

THE NEW

INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

After Munich

Leon Trotsky: Czechoslovakia's "Independence"

Maurice Spector: The Popular Front's Guilt

The Editors: Notes on the 4-Power Pact



The 4th International Congress

By Max Shachtman



B. J. Widick:
A New Stage in
Labor Unity

L. Rock:
The Arab-Jewish
Conflict



The War Mobilization Plan in the United States

TWENTY CENTS

NOVEMBER 1938

At Home

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL continues in a precarious financial situation, but not because of any slack in circulation. As a matter of fact, the October number was in great demand, so that new orders and re-orders resulted in a complete sell-out of the October issue; not even, literally, a handful are left in the N.I. office. So far, so good. But as this column is written, we cannot definitely say that the November issue will be out on time, though we'll try, because too many of the larger accounts in the United States are needlessly and inexcusably delinquent with their bundle payments. Till, also, they awaken to their responsibilities to our Press, it is necessary to add to the list of Party Branches whose N.I. bundles are discontinued. These are Philadelphia, Pa., and the smaller Marysville, Calif. Branch. But we feel confident that the Party and Y.P.S.L. units will hearken to our letters and to the urgent pleas in other columns of the magazine, speed up bundle payments and plan SUBSCRIPTION DRIVES.

New York, both Party and Y.P.S.L., showed a little improvement with the October issue. The Y.P.S.L. increased their amount to 120 copies and the S.W.P. disposed of 360, besides the usual 125 for the Labor Book Shop. The Party is planning a subscription campaign, and the Youth are waking up to the need to circulate the magazine. In Los Angeles, John Murphy is working hard and expects that Los Angeles will show improvement. He writes that the literature department is running a Hallowe'en Party to help liquidate its bills to the magazine.

There were, as we've come to expect, new orders and also increases in bundle orders, namely: Cleveland, Paul Scott, agent, from 25 to 35 again. Cleveland's ambitious now and has set a much wider circulation goal by Christmas. Good luck, Paul! You've earned your spurs on much harder fields. Mildred Kahn, London, England, from 42 to 48 copies; South Bend, Ind., from 15 to 20; Bob Birchman is agent; Sydney, Australia, once again from 30 to 40. Comrade L. Short writes: "The boys upbraided me when they heard I'd reduced the order; so send 40 in future. Group is on up and up and will soon be a significant force in Australian labor movement." New Haven, Morris Gandelman, agent, ordered an extra five copies of October number.

New Orders: The Nation's capital, Washington, D.C., an order for 5 copies; Mary G., agent. Quite a few persons also subscribe there. Haifa and Jerusalem, Palestine, 8 copies. Ithaca, New York, an order for 20 copies by the Y.P.S.L. on the Cornell Univ. Campus. There's a live agent there—Ed. Speyer. Indianapolis, Ind., 5 copies. East Oakland, Calif., E. M., agent, 10 copies.

Many agents continue to work hard and do exceptionally well with

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME IV

NOVEMBER 1938

NUMBER 11 (Whole No. 26)

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles: 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Single copy: 20c. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board: JAMES BURNHAM, MAX SHACHTMAN, MAURICE SPECTOR.
Business Manager: MARTIN ABERN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Editor's Comments.....	323
The 4th International Is Launched, by Max Shachtman	325
Social-Patriotic Sophistry, by Leon Trotsky.....	328
The Popular Front's Guilt, by Maurice Spector.....	329
Labor Unity—A New Stage, by B. J. Widick.....	331
The Deserters and Munich.....	334
The Jewish-Arab Conflict, by L. Rock.....	335
The War Mobilization Plan, by M. J. Michaels and Albert Gates	337
Stalinism and Fascism in Italy, by Z.....	340
Mahoney Bill and Today's Tasks, by The Editors and Jules Geller	344
BOOKS:	
The Story of the C.I.O., by B. J. Widick.....	346
Toward a Decision, by Leon Trotsky.....	347
Balabanoff's Memoirs, by Max Shachtman.....	348
Mann in Uniform, by S. Stanley.....	350
Correspondence, by A. J., Frank Demby.....	351
Clippings	351
Inside Front Cover: At Home.	

the magazine. Karl Shier, Chicago, we repeat sotto voice so that Karl won't swell, still does the best job of all. Ed. Fitzroy, London, England, writes that the September issue was completely sold out, and that the fusion of the groups there has helped swell sales. . . . Frank Maitland, Edinburgh, Scotland, reports that the Scottish comrades are systematically canvassing for regular readers and expect success. A special circular has been sent by the Revolutionary Socialist Party there to all its supporters to take THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. New York, too, Abe Miller informs us, will issue a special circular in connection with the sales and subscription drive. And Minneapolis, writes Chester Johnson, regards the N.I. as "a very valuable magazine" and "is taking steps to increase circulation in this area in line with your recent special circular letter". We are confident results will be forthcoming from there. John Murphy of Los Angeles got up a particularly fine circular on literature with the object of increasing membership activity thereon. St. Paul, Minn., where the Party's recent candidate for Mayor, Jules Geller, is also the literature agent and a contributor to the columns of the magazine, writes that the Branch is holding an entertainment soon for the benefit of the magazine. Other Locals, please emulate. The Lynn, Mass., S.W.P. branch, Lee Colvin, agent, responded with a small donation to the October N.I.'s plea for contributions. Imitation is also in order here.

Many Branches and Y.P.S.L. units have succeeded in placing the maga-

zine in additional bookstores and newsstands. These included Youngstown, Ohio, M. Hess, agent; Baltimore, Md., Wm. Bowen, agent; Los Angeles; Chicago is concentrating on stand sales for next period; Worcester, Mass., Pauline T., agent; Pittsburgh, Pa., M. Krupka, agent. In Akron, Ohio, Bob Ferguson has taken hold of the N.I. and literature department, and that means Akron will step along still faster with the magazine.

* * *

But, we must repeat and repeat, SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE THE FOUNDATION AND SECURITY FOR THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Activity and campaigning for subscriptions is a first MUST always on the agenda. It is possible to secure them through organized efforts. The management will always assist Branches and localities directly and specifically with suggestions and advice. Constant praise for the quality of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL comes in greater amount from everywhere in the United States and throughout the world—far, far too many to think of publishing but a fragment of them on this page. But surely with such a widespread, genuine and favorable sentiment for THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, the Party and Y.P.S.L. units can cash in with MORE SUBSCRIPTIONS, with a bit more of the "old Red try". E. Fishler of Chicago has sent in a number of subscriptions in past weeks, and we've already reported on Tom Gaddis's work in Mpls., which he promises to continue.

The Manager feels pretty sure that

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL now reaches EVERY IMPORTANT COUNTRY in the world. Friend and foe alike must keep up with the finest and soundest thought of the period. Recently a number of subscriptions were received from the Japanese Consulate in New York and from a "concern" in Berlin, Germany. And Stalin & Co. have just had to sneak THE NEW INTERNATIONAL into the Soviet Union to learn better how the enlightened revolutionary workers, increasing in number, are fully "wise" to the betrayer of the world's proletariat. Interesting, is it not, that in the same month, the Governments of the Mikado, Hitler and Stalin just have to make sure their satellites keep up with the times. Well, if the Devil would read. . . .

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL," we agree with comrade C. of Fresno, "is excellent and indispensable for Marxists. Its continued existence is absolutely essential to the Party." R.L., New Castle, Pa., adds that "THE NEW INTERNATIONAL must be kept growing until it reaches the distribution its eminence warrants." Hear, hear! But that's where every comrade enters into the picture—by helping to sell the magazine and really trying to obtain subscriptions. Can you picture what it would mean to the revolutionary movement, to our Party, if THE NEW INTERNATIONAL were to suspend publication? We can; it would be calamitous, and must not be. Great was the role of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL in the past; greater is its role today and in the future. This is recognized everywhere. H.M. v G., writing from Cape Town, South Africa, says:

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is just what the doctor ordered. All the praise that has been heaped upon it from all parts of the world is not one bit exaggerated. Comrades here still cherish affectionate memories of the old *Militant* and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL issued by the Workers Party of the United States. These papers were the educators of the cadres of our movement here in South Africa. The new issue is a worthy successor, and each number is awaited with the greatest eagerness and keenest anticipation."

To this in closing, we have only to add: this column is appreciative of the cooperation and good work of the N.I. agents and assisting comrades, Party and Y.P.S.L., everywhere: San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, San Diego, Fresno, Portland, Boston, Newark, Allentown, Reading, Rochester, Quakertown, Fargo, Plentywood, Omaha, Toledo, Worcester, Detroit, St. Louis, Oakland, Hutchinson, Columbus, Evansville, and other U.S. cities; Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, India, England, Scotland, Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, and the many other places where agents loyally do their work. We urge: Keep up the good work, and more of it. BUILD OUR PRESS! BUILD THE NEW INTERNATIONAL! BUILD OUR PRESS—the great organizer for the Fourth International!

THE MANAGER

The Editor's Comments

THE FEAR OF WAR OF THE BOURGEOISIE IS THE FEAR OF REVOLUTION—THE DILEMMA OF CHAMBERLAIN AND BRITISH IMPERIALISM — CRITICAL DAYS AHEAD FOR FRANCE, AND FOR ITS WORKING CLASS—GERMANY'S VICTORY AS A SPRINGBOARD FOR FURTHER ADVANCES—THE DISASTROUS NET RESULT OF THE FIFTEEN YEARS OF STALINIST REALISM
—THE KREMLIN SOUNDS OUT HITLER ABOUT A NEW ALLIANCE

THE INTERPRETATION of history in terms of the moral character and ability of individuals—the “great man” or devil theory of history has seldom been seen at less advantage than in its attempted application to the Munich agreement. How absurdly fantastic it is, even on the face of it, to imagine that we can explain the agreement and its consequences on the grounds that Chamberlain and Daladier are “traitors”, Hitler a madman, and Mussolini a bombastic megalomaniac. Such explanations, of course, and the whole personalistic theory from which they spring, themselves serve a social function. They act to turn eyes away from the true meaning of events and to fasten resentment and hopes not on the basic factor of the economic and political structure of society but on individual men — scapegoats or saviors. The Munich agreement was thus followed in the American press by a deluge of pictures, biographies, recollections and “psychological studies” of the four who met at Munich.

The actions of individual men do, it is true, have their relevant effect on history, in specific instances can even be the decisive factor. But outstandingly in the case of the Munich agreement, the four men who sat at the conference table had their significance not because of individual idiosyncracies, but because on that occasion they spoke and decided as the responsible and authentic representatives of their respective national states and of the English, French, German and Italian bourgeoisies whose states they are. To ask why the agreement was signed and what may be expected to follow from it, therefore, is not a problem in psychology, but an inquiry into the needs, interests and perspectives of the ruling class within the four nations.

The Munich agreement was signed, first of all, because the bourgeoisie, in each of the nations, fears the war. They fear the war irrespective of the military problem, irrespective of the probabilities of victory or defeat. There can be no doubt that this general fear was far more crucial in the minds of the British ruling class than the more technical fear of the possible temporary superiority of the German air force. The latter was much more than compensated by the enormous advantage in every kind of material resource possessed by an Anglo-French bloc certain of alliance with the Soviet Union and shortly with the United States. The fear was not of Hitler—in the long run, if the problem were merely a military one, Hitler would not have had a chance. The fear was pointed in another direction: at the masses, who did not want the war. The ruling classes remembered 1917.

They were afraid that, whatever degree of national unity might be achieved at the outset with the aid of the treachery of the official labor leadership, it could not last. With the experiences of the last war not altogether forgotten, and with the destructiveness of war ten times multiplied since then, the rulers feared that this time not three years but perhaps only a few months would pass before the masses turned against the war and against those whose war it was. This fear was not peculiar to the democracies,

but was shared also by the ruling class in Germany, which has consistently acted as a brake on the more irresponsible impulses of Hitler. It was the fear of international finance-capital as a whole, and was finally expressed openly and publicly by the spokesman of the most powerful of all the sections of finance-capital: by Franklin Roosevelt, in his cable to Hitler. The war, Roosevelt warned his colleagues, was certain to overthrow the “social and economic structure” in at least several of the nations.

The bourgeoisies of the four nations were thus presented with a *common* problem: the preservation of their class domination. Faced with this, all else became secondary. The unbridgeable gulf between fascism and democracy was closed in the twinkling of a phrase. The war lords of Italy and Germany became overnight the princes of peace. The “sacredness of treaties” was seen to be no more than a verbalism. The League was a joke. The democratic rights of small nations dissolved into thin air. Solemn pacts went overboard without a ripple. For a brief historic moment, imperialist diplomacy could be seen in full nakedness, casting shams aside, a gang of cut-throats sitting down in shirt sleeves to draw up jointly a shameless, ruthless, bloody deal.

The fears were justified. This the great crowds showed who wept and shouted for peace in London and Berlin and Paris and Rome and Munich and Naples. Chamberlain and Daladier and Hitler and Mussolini knew how little those tears and shouts were for them, they knew their real meaning: that they expressed the mighty though hidden will of the masses against the war.

The Munich agreement was able, for the moment, to stop the war. But what did it solve? Did it bring to Europe a lasting peace and re-stabilization? There is no need for idle speculation in giving an answer. We can observe the replies of the participants in the agreement themselves.

Chamberlain Draws Conclusions

CHAMBERLAIN TOOK ABOUT forty-eight hours to make clear just what kind of peace he believed Munich had guaranteed. It was, he explained to Parliament, a peace which would require the re-doubling and tripling of Great Britain's already gigantic re-armament. Thousands of new and faster planes, thousands of new and deadlier anti-aircraft guns, hundreds of new warships. Already the preparations have begun for a disguised form of conscription.

Meanwhile England's semi-formal censorship is tightened, and the restriction of civil rights gets under way. Information of “military-strategic importance” is withdrawn from the press at the suggestion of His Majesty's Government; articles critical of “friendly powers” are politely and firmly pressed into the wastebasket. Just as Chamberlain's peace is built from guns and air-planes, so does he plan to compose his democracy out of the elimination of democratic rights.

Regiment after regiment moves into Palestine, bombing,

slaughtering, wiping out entire villages, to protect—the pipe line from Iraq and the route of the Suez Canal.

Probably more clearly than that of any other nation, the British ruling class knows that from its class point of view there can't be and yet there must be war. There can't be, for the English ruling class has everything to lose, nothing to gain, from the war: its top-heavy Empire would immediately begin falling apart like a jerry-built tenement, whatever victories the armies might be winning, the people at home would rise quickly indeed after the first series of air raids and casualty lists. Yet there must be war, for only by fighting can it keep its swollen possessions out of the insatiable hands of the impoverished nations or (with a glance over the shoulder) of the young American colossus overseas. It senses the blind alley into which it has entered; desperately and vainly it strives to gain time, hoping for a miracle, by buying off the potential immediate threatener, by trying to give him a sufficient outlet to the East and South. But, alas: at the imperialist banquet-table there is not enough to go around. One or the other of the sets of guests must be shoved out of their seats.

France's Next Year

THE PROBLEM FOR the French bourgeoisie is even sharper, more acute. Once the French bourgeoisie believed that through Versailles it had given itself a permanent strangle-hold on Europe. How voraciously it squeezed! French capital financed the huge Skoda monopoly in Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Greece danced unhappily to the strings pulled by the Two Hundred Families, sending their heavy tribute to swell French coffers. Cynically the League was maintained as a pious front for Anglo-French imperialist domination, and the pact for the status quo was signed with the Kremlin. Now all is gone: the Continental hegemony, the French controlled Entente, the League, the Russian pact. The French ruling class sees itself thrust desperately into a corner, snarling to keep its remaining bones to gnaw on: its own continental borders, and its oppressed and terrorized possessions in Africa and Indo-China.

How has it come about? To the French ruling class, prevented by their class position from penetrating into the real causes of capitalist decay, an answer seems to be found when it looks across the Rhine. Germany is united; France a dangerous chaos of conflicting social groups. In Germany the workers turn out goods and above all munitions on a sixty and sixty-five hour week basis; in France the "social laws" keep the work week down to forty or forty-five hours. Seeing this, Daladier told the Chamber of Deputies: we must be united, and we must be in a position to "compete successfully" with others. Translated: we must suppress the possibilities for independent class action, and we must smash the social laws. He underlined his words by breaking up the Popular Front, and by demanding and getting the decree powers.

