bolshevism out of the Soviet Union. It is only his judgment in his own field that is trustworthy. What is Littlepage's judgment in this field? In the Gold Trust he did not encounter a single case of organized wrecking. As for Soviet industry as a whole—much more deadly than any organized wrecking are the unending arrests, imprisonments, shootings which keep every single person in the U.S.S.R. in a state of suspense and fear, especially those who must initiate and plan. Littlepage chokes his book with evidence to show the utter impossibility of successfully organizing an industry and carrying on production under Stalin. Suspicion and terror paralyze the workers, engineers, managers, as if each worked with a loaded revolver at the back of his head. In this he verifies the evidence offered by Tchernavin and confirms Tchernavin's conclusions regarding the complete breakdown of planning under the reign of mediocrity and ignorance. "I suspect there are more watchers than producers," Littlepage repeats. Over and over he shows where Soviet industry breaks down because of the uncorrelated "planning", the shooting of the best and most capable men and their replacement by ignorant scoundrels capable of nothing but ruining machinery, factories, mines. He recounts incident after incident where illiterate peasants, some of whom have never seen a piece of metal before in their lives, are forced to handle valuable machinery, inevitably ruining it. He confirms the terrible stories that have seeped out of the Soviet Union despite the censorship of the press and the connivance of such foreign correspondents as Eugene Lyons, Walter Duranty, and Louis Fischer: people harried and driven like cattle by the hundreds of thousands; whole populations torn from their homes by Stalin and dumped like the unfortunate victims of the old African slave traffic into an alien world; whole sections of the economy disrupted and smashed by frenzied measures of Czar Stalin; police terror; a madhouse confusion of orders, counter-orders; virulent hatred of all foreigners, national iso-

lation; bursting prisons, enormous gangs of tattered political prisoners in concentration camps. Unwittingly he confirms Boris Silver's story of the distrust, the unrest, the seething discontent in Stalinland as he describes the mounting suppression and the increasing suffocation of the Marxist-Leninist ideals during his ten years in the Gold Trust. Despite his own colossal blindness, if blindness it be, this phase of Littlepage's record of conditions in the Soviet Union is one of the most damning documents against Stalin ever written by any of his ex-gold-diggers.

Joseph HANSEN

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.; Rand Book Store, 7 E. 16th 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. 42nd 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. Smith News Stand, 5th and Main, Los Angeles, Calif. Smith News Service, 6th and Hill, Los Angeles, Calif. National News Stand, 221 W. 5th St., Los Angeles, Calif. General News Service, 328 W. 5th St., Los Angeles, Calif. Crescent News Co., 208 W. 8th St., Los Angeles, Calif. Universal News Stand, Hollywood Blvd. and Caluenga, Hollywood, Calif.

Newsstand, 7th and Washington, Oakland, Calif. Newsstand, 12th St., bet. B'way and Washington, Oakland, Calif. Newsstand, in Andrew Williams Market, Oakland, Calif. Newsstand, B'way near 19th, Oakland, Calif. Frigate Book Shop, Howard near Franklin, Baltimore, Md. Nodelman's Newsstand, Church St., bet. Chapel and Center, New Haven, Conn.

Yale Cooperative Corp., 3013 York St., New Haven, Conn. 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. Cor. 57th and Blackstone, Chicago, Ill. Cor. 12th and Kedzie, Chicago, Ill.

Universal News Co., 242 Broadway, San Diego, Calif. 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. Socialist Appeal Club, 3513 Woodward, Room 5, Detroit, Mich. 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.