What this means is that the French bourgeoisie now sets its course directly toward fascism as the only solution which can prevent it from losing altogether even the bones that remain. Let there be no illusions. The French bourgeoisie *must* now resort, and in the shortest possible time, to fascism. To achieve iron national unity and to cancel out the social laws, it must crush the resistance of the working class; and this can be done only through fascism.

Terrible days are ahead for the French workers, have already begun—as in Germany, under the auspices not of the fascists but of the center: Daladier, who will quite probably be soon joined by Blum. Restrictions on assembly and on the revolutionary press, introduced during the war crisis, are continuing. The headquarters and leaders of militant working-class organizations are under constant police surveillance. Posters demand the outlawing of the Communist Party—not, of course, as a revolu-

tionary organization, but as the agent of a foreign power whose friendship is no longer worthwhile. Daladier informs the workers in the munitions industries (and what industry cannot be classified under that head?) that attempts to enforce the forty-hour week will be considered crimes against the state, to be followed by instant dismissal and possible criminal prosecution.

The workers will fight back. But they will fight under the deadening handicap of infinite betrayal by their own parties, of the years of demoralization by the now dead Popular Frontism and the still living social-patriotism. Can they build their new party in time?

Germany Rampant

THERE WAS ONE small kernel of truth that rested, misused, in the interstices of the Popular Front ideology: the truth that fascism cannot be permanently bought off and "appeased". Fascism arises, driven by the overpowering compulsion of the inner conflicts of the given national capitalism. But it does not in the least throw off that compulsion or solve the conflicts. It is their expression; indeed, more, it aggravates and irritates them, deepens and extends them. Its forced-draught economy and finance, its tense and burning demagoguery, hover permanently at the verge of explosion. And so it will continue to be.

The successful taking over of Austria, a large enough morsel surely to last some years in the old non-fascist days, only compelled Hitler to move even faster toward Sudetenland. How could over-industrialized Austria bring meat or eggs or grain or oil or markets or chances for satisfactory investment? Nor does the Sudetenland, in spite of the great value to Germany of a number of its resources and plants, slake any of the major needs. And, as everyone knew, the Sudetens were only a small square in the picture.

Even before Munich, the next phase was unfolding. During the past two years, German trade has been overhauling France and England in one after the other of the nations in Europe's East and South. Now Walther Funk, Reich Economics Minister, completes a triumphant tour of Germany's new backyard. Trade agreements, loans whereby key raw materials will be exchanged for German manufactured goods, plans for capital expansion, all drop easily into Funk's proffered hand. The nations, one by one, turn their political noses toward Berlin.

At the front of the pack cowers Czechoslovakia itself. Devotion to democracy meant naturally, for the Czech bourgeoisie, the chances for larger profits under the wing of England and France and through the super-exploitation of the national minorities. These chances gone through the withdrawal of their friends, who play for higher stakes, the Czech bourgeoisie crawls before Hitler to beg permission to retain a crust or two. Woe, then, to the Czech workers and peasants, who, on the advice of their reformist and Stalinist leaders, trusted their own bourgeoisie and its government to defend democracy! In record time, totalitarianism fastens its yoke upon them, while thousands of their best die starving in the open fields. "Two young girls," report the *New York Times*, "were found (near Pohrlitz) stricken with influenza today. They were without medical help, without beds and little water. Czech and German authorities forbid the taking of food or water to them."

All this, however, is not enough. Volcanic German industry, as advanced as any in the world, not merely in technical proficiency but in monopoly development, strains intolerable against its barriers. The consolidation of the German-speaking territories provides only a strategic base for wider operations. The road opens toward outright colonies and protectorates. If they are not granted, they must be taken, either from those who have them, or by converting sections of the Soviet Union into the orbit of German imperialism.

Stalin Agonistes

THE COST OF STALINISM not simply to the workers of the world, but to the Soviet Union itself, becomes suddenly clearer after Munich. Munich, in its own way, drew up a balance-sheet. Fifteen years of socialism in one country, of Stalinist realism, of Stalinist maneuvers and counter-maneuvers, of Stalinist diplomacy, of the practical, wise and genial direction of the leader of the peoples, netted the Soviet Union: complete, utter and absolute isolation when the crisis came, the scorn, contempt and entire disregard of every other nation in the globe.

It is ridiculous to discuss "whether" Stalin's policy has collapsed. It would be like arguing whether a man were dead when the stink of his corpse had driven every living creature except the worms and buzzards a mile away. *Everyone* knows it has collapsed, from Chamberlain and Daladier (and Duranty) down to the errand-boy at the corner grocery. And the whole house has fallen, every wing and room and corner. The Popular Front met its official demise with the vote in the French Chamber; the phrase "Popular Front" is no longer even referred to, and is nowhere more absent than from the Stalinist press itself. The Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty has been publicly put to rest, though the announcement was ludicrously superfluous. No one even bothers to comment on the burial of the Franco-Soviet Treaty. As for collective security, the four at Munich put that sufficiently out of the way. The *Times* openly jeered at the purge awaiting Litvinov.

What, then, will the Kremlin do? There are still some dreamers, apparently, who play with the idea that it will have "learned its lesson", that now it will see the truth that only the workers of the world in struggle against their own capitalist states can defend the Soviet Union, and will make a new turn to the revolutionary left. These dreamers imagine, evidently, that fifteen years of history can be wiped out in fact as readily as it is in their own heads.

Stalin cannot make a revolutionary turn, if for no other reason, because the first victim of such a turn if actually made would be himself. The parties of the Comintern cannot make such a turn, if for no other reason, because they are no longer political parties in the genuine sense of the term: they are merely

groups of agents of the foreign office and the G.P.U. If they now begin to *appear* occasionally to jerk to the left, as in voting against Daladier (and as will doubtless happen at other times in the period ahead in England and France, though *not* in the United States), this does not at all express a real political movement toward the left but the momentary exigency of the counter-revolutionary foreign office of the Kremlin. We do not interpret a momentary progressive vote by a stool-pigeon in a union as signifying that he is moving leftward; we know that it merely answers the orders of his employer.

The Kremlin has already made a preliminary sounding of what it is going to *try* to do, through its mouthpiece Duranty. In an article given to the world press, Duranty wrote in the most brutal prose that the era of "Litvinov diplomacy" was finished, and that Stalin must now come to an agreement with Hitler. In an unbelievably cynical sentence, omitted from the version published in New York City but included elsewhere, Duranty reminded his readers—and unquestionably above all it was intended for his Nazi readers—that more Jews had been killed in the last two years in the Soviet Union than in all the years of Hitler's regime.

There can be nothing startling in such an attempted orientation. It is a perfectly consistent development of the Stalinist course; indeed, in 1933 the Kremlin also attempted but failed to secure a rapprochement with the then young Nazi regime. Stalin's aim is to preserve "socialism in one country"; i.e., to maintain Russia's territorial boundaries; i.e., to keep himself and his gang in power. To serve this aim it was proper to come to agreement with the class enemy as represented by the democratic imperialisms—this was the policy of the Popular Front. Then why not, when that fails, by agreement with the class enemy as represented by the fascist imperialisms? And, in point of fact, there is no fundamental difference between the two tactics.

To try is not, as the world goes, thereby to succeed. Hitler's price will be high, very high. If not outright cessions of territory and mandates, then at the least a modification of the monopoly of foreign trade, to permit German goods and German capital to enter the Soviet market. This means: to reach agreement with Hitler Stalin must destroy the last remaining conquest of the October Revolution, the nationalized economy.

The 4th International Is Launched

THE DRAMATIC AND TRAGIC political events of the last month in Europe were characteristic of the situation which dictated to the thirty delegates who came from eleven countries to attend the world conference of the revolutionary Marxists in Switzerland on September 3 the decision to found and organize the Fourth International—World Party of the Socialist Revolution.

These events served to underscore heavily the fact that the working class, the toiling masses in general, have at their head a leadership in the form of the two old Internationals which is not only incapable of organizing their resistance to the most monstrous of all the products of capitalism—totalitarian war—but is actually the most vigorous force at work in the ranks of labor itself mobilizing the masses for enthusiastic support of the war.

The period in which we live is preëminently the period of world economy and world politics, in which any form of self-enclosed existence—be it autarchy, isolationism, or socialism-in-one-country—is either an illusion or dupery. The last quarter of a century has strikingly emphasized the indispensability of international organization, leadership and strategy for the proletarian movement. The working class can no more do without them than individual army corps can dispense with a directing general staff. When the old general staffs of the working class, the traditional

Internationals, have proved themselves to be not merely bankrupt but a direct obstacle to the further progress of the labor movement, it is imperative that no time be lost in restoring the world revolutionary organization.

How blind one would have to be not to see the reactionary rôle played by the Second and Third Internationals during the critical September month when Europe see-sawed over the brink of war, a rôle neither unexpected nor accidental, but analyzed and forecast by us years in advance!

What a contrast they presented even to the Second International on the eve of the war of 1914-1918. As is known, all the important parties of the International turned patriotic and chauvinistic, and formed a "civil peace" with their respective capitalist class once the war actually broke out. But in the terror-filled weeks before the beginning of August 1914, they at least made an effort to appear before the masses as opponents of the imminent holocaust. The International Socialist Bureau met in Brussels to discuss—very despondently and without much conviction, it is true—what could be done to mobilize the workers against the war-mongers. The rafters of Brussels' largest hall rang with the voices of thousands of workers echoing Jaures' eloquent denunciation of the ruling class of all Europe. Similar scenes were repeated in most of the other European capitals and important population centers.

Even these impressive, if ineffectual, gestures were, however, everywhere absent in the crisis moments of 1938, when, a bare twenty years after the end of the last War to End All Wars, the world seemed to be catapulting to a new and infinitely more horrible disaster.

What passes for the leadership of the Second International—its world Bureau—did not even consider it necessary to hold a meeting for the purpose of appraising the situation and issuing a declaration that would guide the workers of all the countries who are affiliated to it. How could it meet? What could it say? Its policy is determined in each country not by proletarian internationalist considerations, but by the policy of its respective national bourgeoisie, or, as in the case of the exiled German social democracy, the bourgeoisie of another nation which has given it asylum, and which it considers at least for the time being as its very own—the French. With what felicity the social democracy followed the methods of its national ruling classes down to the minutest detail! Just as Chamberlain consulted with Daladier, without bothering to ask for the opinions of the Czech bourgeoisie, so did a delegation of the British Labour Party, headed by Sr Walter Citrine, consult in September with the leaders of the French Socialist Party without bothering to ask for the opinions of their “comrades-of-the-International” of the German and Czech social democracies. When Chamberlain, just before leaving for Munich, finally condescended to inform the great and democratic British Parliament of his policy and decisions, the leader of the British Labour Party, Major Atlee, could say no more than his colleagues on the other benches: he too wished the Prime Minister Godspeed! It was too solemn a moment for His Majesty’s Loyal Opposition to put forward its own independent position on the war question, which is symbolized by its attacks on the Tory government for failure to speed up the production of military airplanes. That the parties of the Second International have been voting with religious monotony for the war budget in every country where they are still allowed to vote, is too well known to need comment.¹

The parties of the Third International differed from the Second only in their more rabid patriotic zeal, in their unrestrained agitation for an immediate holy war of the Democracies against the Dictatorships. Daladier, in his statement to the Chamber’s military commission defending the abrogation of the 40-hour week in the interests of “national defense”, was able to refer good-humoredly to the antics of his Stalinist friends who demanded of him that he play the part of Don Quixote riding to the defense of imperilled civilization. Throughout the period of the Chamberlain-Hitler negotiations, the Stalinist press in England, France, Belgium and Czechoslovakia carried on an unbridled campaign of chauvinism which put even the outright reactionaries to shame. Shifting away from Daladier in France, the Kremlin hirelings frantically applauded the saber-rattling speeches of Henri de Kerillis, spokesman for the fascists in the Chamber. In England, the only demonstrations organized by the Stalinists were those that condemned Chamberlain for not immediately launching a war against Hitler; “British honor” and “England’s interests”—these were the mouth-filling shibboleths of the Stalinist manifestations. Unbelievable as it sounds—yet, what is unbelievable about Stalinism nowadays?—the “communists” in Dublin, where the writer happened to be on the eve of the Munich agreement, ran up and down the city calling upon

all good Irishmen and true to rally to the defense of that institution so deeply beloved by Erin—British Democracy.

It is this complete absence of a revolutionary international leadership that compelled the conference of the Bolshevik-Leninists not only to reaffirm their view that the two existing Internationals had become counter-revolutionary, but to found the new International. Properly speaking, the struggle for the new International dates back to the seizure of power by Hitler in 1933 and the lamentable capitulation of the communist and social-democratic parties, which retired from the field of battle without even firing a shot. It was then that the world movement that had developed around the struggle of the so-called “Trotskyist Opposition” in the Communist International, announced the abandonment of its ten-year-old position of concentration upon reforming this International. It issued the call for a new communist International and new communist parties to replace those that had collapsed so ingloriously.

In the period of intense discussion and ferment that followed in the radical movement after the German events, the movement for the Fourth International gained strength in one country after another. In 1934, the famous Pact of Four in favor of the new International was signed by the International Communist League, the Independent Socialist Party of Holland and the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Holland (the two last-named organizations were soon to fuse into one), and the Socialist Workers Party of Germany. If the new International was not actually founded until four years later, it was only in order to allow for the elapse of a necessary period in which the fundamental discussions and the clarification and taking up of positions could occur. This was necessary, even if to a much smaller measure, for the International Communist League as well as for the numerous groups which were breaking or had already broken away from the old Internationals.

In this respect, the last four-five years have been among the most instructive and fruitful in our century. To the superficial observer, they appear to have constituted a period of chaos, of endless unifications and an even greater number of splits, of pointless academic disputes and meretricious personal recrimination—all largely incomprehensible and leading to nothing more positive than the constant churning up of stagnant water. The more careful observer, however, could discern both meaning and purpose in the developments of this period. Out of chaos comes the star, said the philosopher; and what appears to many to have been the chaos of these last five years was in reality the all-important period of gestation of the new international revolutionary movement.

Every movement that seeks to adapt itself intelligently to an important turn in history, finds almost invariably that there are elements in its ranks who, either because of forces and ideas latent in them or because of the conservatizing influence of yesterday’s tactic, are unable to adjust themselves to the requirements of the new situation and, consequently, fly off at a tangent. In the past half-decade of the International Communist League’s evolution, this phenomenon took the form of various ultra-leftist groups which in substance resisted the determination of our movement to become the effective leadership of the revolutionary vanguard. The struggle against these groups had only had a profound educational effect upon our movement, helping to inoculate it more deeply against infantile radicalism in its senile stage, but served to dissipate the legend injudiciously disseminated by our adversaries that there was something “innately sectarian” about the “Trotskyist movement”. In the course of the struggle, which was often sharp and almost as often led to splits in our movement, the contending currents were subjected to decisive tests. Everywhere, and without exception, the ultra-leftists, who soon revealed that they were really imbued with a deep-rooted conservatism, stagnated and then began to decompose to the point where many of them disappeared into the politi-

¹The organ of the American section of the Second International, the *Socialist Call*, has an ingenious formula for dealing with the treachery of the Second International to which it is affiliated: it just ignores it, or else deliberately conceals its infamy by referring with pious horror to the equally infamous position of the Third International. A typical instance is its issue of October 1, 1938. It proudly announces on its first page that “French Socialists Fight War” and that there has been formed a “World Workers’ Front Against War”. The first refers to an anti-war manifesto of the Workers and Peasants Socialist Party, but delicately refrains from mentioning the fact that this group was recently expelled from the patriotic party of Léon Blum—French section of Thomas’ International. The second refers to a conference of the London Bureau, composed of groups which are also outside of the Second International. And is there no news at all about what the parties of the Thomas International are doing in the war crisis? Indeed there is, but why talk about it? It is not for nothing that the *Socialist Call* considers itself the stout proponent of sincerity, honesty and morality in the labor movement.

cal void. No less telling is the fact that in this whole period those that succeeded in maintaining a vegetable existence never managed to establish any serious international relationships among themselves; that is, none of them succeeded in rising above the level of a purely national existence. While our movement continued to move forward to deeper solidity and influence, Weisbord, Field, Oehler, Bauer, Eiffel, Vitte, Lasterade, Vereecken, Ridley, etc., etc., having nothing left but wind-blown débris to show that at one time they were living groups.

As for those who scoffed disdainfully at our allegedly permanent process of schism, and who travelled light under the banner of "Unity", they have not a very encouraging balance-sheet to show. They not only did not succeed in averting splits—they have had little else but splits to record in the past period—but they did not learn anything from their splits and subsequent disintegration. The world is strewn with once large organizations which, under the slogan of unity with everybody in an "all-inclusive party", ended up reduced to the smallest and least effectual of sects. The Italian Maximalist party of Balabanova, which tried to hold together the incompatible extremes of communism and social democracy in one party, which continues to bewail to the present day the "arbitrary splitting of the united Italian party by Lenin and Trotsky" some two decades ago, has become the tiniest of all Italian groups, a hazy myth around the head of its traditional spokesman. The tens of thousands of members of Britain's Independent Labour Party, whose leaders talked all the more about the virtues of "unity" in order to talk all the less about revolutionary principle, have been reduced to less than two thousand effective members—outnumbered today in the decisive London area by the despised "sectarians" of the unified British Bolshevik-Leninist organization. An even crueller fate overtook the German Socialist Workers Party (S.A.P.). What happened to the "all-inclusiveness" of the Norman Thomas party in this country should be no less instructive to those still capable of learning from life.

Of all the currents and movements in the international working class, only the Fourth International can boldly and honestly claim the heritage of the great principles and traditions of revolutionary Marxism and its past protagonists. The movement for which it speaks has demonstrated the consistency, virility and lifeworthiness, determination and capacity, to mobilize the masses once again for the conclusive victory over exploitation and class rule. The two old Internationals have long ceased to pretend that they are our revolutionary rivals; they are only reactionary obstacles to the working class which it will sweep aside in its forward march. The groups outside the two Internationals still inimical to our movement—the disintegrating London Bureau and the disintegrated Brandler-Lovestone International (what, by the way, has happened to it? It would be interesting to read an official accounting!)—find that their revolutionary pretenses have become quite transparent.

The road is left free to the Fourth International! The future belongs to it!

Beside constituting the Fourth International, and adopting the statutes that correspond to a serious, centralized world party, the main job of the international conference was the adoption of the Revolutionary Transitional Program of the International—the program of immediate demands for the period in which we are fighting. The importance of this program cannot be overrated. Not only and not so much because of the thoroughgoing analysis it makes of the present period, for that analysis has been made before, but because of the rounded and concrete program it presents to the working class, the peasantry and the colonial peoples of the world for immediate action on all the pressing problems of life and struggle that now confront them. The program—it has already appeared in full in the international conference number of the *Socialist Appeal* and will shortly be printed as a separate pamphlet—corresponds magnificently to

the requirements for such a document laid down by Rosa Luxemburg some two generations ago:

In actuality our whole program would be a miserable scrap of paper if it were not capable of serving us for all eventualities and in every moment of the struggle, and to serve us by virtue of its being practised and not by its being shelved. If our program is the formulation of the historical development of society from capitalism to socialism, then obviously it must formulate also all the transitional phases of this development, it must contain them in their fundamental features, and therefore also be able to indicate to the proletariat the corresponding attitude in the sense of approaching closer to socialism in every given moment. From this it follows that for the proletariat there cannot, in general, be a single moment when it would be compelled to leave its program in the lurch, or in which it could be left in the lurch by this program.

Our international program of action, which will be read and re-read as one of the classic documents of Marxism, does not confine itself to the demand for the socialist republic, nor to general and abstract denunciations of the danger of war and fascism and the offensive of capitalist reaction. On the contrary, it is a document that indicates the line of action that must and can be taken by the proletariat today, now, in light of the contradiction between the objectively revolutionary situation and the ideological backwardness of the working class itself. It is a powerful weapon for cutting the bonds of political enslavement which fetter the international labor movement and at the same time a means of leading it into battle with slogans and demands that correspond to its aspirations and interests and to objective reality. Throughout it is permeated with the determination—repressed or suppressed by all other sections of the labor movement—to restore the *class independence of the workers*, that indispensable prerequisite to effective struggle; and it indicates the concrete practical steps by means of which this will be accomplished.

It will indeed be accomplished! The Fourth International is inspired by an irrepressible confidence in the resourcefulness, the initiative, the powers of recuperation, the invincibility and final triumph of the proletariat. If we are curt and contemptuous towards whimperers, people who have retired from the class struggle with despondent sighs, short-sighted people who identify a period of reaction, however black, with the conclusive defeat of the revolution, people who ascribe their own weakness, indecision and blundering to the proletariat—it is only because we have no patience with anyone who stands to any extent in the way of the serious movement that is resolved to continue the work of mobilizing the masses for the decisive assaults upon the enemy. Better that all these gentlemen stand aside and do their wailing and contemplating in private, before they are moved aside in a less polite way.

We go ahead under the banner of the Fourth International, with our old convictions, our tested principles, and with no doubts as to the final outcome.

Max SHACHTMAN

Argentinians Issue Another Magazine

A SECOND MAGAZINE in support of the Fourth International has been issued in the Spanish language by a group of Fourth Internationalists in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The publication is called *Inicial* and copies of the first number recently reached the office of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Well printed and of excellent content, *Inicial* has already made a place for itself among Argentinian workers. Last month we announced the publication of *Nuevo Curso*. Now two organs of the Fourth International movement are carrying the message of revolutionary Marxism to the workers and peasants in the Argentine. Congratulations, comrades of *Inicial* and long life!

Social-Patriotic Sophistry

The Question of the Defense of Czechoslovakia's "National Independence"

DURING THE CRITICAL WEEK in September, we have been told, voices were heard even at the left flank of socialism maintaining that in case of "single combat" between Czechoslovakia and Germany, the proletariat should help Czechoslovakia and save its "national independence" even in alliance with Benes. This hypothetical case did not occur—the heroes of Czechoslovakian independence, as was to be expected, capitulated without a struggle. However, in the interests of the future we must here point out the grave and most dangerous mistake of these untimely theoreticians of "national independence".

Even irrespective of its international ties Czechoslovakia constitutes a thoroughly imperialist state. Economically, monopoly capitalism reigns there. Politically, the Czech bourgeoisie dominates (perhaps soon we will have to say, dominated!) several oppressed nationalities. Such a war, even on the part of isolated Czechoslovakia would thus have been carried on not for national independence but for the maintenance and if possible the extension of the borders of imperialist exploitation.

It is impermissible to consider a war between Czechoslovakia and Germany, even if other imperialist states were not immediately involved, outside of that entanglement of European and world imperialist relations from which the war might have broken out as an episode. A month or two later the Czech-German war—if the Czech bourgeoisie could fight and wanted to fight—would almost inevitably have involved other states. It would therefore be the greatest mistake for a Marxist to define his position on the basis of temporary conjunctural diplomatic and military groupings, rather than on the basis of the general character of the social forces standing behind this war.

We have repeated hundreds of times the priceless thesis of Clausewitz that war is but the continuation of politics by other means. In order to determine in each concrete case the historic and social character of the war we must be guided not by impressions and speculations but by a scientific analysis of the politics which preceded the war and determined it. These politics from the very first day of the creation of Czechoslovakia had an imperialist character.

One can say that besides the partition of the Sudeten Germans, Hungarians, Poles, and possibly the Slovaks too, Hitler will not stop before the enslavement of the Czechs themselves and that in this case their struggle for independence will have every claim upon the support of the proletariat. To pose the question in this manner is nothing but social-patriotic sophistry. What concrete roads further development of imperialist antagonisms will take we do not know. Complete destruction of Czechoslovakia is possible, of course. But it is also possible that before this destruction will have been accomplished a European war will break out and Czechoslovakia will find itself on the side of the victors and participate in a new dismemberment of Germany. Is the rôle of a revolutionary party then that of nurse of the "victimized" gangsters of imperialism?

It is absolutely clear that the proletariat must construct its policy on the basis of the *given* war as it is, *i.e.*, as it has been determined by the whole preceding course of development and not on hypothetical speculation over a possible strategic result of the war. In such speculations everyone will inevitably choose that variant which corresponds best to his own desires, national

sympathies and antipathies. It is clear that such a policy does not have a Marxist but a subjective, not an internationalist but a chauvinist character.

An imperialist war, no matter from what corner it begins, will be carried on not for "national independence" but for the division of the world in the interests of separate cliques of finance capital. This does not exclude that in passing the imperialist war could improve or worsen the condition of this or that "nation", or, more exactly, of one nation at the expense of another. Thus, the Versailles peace treaty dismembered Germany. A new peace treaty may dismember France. Social-patriots utilize precisely this possible "national" danger of the future in order to support "their" imperialist bandits of the present. Czechoslovakia does not represent any exception from this rule.

In reality all speculative arguments of this kind and the frightening of people over future national calamities for the sake of the support of this or that imperialist bourgeoisie flow from *tacit rejection of revolutionary perspective and revolutionary policy*. Naturally *if* a new war ends in the 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 the Versailles treaty places new chains for decades upon the people; *if* unfortunate humanity bears all this in silence and submission—not only Czechoslovakia or Belgium but also France can be hurled back into the position of an oppressed nation (the same supposition may be made in regard to Germany). In this eventuality the further frightful decomposition of capitalism will cast all humanity back for many decades. Of course in the realization of this perspective, that is, a perspective of passivity, capitulation, defeat, and decline, oppressed classes and entire peoples must then climb on all fours in sweat and in blood over the historic road already once traversed. Is such an outlook excluded? *If* the proletariat suffers without end the leadership of social-imperialists and communist-chauvinists; *if* the Fourth International is unable to find a road to the masses; *if* the terrors of war do not push the workers and soldiers on the road to rebellion; *if* the colonial peoples bleed patiently in the interests of the slaveholders, 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. Even then we, or rather our sons, will have to determine the policy in regard to future wars on the basis of the *new* situation. But today we proceed not from the perspective of decline but from the perspective of revolution; we are defeatists at the expense of 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 conjunctural 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. The program of the Fourth International states that the freedom of all European nations, both large and small, can be secured only within the frame of the Socialist United States of Europe. We look ahead and not backward!

Leon TROTSKY

COYOACAN, D.F., October 14, 1938

The Popular Front's Guilt

THE PREREQUISITE of sound revolutionary policy is to see things as they are. No little part of the victorious advance of Hitler is the gift of his opponents' inability to give a straight account of reality. How little these illusions have served the cause of effective struggle against fascism! When the Nazi movement appeared, clever liberals said Germany was not Italy. The Munich beer-hall putsch they thought very funny, very funny, what with Ludendorff falling down flat on his stomach and Hitler landing up in jail. The social crisis and with it the Nazi movement grew. Hitler lost two million votes and the German communists proclaimed that fascism was finished. The *Rote Fahne* vociferated that the proletariat was ready to strike at the command of the Communist Party. Hitler took power with little more resistance than a couple of street fights. The social democrats, headed by Otto Wels, and trade unionists led by Leipart hoped that by declaring their loyalty to the Nazi state, they would be allowed to function as a legal opposition. Hitler destroyed the entire German free trade union movement and put its leaders into concentration camps. Undeterred by any prejudice for truth, the Stalinists kept telling their followers that all was not yet over; the revolution would break out any day. The country was allegedly honeycombed with red cells and Storm Troopers were preparing to transfer their allegiance. But the German proletariat kept paying the price of capitulation. The next self-deception of these tragi-comic politicians was in Germany's isolation. Hitler was surrounded by the "democracies". The Reichswehr generals were in opposition. Hitler, however, had taken the measure of the "democracies". He occupied the Rhineland and introduced conscription. He made a deal with the Poles and Mussolini. Austria was taken. Czechoslovakia was hemmed in. The gallant Czech people would fight, the world was next told. The French army was the best in Europe. The Russians had the deadliest air fleet and could drop whole regiments behind the enemy's lines by the parachute route. But the ramshackle edifice of the Popular Front and collective security, put to the test, collapsed like a pricked balloon.

The fact is that the Munich accord is the greatest victory that German fascism has carried off since 1933. Hitler stands at the head of a totalitarian state of 80 million Germans, more powerful than Bismarck, or perhaps Napoleon. Munich was the final smash-up of the Versailles balance of power. The map of Central Europe is now redrawn. Economic and political domination of Southeastern Europe goes to Nazi Germany. The Little Entente is dissolved. The Czech alliance with the U.S.S.R. is broken. The Franco-Soviet pact is dead. The Baltic countries are whipped into the orbit of either Germany or Poland. Hungary will be a satellite and nobody takes the military power of Carol's Rumanian dictatorship seriously. In the last war von Mackensen romped through the gallant Rumanian army in the matter of a couple of weeks, if our memory serves us. The remnant of Czechoslovakia has become totalitarian. The French have appointed an ambassador to Rome. Chamberlain and Mussolini are preparing to liquidate Spain. Barcelona can be transformed into a fascist set-up as rapidly as Prague. The Soviet Union is isolated and to all intents and purposes the German army is encamped on the borders of the Ukraine.

Fascism bestrides the continent; it is idle to deny it. Munich was the grand pay-off for two decades of defeat of the proletarian revolution. In 1918 the German Social Democracy could have chosen an "eastern orientation", a bloc with revolutionary agrarian Russia. The Bolsheviks proposed such a bloc. Europe was still in a state of post-war revolutionary ferment. A union of Russia and Germany would have put an end to capitalist domination and led to a United States of Europe. It was the

most natural alliance for both parties. The bourgeois Germany of Rathenau found it necessary to conclude the Rappallo Treaty and foster trade relations. The German Reichswehr found it necessary to seek collaboration with the General Staff of the Red Army. But the Social Democracy contemptuously rejected the Bolshevik advances and embarked on a Western orientation. They decided to fulfil the impossible terms of the Treaty of Versailles, taking on themselves an odium that was to cost them dearly in the future, the odium for the degradation and humiliation of a once great power. But no matter how "loyally" the Weimar Republic kowtowed to the Versailles powers, they were always kept humbly waiting on the door-step of the servants entrance. Otto Bauer preferred the same policy for Austria. In 1923 and again in 1933, social democratic and communist parties evacuated all their positions, surrendered all the social gains of decades to fascism without a struggle. The Austrian workers fought, proving that the rank and file was made of different mettle than the parliamentary leadership. But it was too late.

The tide of revolutionary unrest and the will to combat fascism rose high again in the French labor movement in 1934. The combined efforts of the Socialists and Stalinists succeeded in diverting the revolutionary ferment into the channels of popular frontism. Social-patriotism and class collaboration were sweetened in the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy which had entered into an alliance with the imperialist "democracies". To this alliance the revolutionary cause of the Spanish workers was sacrificed. The struggle of the Spanish workers for their social liberation was prohibited by the united threats and pressure of the "democracies" and Moscow. To all protests of the militants, to all the warnings of revolutionary Marxists the Second and Third Internationals replied that the Popular Front was the way to fight fascism at home, and collective security the way to hold the fascist powers in check abroad. This was the "struggle for peace and democracy". A revolutionary policy, a policy of the class struggle would we were told open the road to fascist aggression; it would weaken the democracies and encourage the aggressor. The Internationals of Social Democracy and Stalinism thus became the most ardent defenders of the capitalist status quo and of the Versailles set-up.

To Hitler these policies of the Comintern and Social Democracy were worth any number of army corps. He no longer had to fear the effect that a revolutionary working class in the "democratic countries" would have on the workers of the fascist countries. The Popular Front's acceptance of the status quo as its point of departure enabled Hitler to represent his opponents as the people who wanted to perpetuate the Peace Treaty of 1919. On the other hand despite all the propaganda for the democracy of "brave little Czechoslovakia", the event has shown that the French workers were little impressed. Millions of workers in both England and France must have had an uneasy feeling that they would be fighting to maintain three million Germans under Czech rule. There must have been many in France who recalled that when a proposal was made in the French Chamber in 1933 to join in the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Czech republic, the Stalinist Peri got up to oppose it on the ground that "our sympathy goes to the working classes of Czechoslovakia and the minorities oppressed by the central power in Prague". He proceeded to accuse Benes of preparing "concentration camps on the model of Hitler's Germany". In the debates in the Socialist party, Paul Faure recently reminded his colleagues that "at the moment when the Sudeten Germans were ceded to Czechoslovakia, the Socialist party took a position in favor of the Sudetens". When it came to the point the French worker proved unwilling to fight for the rotten fruits of the Versailles Peace.