Reitman's, cor. Broad and William St., Newark, N. J. 433 No. Clinton St., Rochester, N. Y. 257 No. Clinton St., Rochester, N. Y. Cor. Cumberland and Clinton Sts., Rochester, N. Y. Cor. East Ave. and Chestnut St., Rochester, N. Y. S.E. cor. Main and Clinton Sts., Rochester, N. Y. S.W. cor. Main and South Ave., Rochester, N. Y. R. Zettlemeier, 637 Hamilton St., Allentown, Pa. 1806 No. Franklin St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Cor. 13th and Market Sts. (N.W.), Philadelphia, Pa. Cor. 11th and Market Sts. (N.W.), Philadelphia, Pa. 40th St. and Girard Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 8th St. and Arch Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. Esser's Newsstand, Front and West Broad Sts., Quakertown, Pa. Nick's, Wick St. and Commerce, Youngstown, Ohio. Eckhart News Agency, 102 Washington St., Seattle, Wash. Roth Cigar Store, 1407 1st Ave., Seattle, Wash. Raymer's Old Book Store, 905-Third Ave., Seattle, Wash. Sunday Forum Newsstand, Independence Hall, Seattle, Wash.

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 Agham Rd., Battersea, S.W. 11, London, England. H. Cund, Book Shop, 1, St. Hilda St., Liverpool, England. T. Mercer, Book Shop, 52 Auldhouse Rd., Glasgow, C. 3 Scotland. c/o P.O. Box 2639, Johannesburg, South Africa.

A. Sinclair, P.O. Box 38, So. Brisbane, Australia. N. Gibson, 288 Drummond St., Carlton, Melbourne, Australia. Pales. Press Co., 119 Allenby St., Tel-Aviv, Palestine. R.S.L., 18 Thistle St., Edinburgh, 2, Scotland. Leon Sapire, 33 Strathearn Mansions, Cr. Bree and Wanderers Sts., Johannesburg, South Africa. N. M. Jain, 21 Dalal St., Fort, Bombay, 1, India.

Remember the Refugees this Christmas!

THOUSANDS

of

VALIANT WORKINGCLASS FIGHTERS AGAINST FASCISM

are

HUNGRY, HOMELESS AND HELPLESS

If the family next door were starving, evicted and robbed of their possessions, you would not hesitate to help them.

INCLUDE THESE REFUGEES in your CHRISTMAS BUDGET

CHRISTMAS CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE
American Fund for Political Prisoners and Refugees
100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Enclosed is \$.....for the Anti-Fascist Xmas Relief Fund.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

Russian Revolution Anniversary Special Offer Until Christmas

The following books have been drastically reduced to enable us to raise cash for new publications. An unusual opportunity to purchase these outstanding works for your own library or as holiday gifts.

- THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN
by LEON TROTSKY (\$2.00) \$1.00
- THE STALIN SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION
by LEON TROTSKY (\$2.50) \$1.50
- RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER
by VICTOR SERGE (\$2.50) \$1.00
- WORLD REVOLUTION: 1917-1936
by C. L. R. JAMES (\$3.50) \$2.50

An additional saving of \$1.00 by purchasing
all four books at \$5.00.

ORDER NOW

LABOR BOOK SHOP

28 E. 12th St.

New York City

BOUND!

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, having completed the current year, is binding all twelve issues that have appeared, plus a complete handy index, and offering the bound volume for sale. Readers will quickly realize the value of the collection. It is being bound stoutly and neatly in attractive cloth, with name and year stamped on the back—384 pages of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL for 1938. The price per bound volume is \$3.00, post-paid to any part of the United States. Attention is called to the fact that only a limited number of bound volumes are available. First come, first serve!

Send all orders and remittances to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place New York, N. Y.

JUST ARRIVED

Russian Bulletin No. 71

Featuring L. D. Trotsky's Article on the
"Fresh Lessons After the Munich Pact
and the Coming World War"

SINGLE COPY 20c — YEARLY SUB. \$2.00

Order from the Labor Book Shop, 28 E. 12th St., N. Y. C.

Pioneer Publishers announces that Daniel Guerin's new book, **Fascism and Big Business**, which was announced for publication last month has been postponed until December 1st. Advance orders will still be accepted at \$1.50* until that date. The price on publication will be \$2.00. Orders should be sent to:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
New York City

*Last month's NEW INTERNATIONAL incorrectly listed price for advance orders at \$1.25.