Collective Security proved to be a colossal swindle. What happened at Munich was a more grandiose repetition of the sanctions farce during the Italo-Ethiopian war. The Munich accord writes finis to the successive hoaxes of the Covenant of the League, the Kellogg Pact to outlaw war, the Nine-Power Treaty to safeguard China and all the rest of the legalistic skulduggery that was to lull the peoples into the illusion that "power politics" had given way to the "reign of law", but was in reality a means of sanctifying the existing partition of the world among the powers on the basis of their relation of forces in 1918. All that the collective security talk did was to blunt the edge of the revolutionary struggle against war and militarism inside the mass movement and thereby enable Hitler, with the acquiescence of the "democratic" imperialisms to advance his interests in Central Europe and effect a new equilibrium. Collective Security was as little capable of stopping Hitler as sanctions stopped Mussolini.

Munich enables us to draw a fresh balance of the condition of "democracy". Several years of the Popular Front have issued in the growth of reaction. The *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent confirms this. "The internal consequences of Munich in France are still incalculable. The idea of building up a tremendous defence machine has gained ground and with it all sorts of theories about an authoritarian regime, a military dictatorship, a totalitarian financial system." A hopeful sign is the report that "among the working class, on the other hand, there is profound disgust with the 'Republican regime' as it has functioned in the last few months and a great loss of loyalty to 'democracy'." The danger is that in default of revolutionary leadership, this same disgust with "democracy" may easily wind up in the channels of fascism. Frank Hanighen in the *New Republic* reports much in the same vein: "... disquieting results are now back of the relief at demobilization and peace, one can discern among the workers not only a disgust with their clumsy government but also a disillusion with such slogans as 'democracy', 'front against fascism', etc." Such darlings of the Left as Kerillis are calling for an authoritarian republic. The *mystique* of the Popular Front is gone.

The role of the U.S.S.R. those weeks of crisis was a complete reflection of the impotence and degeneration of the Soviet bureaucracy. Nobody has yet explained how the destruction of the political and spiritual capital of the Russian revolution could possibly enhance the authority of the U.S.S.R. in international diplomacy. When Eden was toasting Stalin in Moscow and Litvinoff was toasting His Majesty, when Barthou and Herriot were negotiating for Russia's entrance into the League, and the Franco-Soviet pact appeared in outline, it looked like a diplomatic triumph for the Stalinist regime, particularly after the accession of Hitler in Germany. But all this was a pretentious facade. The complete isolation of the U.S.S.R. during the Berchsgaden-Godesberg-Munich negotiations is the pay-off. While Chamberlain and Hitler talked, Litvinoff sat in the charnel-house of Geneva. At no time was the voice of the Soviet Union heard clearly. Litvinoff mumbled something, Maisky mumbled something. Poland was warned not to take Teschen (which she proceeded to do nevertheless). It appears that the real explanation for Soviet paralysis was Colonel Lindbergh. Against the colonel, Stalin ordered full mobilization (of verbal batteries) and war to the knife. Lindbergh destroyed the Popular Front, Lindbergh overthrew collective security and Lindbergh is the mortal enemy of democracy.

Anyone familiar with Stalin's record of diplomatic "successes" cannot be surprised by the addition of Munich. The famous Anglo-Russian Committee experiment wound up in the Scotland Yard raid on Arcos. The famous strategy of Stalin in the Kuomintang ended with the slaughter of Russian functionaries in Shanghai and Borodin and Galen taking to their heels with Chiang Kai Shek's men in hot pursuit. When Hitler came to power Trotsky's suggestion that the Red Army mobilize was denounced

as adventurism (despite the acknowledged fact that the Reichswehr was not prepared to resist had the French marched during the occupation of the Rhineland much later). Instead Stalin hurried to conclude a trade treaty with Hitler. When the workers of all other countries were demonstrating in protest against Hitler's terrorism, only the Soviet workers were ordered to remain silent. Loudly demanding the application of sanctions during the Italo-Ethiopian war, the Stalinist bureaucracy itself steadily maintained its oil shipments to Mussolini. When the Spanish civil war broke out, Stalin did intervene—to keep the working class harnessed to the Popular Front and bourgeois democracy.

But the sabotage and ruination of the revolutionary movement abroad means the increasing isolation of the October revolution. The fear of the gathering volume of political and social discontent in the Soviet Union forces Stalin to his preventive purges, which undermine the strength and morale of the army, the navy, the schools, and every institution in the country. The one shortage that Stalinist Russia escapes is executions. The imperialist powers have naturally drawn their conclusions, Daladier and Chamberlain ignore the U.S.S.R. in their calculations, and Hitler speculates on the state of mind of the Ukrainian peasant—and no doubt also receives reports on the outlook of fascism among the soviet bureaucrats.

The European crisis has strikingly revealed the horror that the masses entertain for modern war. This is confirmed on all hands. The Paris correspondent of the *New Republic* writes: "the mobilization instead of reviving nationalist brio among the people, had an almost reverse effect". If anything more was needed the sense of relief that swept Europe after the Munich conference is sufficient evidence of the desire for peace. Yet in this situation, where the masses are helpless without leadership, the Stalinists, laborites and social democrats were out in the forefront as vociferous warmongers. The Social Democracy of 1914 cannot be said to have actually assumed the initiative of agitating for war. The Comintern of 1938 did. The masses drifted, in the clutch of the diplomacy of their governments. As an organized international force and as a political factor, the working class were therefore absent. The British Labor party on account of its pro-war stand is committed to the heavier rearmament program of Chamberlain. Their leaders like Lord Strabolgi have already come out "for a measure of compulsory National Service" that is to say, conscription.

In sharp contrast with the chauvinist incitements of the Laborite and Stalinist organizations was the fervent peace sentiment manifested by the masses. More than ever that peace sentiment becomes a progressive factor that intelligent revolutionary socialist policy must reckon with. The "struggle for peace" which the Moscow Comintern proclaimed as its guiding light at its Seventh Congress, and which ostensibly justified the Franco-Soviet pact and U.S.S.R. entry into the League of Nations, turned in reality into a struggle for imperialist war. The American League for Peace and Democracy (erstwhile League Against War and Fascism) became the leading exponents of "collective security" for the imperialist status quo. The crisis made clear that the "pacifism" of the masses, repeatedly evidenced in the United States by the figures of the Gallup poll and the support of the Ludlow Amendment, is well nigh universal. Even in France when the workers were brought face to face with the impending catastrophe of war, Stalinist propaganda rapidly lost influence. The struggle for peace must become one of the cornerstones of our policy. But we must convince the masses that the way to peace lies as little in "isolation" as in "collective security" and certainly does not lie in huge programs of rearmament. We must prove that the struggle for peace can be victorious only as a struggle for socialism, that it can be secured not by congressional resolutions or constitutional amendments, but by the working class conquest of power.

Maurice SPECTOR

Labor Unity — A New Stage

JOHN L. LEWIS recently offered to resign as chairman of the Committee for Industrial Organization provided that William Green as president of the American Federation of Labor would do likewise. "It then may be possible," declared Lewis, "for the remaining leaders of the Federation of Labor and the remaining leaders of the C.I.O. to conclude a peace pact, in which event the contribution made by Mr. Green and myself would be of some value." That was a gesture the importance of which lies not in the fact that if carried into action Green would become merely another unemployed member of the musicians' union while Lewis still retained power in the C.I.O., but that it symbolizes the tremendous and basic changes in the labor movement during the past year under the impact of the social crisis.

Perhaps even more striking was the attitude which Daniel J. Tobin, president of the teamsters union, largest and most powerful A.F. of L. affiliate, took at the A.F. of L. convention this year. One may well ask, what is really happening in the labor movement that a 66-year-old fellow-traveler of the A.F. of L. executive council looms as the leader of a progressive revolt within the A.F. of L. against the reactionary policies advocated by that board, on the question of labor unity? And above all, one asks, will there be unity? On what basis and to whose advantage? These are the problems that concern the militant and revolutionary workers. In their answer lies the future of the American labor movement.

It was no secret that the huge lay-offs in mass production industries cut deeply into the dues-paying membership of the C.I.O., while the A.F. of L. appeared to be prospering, relatively speaking. The membership figures released at the A.F. of L. convention were imposing enough: over 3,600,000 dues-paying and 1,400,000 unemployed members. A total membership of 5,000,000 compared to a very generous estimate of 4,000,000 dues and non-dues paying C.I.O. unionists. The bitter struggles within the C.I.O. such as appeared in the autoworkers union and elsewhere promised a stormy future. Newspapers were filled with talk of disintegration of the C.I.O. The action of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 400,000 strong, in refusing to participate in the formation of C.I.O. councils tended to give credence to those pessimistic views of the C.I.O.'s future. Would the C.I.O. unions be forced to make peace, one by one, with the A.F. of L. executive council? Yet precisely at the moment when things looked dark for the C.I.O., the edifice of the A.F. of L. cracked wide-open at the convention, showing that the perennial domination of the aristocracy of labor over the industrial proletariat was doomed. In the past two years the A.F. of L. itself had been forced as a defensive measure to organize many plants on an industrial basis.

In marked contrast to previous depressions, no wave of wage cuts have swept across the industrial scene this last year—a remarkable tribute to the power the proletariat has found in organizing industrially under the banner of the C.I.O. The A.F. of L. registered 800,000 new members in this same critical year. But most outstanding was the signing of a pact covering 250,000 drivers with substantial wage increases. This was the achievement of the teamsters union, under the progressive influence of the Minneapolis labor movement. Superficially, the gains of the teamsters union, tended to reaffirm the hegemony of the A.F. of L. in the entire labor movement. Actually it was a victory for the movement of industrial workers, and this was strikingly brought out at the A.F. of L. convention. While the collapse in building activity seriously crippled the building trades department of the A.F. of L., heart of the die-hard craft-unionists, the gains of the teamsters effected a significant shift in the very social base of the A.F. of L.

It is reflected in the fact that the teamsters have taken control of the Central Labor unions from the building trades unions in such key centers as Akron, Cleveland, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Seattle, among others. By the very nature of their work, the truck drivers serve as a powerful buffer force between C.I.O. and A.F. of L. unions. When 350,000 truckdrivers say they will not fight the C.I.O. but fight for labor unity, the "die-hard" clique in the A.F. of L. becomes a general staff without an effective army. Months ago, an official C.I.O.-A.F. of L. coordinating committee representing the Industrial Union Council and the Central Trades and Labor Assembly was set up in Akron, Ohio, without unfavorable action from top A.F. of L. leaders, although that was feared.

Further evidence of the change within the structure of the A.F. of L., and the effect of the social crisis, is the defeat of Mathew Woll, John P. Frey, and the other bureaucrats of the executive council when their demand that the convention endorse an attack on the New Deal (from the reactionary viewpoint) was rejected. That expressed in distorted form the desires of the rank and file A.F. of L. for a solution to their problems along more progressive lines. The "socialism" of the New Deal over which Woll shuddered was exactly the only aspect which attracts the workers, even though they are dangerously deceived.

One year ago we pointed out that the cost of civil war between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. would soon work towards the direction of unity. The suicidal strife between Dave Beck, Seattle teamsters union czar, and Harry Bridges, Stalinist director of the West Coast C.I.O. was then at the height of its fury. The losses in wages, the arrests and imprisonment of leaders on both sides, the passage of strike-breaking and union-smashing legislation, coupled with the blows of the social crisis, forced a change in that disastrous policy. Beck recently urged an "economic united front with the C.I.O. despite political differences". When Akron, Ohio, cops broke a mass picket line in May at the Good-year plants, sending hundreds of C.I.O. workers to hospitals for treatment against tear-gassing and clubbing, labor mobilized under a United Labor Defense Committee composed of all A.F. of L. and C.I.O. unions in that area. "We'll be next if the cops get away with it," the A.F. of L. unionists realized. The committee has been placed on a permanent basis now. Similar stories of united action can be repeated in many cities. Fear of wage cuts, fear of growing reaction, and the obvious need for labor solidarity in these critical times have intensified the sentiment for unity in the rank and file of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. This burning desire has forced its way into the highest ranks of the labor bureaucrats.

The independent railroad brotherhoods of nearly 2,000,000 members face the most serious challenge of many years in their negotiations with management. Already a strike vote has been taken by 1,000,000 members against acceptance of a proposed 15% wage cut. Only the united strength of the entire labor movement can give the railroad workers effective support against government or management treachery. It is of the utmost concern to the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. to prevent a wage cut in this basic industry so that the example might not become a contagious one to the employers. This situation impels the brotherhoods towards desiring and becoming a part of the united labor movement.

The hegemony of the industrial workers in the American labor movement and the vital needs of this decisive force are bringing a rapid shift in the direction of unity. There are no longer any fundamental reasons that justify the separation of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. This is evident to the rank and file workers in both sections. The leaderships are on the spot. Perhaps unity will take the form, in terms of leadership, of a Dan Tobin-John L. Lewis-

George M. Harrison combination. For over a year we have heard reports in high C.I.O. circles that Tobin would be Lewis's candidate for president of a united labor movement. David Dubinsky, president of the I.L.G.W.U., is very anxious to emerge as the great "compromiser" in the labor movement. But these considerations are secondary. It is the content and not the form of labor unity that is decisive. The question no longer is pro-C.I.O. or pro-A.F. of L. Industrial unionism is a fact.

Roosevelt and Labor Unity

The message of President Roosevelt to the A.F. of L. convention urging unity of the labor movement was hailed in many sections of the labor movement as a powerful factor in bringing about peace. It is undeniable that Roosevelt wants labor unity. The questions that must be answered, however, is what kind of unity? This summer a Roosevelt-appointed commission went abroad to study the British Labor Disputes Act, and the Swedish arbitration system. Why? Surely the "Brain Trust twins", Corcoran and Cohen, know the provisions of those laws. The *New York Times* carried a complete analysis of them. What was desired by Roosevelt was publicity for the idea of arbitration, for the idea of "peaceful settlement" of the disputes between unions and management. Roosevelt is looking for a legislative method of taking away the right of labor to strike. And this idea is carefully being built up.

Simultaneously with this maneuver, another Roosevelt commission went into action. It was the Maritime Commission whose aims are (1) to build up a powerful merchant marine through huge subsidies, (2) to smash maritime unions. Both are essential points in Roosevelt's war plans. Maritime labor is to be crushed by taking away the union's vital right of control of hiring halls, and by the creation of "training schools for seamen", i.e., for strike-breakers. Government fink halls instead of union halls. The progressive role of the Sailors Union of the Pacific lies precisely in its intransigent fight against this government strike-breaking. The war crisis in Europe caused Roosevelt to accelerate his activities to curb any independent and militant tendencies in the labor movement. Hence his message to the A.F. of L. convention. Less than six months ago he refused to make such a statement, according to a revelation of Dan Tracy, president of the A.F. of L. electrical workers union. But the war crisis forced Roosevelt to discard his usual caution in avoiding stepping on anyone's toes.

Outright passage of a Hill-Shepard Bill or a similar measure which would break the back of the labor movement in war time has proven too difficult at this stage. A more gradual build-up is necessary from Roosevelt's point of view. Commissions to deal with "specific" problems. That is the way. Perhaps we shall even see a commission on labor unity. And even more important, the controversy over the Wagner Labor Disputes Act offers another wedge for the Roosevelt administration to foist union-controlling legislation on the labor movement.

The A.F. of L. executive council was voted power by the convention to seek amendments to the Wagner Act. Its criticism of the Act was primarily reactionary. It helped the C.I.O., i.e., the industrial proletariat, in its organizing campaigns, the council declared. The Act, or rather the interpretation of it by the National Labor Relations Board, hurt a few A.F. of L. unions. It made a few unjust decisions. Of any real criticism, that the Act and the N.L.R.B. didn't help labor enough, we heard not a word from the A.F. of L. So a campaign to modify it has begun. It so happens that this is precisely the program of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Here lies Roosevelt's opportunity. Pretending to succumb to the pressure of the A.F. of L. and of the Chamber of Commerce, he will announce or permit modification of the Wagner Act—and slip in provisions similar to those contained in the British Disputes Act. And another chain in binding labor during war will have been forged! The fight against altering the Wagner

Act carried on mainly by the C.I.O. unions is therefore a progressive one and it must be supported. Roosevelt views labor unity as a step vital to "national unity" in war-time. Counterposed to this is our concept of labor unity against "national unity" in labor's struggle to block another world imperialist slaughter.

The recent war crisis also served to expose clearly the role which the union bureaucracy will play more openly in the future. William Green, speaking on Czechoslovakia sounded like an editorial from the *Daily Worker*. He has already publicly announced support of Roosevelt's war plans. John L. Lewis in Mexico City did his part to try to swing Latin American workers behind the aims and needs of American imperialism. The never-ending poison of nationalism which the Stalinists feed their members and the labor movement is a guarantee that no matter what opponent America has in the next war, the patriotism of the C.P. is assured. Its special role in wartime will be the hounding of all progressives and revolutionists. Against this entire scheme of chaining the American labor movement to Roosevelt's war machine stands an ever increasing section of the unions. The strong anti-imperialist war resolutions passed by the Minneapolis A.F. of L. and the Lynn, Mass., C.I.O. unions is a sign of this development. The fight against the Hill-Shepard or May Bill by the entire labor movement is another indication. Real support for the original Ludlow war referendum bill also came only from the labor movement; the S.W.O.C. and the United Automobile Workers of America are two of the major unions which endorsed the war referendum proposal.

Future of the C.I.O.

The key to a thorough understanding of the C.I.O. lies in recognizing that it is primarily a social movement reflecting the needs, desires and aspirations of the conscious and decisive section of the industrial proletariat. It expresses itself on the economic front through industrial unions. Its political arm is Labor's Non-Partisan League. It represents a historical break with the traditions of conservatism in the A.F. of L. And it is inevitable that, under the limitations of purely economic struggles in an epoch of social crisis, the workers will turn more strongly in the direction of political action. Labor's Non-Partisan League of today must necessarily become the basis of a serious Labor Party development of tomorrow unless war or a not impossible temporary upswing in industrial and business activity postpones it. The vital importance of the C.I.O. movement to the progressive and revolutionary workers rests in understanding this conception.

The convention of the C.I.O. called for November marks a milestone in its history. Here the conflicts, contradictions, present and future of the C.I.O. will be decided one way or another. It faces three major problems requiring urgent solution. Every recent development within the C.I.O. indicates that it will stand ready to negotiate its differences with the A.F. of L. and unite. The rubberworkers convention and the New Jersey C.I.O. conventions took clear and progressive positions on this question recently. So have many other C.I.O. unions. The presence of delegates from the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 400,000 strong, at the C.I.O. convention would virtually guarantee a proper policy on labor unity. Indirectly, the I.L.G.W.U. exerts great pressure. Its refusal to accept the Lewis leadership unqualifiedly, and its withdrawal from C.I.O. council building moves helped curb the C.I.O. zealots. Now, a tactical change in policy for a drive within the C.I.O. would be a great impetus for labor unity, as was Tobin's action at the A.F. of L. convention. Which course the I.L.G.W.U. adopts, remains to be seen. Its executive board is meeting a few days prior to the date of the C.I.O. convention.

Two events in the C.I.O. served to bring out its most serious weakness and internal menace, i.e., the Stalinists. It took the

acute crisis in the autoworkers union and the division in the West Coast C.I.O. to warn the entire labor movement of the disastrous consequences of the Stalinist "rule or ruin" policy. Serving only the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy, the Stalinists opened up a reckless campaign to smash Homer Martin, president of the autoworker unions, mainly because he opposed their war-mongering "collective security" program. Harry Bridges, Stalinist West Coast C.I.O. director, alienated the A.F. of L. movement by his raiding, he split the Maritime Federation of the Pacific in an effort to obtain dictatorial control over the maritime workers, and drove the S.U.P. back into the A.F. of L. by his "rule or ruin" tactics. All this was done with the objective of chaining the militant maritime workers to Roosevelt's war plans. And on the East Coast, the National Maritime Union, Stalinist-dominated, accepts the government fink halls for the same reason. In every union, and many C.I.O. unions are controlled by them, the Stalinists frame-up militants, engage in an orgy of red-baiting against progressives, trample on union democracy, and ignore the most elementary union tasks necessary to preserve the unions.

Within the C.I.O. itself the reply to those ruinous policies was not long in forthcoming. The Los Angeles Progressive Trade Union conference, dealt Bridges and the Stalinists a heavy blow when they proclaimed publicly their opposition to that reactionary clique. They issued a 60-page booklet giving a detailed account of the Stalinist wrecking activities in the West Coast C.I.O. They demanded that Lewis remove Bridges from his appointed post!

The six-point program of the Los Angeles progressives offers a real weapon in fighting the Stalinist union wreckers and their bureaucratic allies. (1) Labor solidarity in the struggle for better conditions of employed and unemployed alike. We offer aid to any union, A.F. of L., C.I.O. or railroad brotherhood which is engaged in such a struggle. (2) Organize the unorganized. (3) Industrial unionism in the industries for which it is suited. No raids on existing organizations. (4) An actual democracy in the trade union movement. (5) Struggle against anti-labor legislation and government interference whether through use of courts, the National Guard, the police or otherwise. For the enforcement and extension of workers' rights. (6) For independent political action to supplement the trade union struggle. Around this program of action the C.I.O. can have a progressive future. Insofar as this program finds expression at the C.I.O. convention will the convention have a progressive character. Against this platform will be rallied the Stalinists and other reactionaries in the C.I.O.

For supporting the Stalinists in the autoworkers union, and for appointing Bridges as West Coast Director, John L. Lewis bears responsibility to the C.I.O. membership. The temporary successes of the Stalinists in the C.I.O. are largely due to Lewis' assent to their "rule or ruin" policy. Yet the defeat of the Stalinists rests not merely in a change of policy on Lewis' part. Quite the contrary. Only where the C.I.O. rank and file unites behind the Los Angeles program will a really serious struggle against the Stalinists be possible. The Lovestonite theory of "using" one bureaucracy to fight another revealed itself bankrupt in the auto union crisis. Martin, in the autoworkers union, answered the Stalinist attack with an essentially progressive program, unfortunately applied in a bureaucratic fashion. It was this weakness that played directly into the hands of the Stalinists, and along with the intervention of John L. Lewis, won for them, at least temporarily. The subsequent dismissal of militant organizers known as oppositionists to the Stalinist wreckers casts an ominous shadow on the future course of the union.

The third question before the coming C.I.O. convention is the future course of Labor's Non-Partisan League. The C.I.O. leadership apparently has learned nothing from the bitter experiences suffered by the policy of supporting Democratic or Republican "friends of labor". Martin L. Davey was elected governor of

Ohio with C.I.O. support. He used the National Guard to break the "Little Steel" strike. Now the C.I.O. is supporting Charles Sawyer, in Ohio. He is a millionaire corporation lawyer, described two years ago by the C.I.O. leaders as a "reactionary capitalist". In Pennsylvania, the L.N.P.L. again endorses Governor Earle for re-election after a public break in the primaries. In New Jersey, the Hague machine controls the Democratic party and holds a strong influence over the Republicans, and the C.I.O. workers won't swallow either. Yet the C.I.O. leaders quietly ignored the mandate of a special state-wide convention last winter to set up a Labor Party. This was done by a simple device. The executive committee elected at the Labor Party convention later reconstituted itself as the executive committee for Labor's Non-Partisan League. Now it refuses to run independent candidates when this is the only course left outside of boycotting the elections or supporting the Hague machine.

Labor Against Fascism

Incipient American fascism found its leading vocal expression in "I am the Law" Frank Hague, mayor of Jersey City, and member of the national committee of the Democratic Party. His ruthless crushing of C.I.O. organizing drives, his expulsions of "outside agitators" from the city through vigilante force, his red-baiting, and above all, his tremendous political power make him a serious challenge to the labor movement. It is a sad commentary on the state of the A.F. of L. movement in New Jersey that many prominent A.F. of L. leaders endorse Hague. One central union council even passed a resolution to that effect. Hague is out to protect the sweatshops of his area from unionism. He has fought the efforts of the C.I.O. to organize those exploited workers by thuggery and by clever demagoguery. The C.I.O. record against him is deplorable. Stalinist stooges, weak-kneed "liberal" congressmen, fake Stalinist "civil liberties" committees, Sir Galahads of the Norman Thomas stripe, have tilted with the effect of a Don Quixote against the Hague menace. Surrounded by Stalinists, W. J. Carney, militant New Jersey C.I.O. director, has found himself swamped by the resolution-passers while the courageous S.W.O.C. workers at the Crucible steel lodge in Jersey City find themselves alone in a successful fight for unionism against Hague. In the fact that the steel workers district council of New Jersey adopted a militant program of action for organizing in Hague's domain—the best way to fight him—lies the hope of smashing Hagueism. It should hardly be necessary to add that the Stalinists spend most of their time fighting the steel workers policies.

Elsewhere in America a similar acceleration in the growth of vigilante movements directed primarily against the union movement was witnessed this past year. The terror against the C.I.O. in New Orleans; the vigilante attack on the C.I.O. workers in Westwood, California; the kidnaping and beating of union organizers everywhere; these are cumulative manifestations of the growth of reaction. Rev. Gerald K. Smith again finds audiences for his gospel of fascism. The Silver shirts, the Bund and a score of other fascist groupings take on a new lease in life. What is the answer? A United Labor Defense Committee with special squads in Akron is a partial solution. Union Defense Squads in Minneapolis was the quick answer of the labor movement to threats by the Silver Shirts that they would raid the union headquarters and run the union leaders out of town. Extension of the idea of Workers Defense Squads—in this alone is there a safeguard against fascist attacks.

There is another danger. Division of the workers and farmers is a major point in the strategy of the bosses. Wealthier farmers organize into Associated Farmers, Inc. on the West Coast and the Middlewest. They recruit vigilantes and propagandize against the unions. In reply, the unions in Minneapolis, Omaha, the West Coast, and the rubberworkers in Ohio, unite with the lower strata of farmers. They cooperate with the farmers in obtaining

equitable prices. The C.I.O. has a national tie-up with the Farmers Union. Unity against the common enemy, America's Sixty Families, has been the only effective slogan for rallying the farmers to the worker. Labor is rapidly learning that it must give leadership and support to the sharecroppers, the lower strata of farmers, and the agricultural workers. Otherwise, a valuable ally can easily be turned into a foe.

The Unemployed

Around 15,000,000 unemployed suffer in misery from conditions brought by the social crisis of American capitalism which offers starvation as the only permanent prospect for the working class, under this system. Of these, less than 100,000 pay dues into the Stalinist-controlled Workers Alliance, although it claims 400,000 membership. For the first time in its history, the A.F. of L. took note of its unemployed members in convention reports. They number 1,400,000. The C.I.O. has at least that many. Of great importance is the new attitude towards its unemployed members. Unemployment is considered as the problem of the union movement. The idea of a completely independent organization for the unemployed hasn't worked out in the last decade, whatever the reasons may be. The only permanent and really successful—in obtaining concessions from the government—unemployed organizations have been those allied directly to the union movement. This has been the experience of the Federal Workers Section of 544, in Minneapolis. It has been followed in Salem, Ohio, in Lynn, Mass. and has begun in Akron. The auto-workers in Detroit, steel lodges in the middlewest: in fact, in many sections of the C.I.O., the union movement retains the unemployed as members in good standing, and takes up the problems. It gives the unemployed much greater power and prestige in fighting against present relief conditions when direct union affiliation has been retained. It unites more closely the employed and unemployed.

The recent national convention of the Workers Alliance consummated the final rites over this once large organization and turned it completely into another Stalinist stooge outfit. The progressive section in New York City broke away from the national organization. Other defections are on their way elsewhere. The Stalinists have but one hope left of covering up their criminal irresponsibility and actions in the Alliance that crippled it for life. For a year David Lasser, head of the Alliance, has been begging John L. Lewis for a C.I.O. charter. Against this maneuver and its ruinous consequences, hundreds of C.I.O. unions have written to the national office urging the C.I.O. to coordinate its unemployed work on a national scale and itself form a C.I.O. unemployed union, along industrial lines. Such a step would clearly be progressive, if the Stalinist wreckers are isolated and kept from capturing the proposed set-up. The question is coming before the national C.I.O. convention. It must be noted, that the A.F. of L. has been able to maintain high wage levels for its members on W.P.A. projects, and is talking about organizing the unemployed. This much is certain for the future, no matter what particular organizational forms emerge. The trade union movement in America must definitely and to an ever increasing degree concern itself with the unemployment question.

Summary

In the midst of an epoch of triumphant world reaction marked by the ascendancy of fascism, the American workers made remarkable advances. The brilliant wave of sit-down strikes of 1936-37 shook American capitalism to its foundations. It established industrial unionism permanently. Young, inexperienced, and barely organized, the C.I.O. carried on though it was plunged into the depths of a severe social crisis. And the American Federation of Labor found itself hammered by the blows of this same crisis. Yet, today the labor movement has held its own. In some respects it has made organizational gains. After the first

shocks of mass unemployment, the labor movement steadied itself. American workers are groping around for an answer to the crisis that has brought such increased misery and insecurity for them. Proposals for \$30 every Thursday, for an annual guaranteed wage, for a 30-hour week, for unemployment insurance, and a hundred other plans are advanced and experimented with by the labor movement.

There exists a certain inner cohesion in all these events. Inexorably, the American workers are moving towards class solidarity reflected in the trend towards unity in the labor movement. Dissatisfaction with capitalism is revealed in every proposal, good or bad, that the labor movement accepts against a continuation of the status quo. It is precisely this situation that offers unparalleled opportunities for the revolutionary movement. A program of transitional demands that express the desires of the workers in terms of tomorrow, a program that accelerates the development of class solidarity, a program that gives a better answer for today and prepares the workers for revolutionary advances tomorrow: This is a tremendous weapon held by the S.W.P.

The prospect of immediate world war in the recent European crisis threatened to cut short the opportunities of the revolutionary movement. The American labor movement would have been unprepared to meet that fundamental question except to fall victim to social patriotism. In the respite from war, history has given time as an ally to the revolutionary movement. Its agitation for a sliding scale of wages, for a 30-hour week, for turning over idle plants to workers, in a word, its program of transitional demands is on the order of the day. And war will not interrupt immediately. Our opportunity to cultivate the slender roots we have planted in the labor movement into a solid and broad base of the revolutionary movement is here now.

B. J. WIDICK

The Deserters and Munich

THE FRENCH syndicalist review, *La Révolution Proletarienne* (Oct. 10, 1938) prints the following interesting news, which has not appeared anywhere else to our knowledge, and which we publish for the information of our readers:

"From the information that we now have on the conference at Munich and especially from the speech of Chamberlain, it appears that it is Mussolini who, by taking the initiative in proposing different conditions from those contained in the memorandum of Hitler, made it possible for the conference to take place and to reach a conclusion; it is he who 'saved the peace'.

"Why did he do it?"

"On September 6, during the first days of the 'diplomatic tension', a company of Italian *bersaglieri* crossed the French frontier in the region of St.-Martin-Vésubie (Maritime Alps) with arms and baggage, their officers at the head and mule-packs at the end, to surrender to the French authorities.

"The fact was denied, the following day, by the semi-official newspaper of the Préfecture [police], the *Petit-Niçois*, but too many people saw the Italian soldiers in the streets of Nice and in the courtyard of the barracks for the thing not to be certain.

"During the weeks that followed, the desertions of this sort multiplied, increasing, according to the information supplied by comrades living on the spot, to several thousands of Italian soldiers on the frontier of Savoy. The French government holds all the newspaper and information services so tightly in its hands that nothing was published about this.

"But Mussolini did know about it. And that is why we can understand why *he did not want war*.

"The Italian deserters prevented, in September, the European war, like the Russian deserters prevented, in August, the Russo-Japanese war."

The Jewish-Arab Conflict

ARAB ECONOMY is for the most part feudal. Even its capitalist elements are to a considerable extent tied up with the feudal mode of exploitation (usury) or are feudal in origin, functioning both as landlord and capitalist. Alongside of this development has arisen a new stratum, the intellectuals who are connected with the upper classes (free professions, government officials). For the present it is these upper classes that exercise a dominant influence over the Arab masses. It is capitalist development in Palestine as well as English imperialist oppression of the Arab people which created the conditions for the rise of the Arab nationalist movement under the present leadership of the feudal and semi-capitalist classes.

These classes see in the imperialist domination of the country a superfluous and alien guardianship in the political control over the masses. Since, however, there is no fundamental social and economic antagonism between these classes and imperialism, the conflict is not too profound. On the other hand there does exist a conflict between the Arab upper classes and the Jewish population. Not because the latter is an element for the support of British imperialism but because it is a means for the development of Jewish capitalist economy. This conflict arises because the feudal elements among the Arabs fear the modernization of Palestinian society by the Jews and their own destruction. The Arab capitalist elements take part in this struggle mainly because of their exclusivist tendencies and their competition with the Jews.

The Arab ruling classes, aiming to settle the conflict with the Jews in their own favor, are always ready to strike a compromise with British imperialism at the expense of the Jews. Thus, for example, Djemal al Husseini, one of the outstanding leaders of the nationalist movement declared that the Supreme Arab Committee was agreed that Palestine should become a British crown colony, provided that Jewish immigration was halted. Another leader, Hassan Sidky Dajani, wrote in an open letter to the High Commissioner: "England is mistaken if she believes that we have risen against her . . . we recognize the power of her troops—a word from you, a word which England will not have to pay for too greatly would suffice to restore the situation to normal."

At the same time a basic conflict exists between the interests of the national and social emancipation of the Arab masses and British imperialism. This conflict can only be solved through the abolition of imperialist rule and the establishment of political independence.

Meanwhile, there exists, objectively, a conflict between the Arab masses and the Zionist aspirations towards exclusivism and maintenance of British rule. This conflict can only be solved to the extent that Jewish masses in Palestine renounce Zionist exclusivism. While the opposition of the Arab upper classes to the Jews is reactionary, the struggle of the Arab masses against Zionism is absolutely progressive. The upper classes are today successful in diverting the national struggle of the masses into anti-Jewish channels by means of the fact that the predominant majority of the Jewish population is Zionist. The anti-Jewish terror has only increased the influence of Zionism on the Palestinian Jewish masses and diverts their bitterness from the struggle against imperialism. All this leads to a situation where today a great part of the Arab masses believe that through their struggle against the Jews they are furthering their own national liberation whereas in fact they are only making their struggle more difficult to the extent that they are strengthening the positions of imperialism, Zionism and the feudal Arab leadership.

Aspects of Arab Nationalism

The entire development of the Arab nationalist movement in Palestine manifests a twofold aspect. On the one hand a feudal semi-bourgeois leadership which leads the movement into anti-Jewish channels without touching imperialism, on the other hand the Arab masses whose will to national liberation becomes increasingly stronger in so far as it crystallizes into anti-imperialist hatred. Only an international leadership can resolve this dual aspect. It is interesting and useful to consider the various stages through which Arab nationalism has passed. In the degree that the nationalist movement gained strength, the leaders proceeded to change the slogans, giving them an anti-Jewish twist. In 1921 the main argument of the feudal leaders was that the Jews wanted to gain possession of the holy places and secondarily, that the Jews were importing bolshevism. Definite statements were made that the movement was directed not against England but against Zionism. A couple of years before the pogroms of 1929 religious arguments were used for anti-Jewish agitation.

But with the development of the nationalist movement and the unity of the Arabs, Christians and Moslems, the religious argument was soft-pedaled and the question of the influence of Jewish immigration on the economic situation was stressed. The Arab leaders began to carry on propaganda using the slogan, "The Jews buy land and drive out the Arab peasants; the condition of the Arab peasants is so hard because of Jewish immigration; Arab industry suffers because of the development of Jewish industry; the Jews are to blame for the difficult financial condition of the government treasury and therefore you must fight the Jewish immigration and settlement."

The economic exclusivism of the Jews under the influence of Zionism (boycott of Arab workers and goods, etc.) enabled this agitation to find a widespread response among the Arab masses. Then came the years of prosperity, 1932-35, in which despite Zionist exclusivism the income and the living standards of the Arab masses arose in consequence of Jewish immigration. The economic arguments of the Arab leaders against the Jews lost their point. The national consciousness among the Arabs gained in step with the capitalist development of the country and of the nationalist liberation movements in the surrounding countries of the Near East. The question of the political set-up became a central problem around which the Arab nationalist movements concentrated. In the same period the Zionist chauvinist tendencies among the Jews became stronger with the decline of the international working-class movement. The chauvinist Zionist slogans among the Jews struck a responsive note with the greater political tension in the Mediterranean and the resulting need of British policy to create a considerable Zionist power in Palestine. Instead of the former slogan of the Zionist organization "Palestine a bi-national state", Zionist policy came out openly with the slogan of "The Jewish state". The Arab feudal and semi-capitalist leaders who were afraid that the nationalist movement would develop along independent and consistently anti-imperialist lines now raised the cry, "The Jews want to build a Jewish state in Palestine which will oppress the Arab minority while serving as a means of oppression in the hands of English imperialism."

The present Arab nationalist movement, permeated with an exclusivist spirit in the struggle against the Jews, is fertile soil for chauvinist fascist and particularly anti-Jewish ideas. The fascist powers send propagandists and money to Palestine in order to strengthen this ideological reactionary influence and so gain control of the nationalist movement. In the measure that the Comintern and the Second International play the role more and

more of political gendarmes against the movement of liberation in the colonies and to the extent that the international labor movement finds itself in a state of decline, the influence of chauvinist, anti-Jewish ideologies becomes stronger. Fascism succeeds more and more in making use of Arab nationalism in its own interests.

The Zionist Movement

It is our conviction that Zionism is a nationalist reactionary conception because it builds its hopes not on the class struggle of the international working class but on the continuation of world reaction and its consolidation.

The Zionist movement has been fighting for years to realize the slogan: "One hundred percent Jewish labor, one hundred percent Jewish production, etc." Pickets of Jewish workers were organized against Arab workers who held jobs in Jewish enterprises. Among these pickets there were to be found all kinds of people, from the right fascist wing of the Zionist movement to representatives of the "Haschomer-Hazair" (affiliated with the London Bureau). Haschomer-Hazair does not demand one hundred percent Jewish labor but Jewish labor only in Jewish enterprise with the exception of localities where the Arab workers have been engaged for many years (only 18% of the Arab workers in Jewish enterprise belong to this category). While therefore the Zionist movement generally demands 100% Jewish labor the Haschomer-Hazair demands 82% Jewish labor. There is still another small Zionist party divided into two wings which is against this picketing, the Left Poale-Zion.

This system of the "conquest of labor" leads to a situation where only in periods of economic crisis and the decline of wages of the Jewish workers, only in periods of political reaction can its aim be achieved, the penetration of Jewish workers by the eviction of the Arabs. In periods of the development of the Jewish and Arab working classes, of increased immigration, of rising living standards, the system of "the conquest of labor" is thwarted and the Jewish worker leaves the industry which was the bone of contention of the chauvinist struggle. The following table gives the figures for four different periods: 1) September 1933, beginning of prosperity in Palestine; 2) September 1935, high-water mark of prosperity; 3) June 1936, one month after the bloody events and the economic crisis; 4) September 1936, one and a half years after the beginning of the latest sharp crisis. The figures show the number of workers in six of the largest and most important Jewish colonies:

	Jewish Workers	Arab Workers
September 1933	2,433	1,687
September 1935	1,804	3,009
June 1936	2,739	1,271
September 1936	3,818	896

The business of picketing for Jewish labor only increases the damage which the working class Jewish as well as Arab, suffers from the unrestricted national competition of the workers of both peoples. The Arab workers, too, begin to set up pickets against Jewish labor, for example, in public works. The consequence is that the upper classes gain in influence. The government, too, knows how to exploit the situation. It plays the role of arbitrator and declares picketing illegal when it is on account of race, religion or language. This enables Jewish employers to avail themselves in any real conflict of Arab strikebreakers and likewise gives the Arab employer his chance to use Jewish strikebreakers. The system of the "conquest of labor" with its picketing weakens the working class and strengthens the position of both employers and British imperialism.

We should like to touch on the question of the relation of Zionism to imperialism. The Zionist movement is against the independence of Palestine and against every form of democracy ("as long as the Jews are a minority"). The extreme right wing of Zionism, the Revisionists, who have their separate organiza-

tion, have for years been demanding the establishment of the Jewish state on the basis of "an understanding between the Jewish legions and the strategic interests of British imperialism". Other sections of the Zionist bourgeoisie headed by Dr. Weizmann once declared that "Palestine will remain as Jewish as England is English". Later they declared that Palestine would be "bi-national" and that the mandate must be upheld at all costs. Today they support the partition plan and the setting up of a Jewish state as an ally of British imperialism. The Zionist reformist party (Mapei) calls for cooperation with the government and for the most part supports the idea of partition. *Haschmer-Hazair* calls for the struggle to preserve the mandate. The Poale-Zion party are for an anti-imperialist struggle but does not indicate what form of political regime is its immediate aim so that their slogans remain empty. Like the other Zionist parties they are against the democratization of the political system in the country. In consequence of their opposition to the immediate independence of Palestine a section of their supporters have rallied to the partition plan.

The whole Zionist movement with all its wings, therefore, supports British rule in Palestine in one form or another.

The Jews and British Imperialism

There are two opinions about the relation between the Jews in Palestine and British imperialism. The one views them as an integral part of the imperialist camp (this is the idea of the extreme Arab nationalists and their lackeys in the camp of the Stalinists); the second looks upon the Jews as an integral part of the Palestinian population and as such anti-imperialist. Neither of these views is correct. The former is wrong because the Jews are no thin, privileged stratum representing the exploiting interests of the Motherland. Simple comparison between the whites in South Africa and of the Jews in Palestine shows how wrong this view is.

The reformist leaders of the Jewish labor movement have drawn this comparison as an argument against the international organization of workers in Palestine. The Communist Party of Palestine (Stalinist) has naturally seized on this analogy in order to expose the "imperialist" role of the Jews. In the first place, however, the Jewish working population makes up more than half of the entire working class of Palestine whereas in South Africa, the whites are only one fifth of the working population. The South African white workers are for the most part the skilled element, and the natives are common laborers. In Palestine, categories of all kinds of labor are represented in both the Jewish and Arab sections. The South African whites are a thin "aristocratic" upper crust, who get about five times the pay of the natives. In Palestine the Jewish workers constitute not a thin crust but a class. In South Africa the whites enjoy ample political rights (democratic legislation, progressive labor legislation, etc.) whereas the Negroes are suppressed colonial slaves. In Palestine, both Jews and Arabs are oppressed by an alien government and are deprived of any kind of democratic rights.

Furthermore, take the fact that in Palestine there are two cities of mixed population where the Jews are in the majority, Jerusalem and Haifa. In both places, nevertheless, in accordance with the decrees and appointments of the government, the Mayors are Arab. The Jews are as little privileged in the matter of budget expenditures as of municipal administration. The Jews contribute 63 percent of the government income whereas in return they receive merely 14 percent (1934-35) of the government expenditures on education, only 34 percent of the public works expenditures, etc. Nor are they privileged in the matter of labor legislation.

If the Jews were an integral part of the imperialist camp, if their existence depended upon the exploitation and oppression of the Arab masses, it would be the duty of every revolutionary socialist to fight against the growth of the Jewish population.

But the position is quite otherwise. On the other hand, the view that compares Jewish immigration into Palestine with Jewish immigration in America is equally unreal. The Jews in America are a part of the general economic system and entertain no chauvinist aspirations such as the boycott of foreign goods and labor or the establishment of a national state. The Jewish population in Palestine does strive to become a majority and determines its political road in accordance with this perspective, building up a relatively closed national economy and boycotting Arab labor and goods. Influenced by imperialism and Zionism both, this population is against every attempt to obtain the democratization and independence of the country. If the Jewish population were an integral part of the Palestinian, it would be the duty of the revolutionary socialist to support the increase of this population element in all its forms as part of the anti-imperialist struggle. But to support all forms of the extension of the Jewish element (e.g., to be against democratization for fear that it would hold up the growth of the Jews) would be to sharpen the Jewish-Arab conflict, diminish the class differences inside the Arab population, and strengthen the Zionist tendency among the Jews.

The Jewish-Arab Conflict

What are the causes of this conflict? Two answers are advanced in Palestine. The Zionist groups say that the conflict is simply the collision of feudalism and reaction with the progressive forces of capitalism. The Arab nationalists and their Stalinist supporters, claim that the collision is between the Arab liberation movement and Zionism.

But the first explanation is wrong because the fact of the conflict between feudalism and capitalism does not explain the

Arab national movement in Palestine. There are parallel manifestations of nationalism in the adjacent countries (Syria, Egypt). Moreover it does not explain how a clique of effendis succeeded in getting control over a militant national movement of hundreds of thousands. It is clear that the basis of the antagonism of the Arab masses to the Jewish population does not arise from the fact that the latter have brought in a higher standard of living and have created a modern labor movement. Their principal opposition arises from the fact that they see in the Jewish population the bearers of Zionism, that political system based upon national exclusivism and hostility to the aspirations of the Arab masses to independence and democratization of the political regime.

The second view, the claim of the Arab nationalists, is likewise erroneous. It does not take into consideration that there really is a conflict between feudalism and capitalist development, secondly that inside the nationalist movement there is an Arab bourgeoisie which in competition with the closed Jewish economy develops exclusivist Arab tendencies, and thirdly, that the Jewish population is no integral part of the imperialist camp.

What follows therefore is that the collision in the Arab-Jewish conflict is between two national exclusivist movements (between Zionism and the feudal, semi-bourgeois Arab leadership on the one hand, and on the other the struggle of the Arab masses against Zionism. The consistent struggle for the easing up of this conflict is therefore only possible on the basis of the struggle against Zionism, against Arab national exclusivism, and anti-Jewish actions, against imperialism, for the democratization of the country and its political independence.

Jerusalem.

L. ROCK

The War Mobilization Plan

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENTS in the modes of production have revolutionized the instruments of warfare as well as of peace. The rifle, the bayonet and the man have lost much of their importance. In their place have been substituted heavy artillery, machine guns, airplanes, tanks and gases, all of which must be constantly replenished and fed with a continuous supply of munitions, and which, of course, requires a high rate of production on the part of industry. Throughout, and even before the war, industry must be organized and mobilized for this purpose.

Trotsky has described this problem in an article entitled, "Disarmament and the United States of Europe," (*The Militant*, December 7, 1929) in the following words:

"The issue (the outcome of the next war) will be determined by the respective powers of production of the two camps. This means that the war fleets of the powers will not only be supplemented and renewed but in great measure created in the very course of the war. . . . We have seen how England and America in the very course of the war created gigantic new armies and armaments infinitely superior to the old armies of the European Continent. It follows that the soldiers, sailors, cruisers, cannons, tanks and airplanes, existing at the outbreak of hostilities only constitute a point of departure. The decisive problem will depend upon the measure in which the given country will be able to create under the enemies fire cruisers, cannons, soldiers and sailors. . . ."

It thus becomes evident that the arena of modern warfare extends from the battlefield to the industrial centers of the warring nations with every factory engaged in the production of war materials a sector of the battle front and every worker a soldier.

For these reasons the United States, with its vast industrial superiority over all other nations, has realized since the World War that it was better prepared for the next than any of the

others. It could, at disarmament conferences, complacently agree to scrap many war ships which it had built during the last several decades and to limit the number which it would build, knowing that it could rebuild its fleets in a shorter period of time than its rivals. False too, is the notion propounded by Washington that America's peaceful intentions are confirmed by the smallness of its standing army. As a matter of fact, it is technically better prepared than any other nation to produce almost instantaneously vast quantities of cannon, tanks, airplanes, machine guns and munitions. The army is maintained at a high standard of technical equipment at all times. A large standing army during peacetime, in the absence of frontier problems, would at present be an unnecessary burden on the capitalist class and would not materially advance war preparations. Moreover, American man power has become well-trained by its highly developed industries to make the most efficient use of mechanized war equipment. Mobilization of troops for the war is not the most important phase of the preparations.

With these things in mind the United States quietly began its preparations on the industrial front as far back as 1921. Since then, under the professed aim of taking the profit out of war, the War Department has been continuously engaged in perfecting an industrial mobilization plan. At various times these plans have been publicly announced. And at the time of the sinking of the Panay by the Japanese, when war feeling had been stirred up by the Roosevelt administration to such an extent as to insure the passage of the billion and a quarter dollar navy bill. The Shepard-Hill bill which had been pending in Congress for some considerable time, became the subject of congressional interest and nation-wide discussion. As the war scare subsided public interest in the bill also subsided. Nevertheless, the bill as well

as the entire industrial Mobilization Plan lies ready for immediate enactment and application when war becomes imminent, and they therefore deserve the most careful consideration of the labor movement.

The Nature of the Mobilization Plan

The Industrial Mobilization Plan known as the preparation for M-Day (the War Department designation for the day of the outbreak of hostilities when the mobilization of all the national resources is to take place), consists of several parts. In the field of legislation there is the Shepard-Hill Bill introduced into the Senate and the May Bill introduced in the House of the last congress. There has also been prepared by the War Department a bill for drafting men which is ready for introduction in Congress whenever war is considered imminent. In addition, there is a detailed plan for the mobilization of industry which has been worked out by the War Department and is officially known as the Industrial Mobilization Plan. Finally, there are a great many orders and regulations which have already been prepared by the War Department and they will become effective immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities.

THE SHEPARD-HILL BILL AND THE MAY BILL. For all practical purposes these bills are essentially the same, differing only in the method of taxing war profits. The former proposes a tax of 95% of all profits above the preceding three-year average, while the latter proposes in general terms "that taxes during the war shall absorb all profits above a fair normal return to be fixed by Congress".

The bills are the result of intensive study and preparation by various committees and commissions working in conjunction with and most likely under the domination of the War Department. They provide the legal basis and general framework for the application of the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan and are sufficiently innocent on their face to permit their introduction in Congress and a public discussion even before the outbreak of war, whereas the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan, although not entirely a secret, is not designed for public consumption.

Upon the declaration by Congress of the existence of war or a national emergency, the bills delegate to the president complete authority to do the following: to regulate prices; to proclaim control over the material resources, public services and industrial organizations; to license practically all business; to determine priorities of various industries and businesses in the resources of the nation; to register all persons engaged in the management and control of industry and place them in the government service; to reorganize, if necessary, all executive branches of government and create the necessary agencies and commissions, and finally, to draft into the military service all males between the ages of 21 and 31.

War Profits

By giving the president the power to control prices it is claimed that war profiteering will be eliminated and the burdens of the war will be equally distributed between capital and labor! Even if war profiteering could be eliminated the burdens of a capitalist war could never be equally shared by capital and labor. The workers actually pay with their lives and bodies at the front and by a more intense exploitation in the war industries. Aside from this, however, is it true, as the proponents of the bills maintain, that war profiteering can be eliminated through the control of prices?

The experiences of the last war in which the government also attempted to control prices to some extent, particularly in the establishment of government contracts for war materials, have shown the utter impossibility of preventing profiteering through the control of prices. The tremendous fortunes amassed in the last war demonstrate this to be the fact despite any effort which

may be exerted to the contrary. The War Department, to excuse its inability to curb excessive profits during the last war, has given the following reasons: a) the personnel which is to regulate prices comes from big business, owns stocks in the leading corporations and is inextricably interwoven with the owners of industry; b) accurate information as to costs lies largely in the hands of these industrialists and financiers; c) Capital had gone on strike and refused to invest in war industries unless it obtained the exorbitant prices it demanded, and d) the practical difficulty of auditing the books of all the companies whose prices must be regulated, is almost insurmountable.

The experience of the next war will no doubt be the same and these alibis, already manufactured in advance, will again be used to excuse huge profits. But price control will be rigidly exercised in relation to wages. Although the bills do not expressly give the president the authority to fix wages they could easily be construed to contain that power under the authority to fix "rates", "compensation", and the "compensation for services". In addition thereto, the numerous war industries boards, arbitration boards and labor boards, together with the restrictions on the freedom of the labor movement which have been planned by the War Department and which we shall discuss later, will act as effective brakes on the rise of wages.

The cost of living will undoubtedly rise in the course of the war. Wages will also rise slightly, but by no means as rapidly or in proportion to the rise of the cost of living. During the last war the government made some attempts to regulate wages but its power to do so was not as firmly fixed as is true in the case of the present bills. Nevertheless, we found the cost of living rising much faster than wages, and real wages rising only slightly. For example, by 1918, although the cost of living had risen by 70% over 1914, wages rose only 63%. It is reasonable to expect that in the next war this will be true to an even greater extent because the war will be more expensive and American capitalism will be less able to pay the costs of the war than it was in 1917, so that the workers will have to bear an even greater share of the burden.

The Draft and the Unorganized Militia

No matter how great the hysteria created by the war propaganda machines, the masses do not respond in sufficient numbers to appeals for enlistment in the armed forces. To overcome this condition, bourgeois governments resort to compulsory draft acts. Although the bills with apparent innocence authorize the president to draft into the military service males between the ages of 21 and 31, the actual draft law which has been prepared, is much more drastic. It provides a), for the registration of all males over the age of eighteen; b), that all registrants between eighteen and forty-five be subject to military service and become automatically members of the "unorganized militia"; c), that the president may defer the military service of any registrant whose continued employment is essential to the national interests, and, d), that the president may, when in his discretion the national interests require it, call into the armed forces any registrant liable to service, no matter how classified.

Under the bills no male between the ages of eighteen and forty-five is exempt from military service. It is even likely, in the event of a long war, that the maximum age limit would be raised substantially above forty-five as was true in many countries during the last war and is also true for some countries at the present time. Instead of exemptions there are only deferments, which may be canceled at any time if the individual should cease to be "continually and usefully employed". This method of canceling deferments from the draft has been devised as a substitute for the conscription of labor and its full implications will be more thoroughly discussed below.

The extent to which the government intends to go in marshalling the forces of industry and business is demonstrated in

the licensing provisions. Practically all business, with the possible exception of newspapers, will be subject to being licensed. The government's power to regulate and prescribe the terms under which business shall operate is virtually unlimited. Only the veto of the Supreme Court seems to limit this absolute power and the likelihood of such a veto in a period of war, as our experience in the last war showed, is remote.

A war bureaucracy will be organized on a basis which may prove to be permanent. The reorganizations will make possible the constant surveillance of labor, business and military bodies, to insure the carrying out of the government's war acts and to "unify" the country in pursuit of victory.

These essential provisions of the bills appear to represent the normal preparations of a capitalist government for war. They are however, as we have already indicated, the legal covering for the more drastic plans of the War Department. The full extent of the danger to the working class and its organizations becomes apparent only when considered in conjunction with the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan.

The Industrial Mobilization Plan

The paramount aim of the Plan is to insure an adequate supply of labor during the war. By an "adequate supply", is, of course, meant the continuous and loyal employment of workers in industry throughout the duration of hostilities and the stifling of the natural anti-war sentiment of the masses—to prevent its expression in an organized opposition to the war. How is this to be realized?

The instrumentality designed is the War Labor Administration, to be directed by an "outstanding industrial leader", known as the War Labor Administrator, and appointed by the president. Labor is to be represented only in an advisory capacity, by four out of ten members of the Advisory Council. They are to be selected by the president, not by labor and are to meet only when directed by the War Labor Administrator. The type of "outstanding industrial leader" to be selected by the president can easily be imagined, and, although he cannot be named in advance, there can be no doubt that he will represent only the interests of the American ruling class. The War Department says he "should be an outstanding citizen who is thoroughly familiar with the problems entering into the relationship between employer and employee and who is capable of dispassionate (!) judgment in their solution." This formula has often been used in the past to sell the working class a gold brick.

The functions of the War Labor Administrator in the subtle language of the plan are: a) To determine labor requirements; b) To fill the requirements of bringing together the job and the worker, and c) To keep together the job and the worker.

There is no doubt that the War Department has already substantially performed the first of these functions by having made a more or less complete survey of labor requirements for war industries, determining the number of workers necessary in the chief industries, the skill required, their location and their wages, hours and conditions of employment. As war becomes more imminent, the survey will become more complete and the W.L.A. will have the task of completing and using the information.

The second function, that of bringing together the job and the worker, embraces the idea of the registration of all labor and virtual assignment to the various industries. The provisions of the draft law whereby all males over the age of eighteen (with no maximum age limitation) shall be registered already provides the W.L.A. with its industrial census. Using these records, together with the survey of the War Department as to labor requirements, the W.L.A. will be in a position to make its assignments.

And, lastly, the W.L.A. will regiment the workers by "keeping the job and the worker together". This means that the worker will be restricted from changing jobs, industry or location.

Naturally, the application will not be as forthright as we have indicated. Other divisions of the War Labor Administration have been provided to help realize these aims. For example, the Public Relations Division will have the task of manufacturing patriotism, war hysteria and atrocities stories. The employment service, unlike the employment agencies in peacetime, considers its task that of distributing workers into places in industry rather than making places available to workers which they may accept or reject. The War Department has already stated that in war time it is not possible to permit workers free movement and choice. The method will in effect be that of assignment. Cancellation of deferment from military service will also be a method used to "induce" the worker to take and keep a job.

The War Department has devised a fairly clever scheme to insure that labor will fulfill its tasks in the prosecution of the war. In the last war several of the European countries found it necessary, at least to some extent, to conscript labor. The American plan for the next war finds this a little too crude and wholly unnecessary. In place of conscription of labor the plan calls for a system of cancellations of deferments from military service.

In essence it will operate as follows: As a preliminary all males from the ages of 18 to 45 are made part of the unorganized militia by the draft law, which we have already discussed. This immediately subjects them to military service at the call of the president speaking through the various draft boards. However, all such males cannot immediately be taken into the military service, first, because this would too greatly disrupt industry and production and second, they would not be required immediately for military purposes. Nevertheless, no provision is made for any exemptions from military service as was the case in the last war. Instead the Plan provides that anyone's liability to military service may be deferred by the draft authorities on the basis of their needs to industry, business or government agencies. This deferment, however, is subject to cancellation whenever an individual ceases to be continually and usefully employed. The War Department has stated, "A deferment once made is not final . . . and any man can be reclassified and called when circumstances require."

The bourgeoisie and their government require a state of class peace in war time to insure the prosecution of the imperialist war and the continuous war production in industry. Any outbreak of class struggle, strikes, sit-downs, or stoppages, tending to impede the progress of the war must be avoided by any means at hand. Cancellation of deferment is therefore held as a threat over the heads of militant workers as individuals or as members of revolutionary organizations.

Control of Public Opinion

For the purpose of enlisting mass support to the Industrial Mobilization Plan and the War, the Plan sets up a Public Relations Administration. Without going into the details of the methods which this Administration will use, it would be sufficient to recall the mass of propaganda issued by the infamous Creel Committee, organized by the Wilson Administration to obtain nationwide support to America's entry and participation in the World War. The press, the movies, the radio, the schools, the churches and every other medium of propaganda at the disposal of the capitalist state will be chained to the war machine. As in the last war, the bourgeois press will be asked to assume a voluntary censorship of its publications. But a rigid censorship will be enforced upon all revolutionary and labor press. Anti-war propaganda, of course, will not be tolerated, and will be prosecuted by Espionage and Sedition laws.

What will be the nature of the capitalist state in the period of the war? Will it be democratic; fascist; military dictatorship; or perhaps some new form of state?

Regardless of the name ascribed to such a government, the general character of the regime and the methods it will employ

have already been described. It will strictly control all labor organizations, deprive labor of its elementary democratic rights and at the same time exercise a certain degree of control over industry itself. In these respects, it will closely resemble the totalitarian states as we now know them. In fact, the strain of the war on the economic system and the necessity of the ruling class to maintain its power, already dictates the régime's nature.

In the final analysis, however, the outcome of the struggle between the classes will determine the nature of the régime. As the war becomes extended the opposition of the masses to the war must lead to organized revolt of the proletariat against the

bourgeoisie itself in order to end the war. The tempo, the sharpness and the strength of this revolt will depend upon the power and program of the revolutionary organizations in the leadership of the working class. As such revolutionary organizations gain strength of their own and the following of the majority of the working class, despite the restrictions and repressions by the government during the war, the conflict must sharply take the form of a struggle for the workers' state and socialism against fascism and capitalism. Thus the period of the totalitarian régime will be defined by this struggle.

M. J. MICHAELS and Albert GATES

Stalinism and Fascism in Italy

STALINISM PRESENTS ITSELF throughout the entire world as the only force which struggles in a determined and consistent manner against fascism. Whoever is not disposed to admit this claim, whoever does not submit to its declarations, whoever is bold enough to pull away its mask and present Stalinism to the masses in its true form revealing its repugnant depravity and duplicity, whoever dares do this falls inexorably under the blows of its limitless hate and its impudent calumnies. One is faced immediately with the threat of being machine-gunned passing a street corner, or being kidnapped by one of the innumerable bands of the G.P.U., to disappear completely.

Yet facts are stubborn things. And more and more it is becoming evident that Stalinism with its "ideology", its policies, its gangsterism which reaches into every domain, its habits, provocations and assassinations, far from constituting a barrier to fascism facilitates its ascendancy over the masses and becomes in fact an aid in its march to victory.

It would be idle to recall the contribution which Stalinism made to fascism with its policy which led to the crushing of the Chinese revolution in 1927. Futile also to recall the role played by the criminal Stalinist policy in the rise and triumph of fascism in Germany. Today it is clear to the whole world that the shameful capitulation of the German Stalinists before Hitler, without a struggle, formed part of the political "plan" of Stalin who, with the genius which distinguishes him, thought that in this way he would secure the alliance of a greatly strengthened Germany against Anglo-French imperialism. Just as in 1927 he offered to Chiang Kai-shek the head of the Chinese revolution to maintain him as an ally, so in 1932 he sacrificed the German revolution in order to buy an alliance with Hitler.

It is primarily as a result of the policy followed by the Stalinists in China and in Germany that fascism represents at the present moment a mortal danger in all countries of the world. Equally clear is the real significance of the Popular Front advocated by the Stalinists in France, in Spain, and elsewhere. The struggle against fascism, however, has been and is nothing but a pretext. The real aim of the Stalinist policy is quite different: it consists of an attempt to find new allies for the Soviet bureaucracy. It matters little if these allies are "democrats", or downright reactionaries, or fascists. In point of fact, the real line of demarcation established by the Stalinists between "friends" and "enemies" is not at all the line which separates fascists and anti-fascists. Still less is this demarcation based on the criteria of class.

No, the "friends" are those who accept—in the largest sense of the word—the policies of the Moscow government. The "enemies" are those who refuse to accept it. The former are respectfully treated as the "friends of peace", as upright and honest men, even when they are reactionaries or fascists. The latter are termed "bandits", "spies", and "fascists", even if by all the actions of their whole lives—and sometimes even their

deaths—they have shown themselves the most bitter enemies of fascism.

Lord Cecil, for example, who declared peremptorily to an eminent French personage that he favored the victory of Franco in Spain, but that he was opposed to Germany and Japan, remains for the Stalinists a "great friend", a "striking illustration" of the "British people and policy". French reactionaries who favor the maintenance of the Franco-Soviet pact are either spared from criticism or are praised extravagantly. On the occasion of his visit to Paris, Marshal Smigly-Rydz was greeted by Thorez in terms of unprecedented servility although the blood of Polish strikers and peasants killed by his bullets was still fresh on his hands. And in contrast, revolutionary workers who, for example, at the outbreak of hostilities in Spain were the first to man the barricades and hurl themselves into the trenches against Franco and to fight for the triumph of socialism; those who in fact wanted to fight against bourgeois exploitation; those who are unwilling to offer their skins spontaneously for the next imperialist butchery in the camp of the "democracies"—are called thieves, spies, "agents of the Gestapo", whom it is necessary to exterminate like mad dogs.

This policy which is anti-fascist in name only (and sometimes, as will be shown in the following, even the name is abandoned) and which in practice renders the greatest services to fascism, is manifested with striking clarity amongst the Italian Stalinists. To show this, we shall limit ourselves to presenting certain typical facts and attitudes in which is concentrated to a certain extent and summarized the policy of Italian Stalinism.

* * *

The Ethiopian War

The Ethiopian war, by its clearly imperialist character, by the particularly odious manner in which it was prepared and conducted, by the shady deals which it fostered before, during and after "sanctions", and finally by the effects it would have on the toiling masses in Italy, offered—after the "Matteoti crisis" of 1924—a unique opportunity for the Italian proletariat to crush the fascist régime and open the way to the triumph of the proletarian revolution in the Peninsula. A party whose leaders were anything but bureaucrats rotten to the very marrow of their bones, cowards and traitors, and which had not trampled upon the elementary teachings of Bolshevism with an intensity which amounted to pure sadism, would have been able without great difficulty to become the determining factor in the Italian situation. It would have been able to summon millions of proletarians and the great masses from the fields and cities to hurl themselves in powerful waves against the bourgeois-fascist régime of Italy, even to the point of dismantling it and destroying it.

But two conditions were necessary to achieve this: first, to show the Italian people by a fiercely internationalist attitude that

the struggle against the Abyssinian war had nothing in common with an attempt to shield the colonial spoils of Anglo-French imperialism, and that, on the contrary, the struggle against the savagery of fascism was at the same time the surest means of splintering the bases of Anglo-French imperialism; and, secondly, to develop by all means available the class struggle within Italy. Realization of this second condition, it is evident, would have resulted as a direct consequence of the first.

But the Italian Stalinists not only did nothing to further these aims, instead they did everything possible to prevent their realization.

Beyond the boundaries of Italy, all their activity was based upon and carried out under the patronage of the League of Nations, that is, the interests of Anglo-French imperialism. The disastrous masquerades of the "Anti-Fascist Congresses", the delegations at Geneva—all staged with Stalinist gold—the press campaigns, all were carried on for the purpose of assuring British and French imperialism that their only guaranty for the pacific exploitation of their dominions and colonies was the victory of "anti-fascism".

Fascist Italy—more precisely, the Italy directed by Mussolini—constituted a danger for the conquests of the Anglo-French imperialists, while an Italy freed of Mussolini would be a guaranty for the fleshpots of the magnates of London and Paris. This was the thesis, sometimes masked, sometimes open, but always real, of the Stalinists and of the official Italian "anti-fascists".

It was precisely this thesis which Mussolini needed in order to disqualify with a stroke of the pen all "anti-fascism" beyond the frontiers and to bind around himself the Italian masses. You see, said the fascist press, these anti-fascist gentlemen who live abroad and pride themselves on being Italians, just look at them. They *oppose our* conquest of empire, but breathe never so much as a word against the empire of those who eat five times a day and rule over hundreds of millions of colonial subjects. And not only that: they go so far as to place themselves in the service of the rich imperialists, urging them to act against us who are poor, who have only colonies of sand and who are merely struggling to attain for ourselves our rightful place in the sun.

The influence of anti-fascism was liquidated.

Mussolini obtained an enormous victory. The Stalinist policy succeeded in cementing the masses around him instead of, as was imperative, mobilizing them to fight him.

The "skillful" policy of the Stalinists and of all official "anti-fascism" within Italy was, if possible, even more stupid than that practiced beyond the borders. Furthermore, it was merely the inevitable extension of that policy. It found its highest expression in the "Anti-Fascist Congress" convoked at Brussels in 1936 in the midst of the Geneva "sanctions", summed up in the two formulas: "*Via Mussolini dal Governo*" (Mussolini out of the government); and "Do nothing which might frighten the Italian (and the British and the French) bourgeoisie." With the first formula the Stalinists and the official "anti-fascists" declared openly that their immediate aim was not the overthrow of the fascist regime, but only the removal of Mussolini! And with the second they said to the masses: Attention! Demand the removal of Mussolini from the government, but . . . do not take any active steps for, otherwise, you will force the bourgeoisie to run to him again for protection!

Translated into simple language, these two formulas signify the following: You, the monarchy, the Vatican, the bourgeoisie, the landlords, if you remain attached to this adventurer Mussolini—will be lost. Dismiss him, then, and in exchange we will permit you to enjoy "*tranquillity*"—and we already give you our pledge. Thus the "skillful" formula of the Stalinists which was to "mobilize all the layers" of the Italian people against the "adventurer" Mussolini, was nothing but a straight-jacket clamped down upon the proletariat and the working masses of Italy to prevent them from swinging into action.

It was, in fact, a repetition, word for word, of the policy followed by L'Aventin in 1924 during the Matteotti crisis. But without a parliamentary split, without the agitation of the masses, and carried on not at Rome, but in Brussels! The policy of L'Aventin served and consolidated fascism. That of the Stalinists, carried out during the Abyssinian war, served and consolidated it twice over. It does not strain the imagination to guess that Mussolini, reading the speeches and resolutions of Brussels must have been convulsed with great roars of laughter. "The masses will demand . . ." while remaining "tranquil"! Then, no strikes, no defeatism, no sabotage, no seizure of the land, no refusal to pay taxes. In a word, no civil war in Italy. Empty phrases, nothing more, serving merely to justify the appointment of the bureaucrats. But if the masses remain tranquil, if they do not listen to the "demagogy of the Trotskyist provocateurs" (for once again at the "Anti-Fascist Congress" at Brussels this was their language) then thought Mussolini, the monarchy, the Vatican, the bourgeoisie, the large proprietors, and *tutti quanti*, quite correctly, the masses even if they wish (which, moreover, was far from being true) will be completely incapable of leading any disturbance!

Mussolini applauded. He had won a second battle.

* * *

The "Honest" Interests of Italian Imperialism

The assurances given by the Stalinists to all layers of the Italian bourgeoisie about the maintenance of social peace in Italy, were, nevertheless, considered insufficient by the Stalinists themselves; the more so since none of these bourgeois layers were in a hurry to respond to their appeal; and still more because the assurances given Anglo-French imperialism about the integrity of their colonial domination deprived the Italian bourgeoisie of all imperialist perspective. This obviously was unspeakably disagreeable to the latter. But the Italian Stalinists are nothing if not resourceful. That is why overnight they discovered the "*honest interests*" of Italy (imperialist and fascist) in Central Europe and the Balkans. "*Our government*"—that is, the government of which Mussolini is the head—wrote the Stalinist bureaucrats in their press, instead of making war against the Abyssinians, instead of seeking adventures in the Mediterranean, should organize and "*defend the just and honest interests of Italy (sic!) in Central Europe and the Balkans. In so doing, they will work for peace, for civilization, for the honor of our well-loved country: Italy.*"

As can be seen, the plan which the Italian Stalinists offered—and offer—to fascist Italian imperialism is complete. It is true, they wanted to place a barrier in the direction of Africa and the Mediterranean, but solely to offer immediately thereafter—animated solely on paper—an infinitely more "advantageous" compensation beyond the Adriatic. For it was surely necessary that Italian imperialism also should find some way to secure its bread.

Only "our government"—the fascist government with Mussolini at its head!—was not entirely of the same mind as the Stalinists. The government thought that at the moment expansion toward Africa and the Mediterranean contained fewer risks than the "defense" of the "honest" interests indicated by their enterprising collaborators. It is possible that they were wrong—we hope so with all our strength—and that they will end up by breaking their necks. But what is important is that *the Stalinists, with their plan, completely erased all difference in principle between them and fascism with regard to the imperialist expansion of Italian capitalism.* The Stalinist plan did not envisage fighting Italian imperialism, but merely strove to offer it the best means of escaping from its impasse. The "struggle" between the Stalinists and Mussolini was henceforth one to determine which of the two was to be the most perspicacious servant of Italian

imperialism. Thanks to the Stalinists, the proletariat and the working masses of Italy were no longer called to choose between their enslavement under imperialism and their liberation, as well as the liberation of peoples everywhere, *but between two different directions* through which the imperialist policy could be assured: expansion toward the southeast, or expansion toward the northeast.

But once again, if one confines the struggle within these limits, the victory of fascism is certain, in the first place because fascism combines at one and the same time the two directions of Italian expansion. For it, the paths toward the southeast and toward the northeast are not mutually exclusive, but complement each other. It grabs to the right and to the left now leaning upon, and now blackmailing in turn the "democracies" and "Hitlerism". And it is necessary to admit that up to the present the game has succeeded quite well. This was possible because the Stalinist "plan" bound the proletariat and the working masses of Italy socially, politically and morally to Italian imperialism. If "our government" (the fascist government headed by Mussolini!) is called upon to defend its "just" and "honest" interests in any place whatever, it is necessary to support it, not to fight against it.

Moreover, if expansion beyond the Adriatic is "just" and "honest" because it is in opposition to Germany (which has no colonies), why would expansion toward the Mediterranean and Africa be dishonest and unjust? Because possibly it comes into conflict with Great Britain and France? But what Italian *cafone* would be sufficiently naive to admit this? Finally, confined to these limitations, the "struggle" will always end with the victory of fascism, for any real mobilization of the masses against it would be impossible. In fact, the masses will never understand the need for an insurrection which has as its aim not the overthrow of their exploiters, but rather to force the exploiters to feed from the manger on the left rather than from the manger on the right. They will understand the need still less if the "premium" of the insurrection is to be a reinforcement of the imperialist yoke around their necks.

The one who gains in all of this once again is Mussolini.

* * *

"Brothers in Black Shirts"

At the end of the Abyssinian war, there came out of Moscow, the philosophy that it was better to let the building burn in the desert (the building was Abyssinia) than to risk setting Europe on fire. The Italian Stalinists, always keen to sense the direction from which the wind is blowing, understood that truly the time of half-measures had passed. At last, one could speak out loudly and clearly. The ex-mice of the censorship service (that is the espionage service against revolutionary and discontented soldiers) during the world war; the ex-traffickers of the sacristy, the ex-subordinates of Mussolini in his treason and in his interventionism, all the band of cowards and slaves who actually "direct" the so-called Communist Party of Italy, could finally breathe freely. The insurmountable contradiction between the remains of the Bolshevik traditions which still lived in the party and their true nature, those who were prepared to sup royally at all tables, was henceforth at an end.

It was a question, naturally, always of peace, democracy, and liberty. Before these three deities, any fresh hesitation would be a crime. It is true that heretofore the monarchy, the Vatican, the big bourgeoisie of the cities and the fields had turned a deaf ear. But Mussolini would certainly understand. Mussolini, said these former companions in treason, he is not a fossil. An adventurer, perhaps, but a man of politics. A realist. There is nothing to exclude the possibility that one can go along a short distance together with him, and who knows, with this Mussolini, there is really nothing to prevent us from travelling the entire road in each other's company. Such was the "plan"!

It was necessary to divert fascist Italy from its friendship with

Hitler and lead it to struggle on behalf of the "democracies"! To do this, "*our brothers in black shirts*" can give us the greatest possible support. The enemy is no longer fascism, it is Hitlerism. Enough, then, of anti-fascism. In Italy there are no longer fascists and anti-fascists, just as in Stalinist documents there are no longer proletarians, bourgeoisie, poor peasants, rich peasants, exploited and exploiters. In Italy, there are now only Italians and anti-Italians. But these latter are hidden elsewhere than among the fascists. So, gentlemen, one liquidates. The "Proletarian Anti-Fascist Committees" are liquidated; the "anti-fascist demagogy" is liquidated; the very word "anti-fascist" is liquidated. The unfortunate militants of the rank and file who do not know what is happening and who continue to declare themselves anti-fascists have their ears pulled, and if they still do not understand, are quickly denounced as anti-Italians, agents of Hitler, spies of the Gestapo, etc., etc. . . . "*All Italians are brothers,*" proclaim the Stalinists, except, naturally the "Trotskyists" who want to fight against our "brothers in black shirts", in order to play the game of Hitler whose agents they are!

The Stalinist press daily discovers new marvels in Italy. Italy becomes once again "the most beautiful garden in the world". The fascist trade unions are no longer hells in which the proletariat is muzzled and bound. That is a "Trotskyist calumny". The fascist syndicates are the "syndicates of Italian workers". The fascist institutions are transformed as if by magic into institutions of the Italian people. Among the sons of the same country there did exist, unfortunately, misunderstandings and suspicions. Some were called fascists, the other anti-fascists. Lack of understanding was common to both, certainly, but especially to the anti-fascists who did not appreciate as they should the great love of their "black-shirted brothers" for Italy. If the "brothers in black shirts" also sinned, it was because of an excess of love. So, one must excuse them. In any event, all that was naught but a sad nightmare of the past. Henceforth, general celebration, general embracing. No more anti-fascist insignia which would be provocations against "our brothers". "Our brothers", besides, will readily understand that their insignia also no longer serve any purpose. All sons of the same fatherland, we will have but a single flag, the tricolor. Forward, against Hitler. . . .

Scratching his head, the rank and file militant asked: What? What? The members of the fascist gangs who killed, violated, mutilated members of my own family? "Brothers in black shirts," replied the bureaucrats. The cops who in the cities and villages still swing their cudgels and create a reign of terror? "Brothers in black shirts." The fascist bureaucrats who in the factories, in the trade unions, everywhere spy on the workers and turn them over to the vengeance of the employers and the police? "Brothers in black shirts." The bosses of the large fascist corporations, the Rossoni, the Ciardi and Co.? "Brothers in black shirts." But finally, demands the poor rank-and-filer, completely dumbfounded by surprise at having so many unsuspected brothers: and Mussolini? "Brother, brother in black shirt," reply imperturbably the Stalinist bureaucrats. We are not anti-fascists, therefore Mussolini also is our brother.

And so that this might be perfectly clear, the Stalinist press published an official declaration of the party in which the Stalinists asserted they were ready to march "hand in hand with all fascists, *whatever degree they represented in the hierarchy of the party of the state.*" The invitation to the "black-shirted brother", Mussolini, could not have been more pointed. And all this orgy, all this debauchery of Stalinist fraternization with the fascists, including Mussolini, took place at the end of and after the Abyssinian war, when its disastrous consequences were making themselves felt most widely and when it was still possible to rouse the masses against the regime.

Once again the Stalinists served "honorably" *their* fascist brothers.

To the repeated advances made to him, Mussolini responded by intervention in Spain and by consolidation of the Rome-Berlin axis. These two facts considerably cooled the ardor of the philo-fascists, the Stalinist bureaucrats. Cooled their ardor, but did not extinguish it. One example suffices to prove this. At the time of the occupation of Austria by the Nazis, the Stalinist press unleashed an unbridled campaign against Mussolini as responsible for having placed "our dear Italy on its knees before Hitler". Mussolini is once again, then, in the culprit's seat. From a "brother" he has been transformed into an "evil soul". But the hand still remains outstretched toward the fascists. One could go so far as to say that the resurrection of a part of the "anti-fascist" phraseology only served to cover up a policy even more "fraternal" than ever towards the fascists.

As a matter of fact, if up to yesterday the Rome-Berlin axis was only a perspective which it was necessary to prevent at any price, today it has become a reality. The conclusion which the Stalinists drew from this was that now there was once again on the order of the day in Italy the problem of the "struggle"—*for national independence*. And this national independence could be assured not by the outbreak of a civil war against the direct exploiters of the Italian people, but by the union of all classes against the "tedeschi" (in the Stalinist press the term "tedeschi" has the same connotation of contempt as the word "boche" for the French). That is why the *leit motiv* of all the Stalinist press is as follows: The Italian people are under the heel of Hitler and the "tedeschi". Our journalists (that is, the fascist journalists) are obliged to write according to the dictates of the "tedeschi" agents. Italy has been invaded by the "tedeschi" who in the factories, the offices, editorial rooms, everywhere, exercise their terror against the Italian people. It is not the fascists and the Italian capitalists who oppress the Italian workers, but the "tedeschi". Mussolini and a few other fascist leaders, as well as a half dozen or so of the influential members of trusts are obviously the filthy servants of Germany. They must be chased out. But Italian fascism, as such, is free of guilt. The fire must be concentrated against the Germans, against the "tedeschi". War, then, against the "Tedeschi". *Bastone tedesco l'Italia non doma* (The club of the boche shall not dominate Italy)—this is the refrain the most cherished by the Stalinists. And their *fascist chauvinism* goes even farther. It surpasses, probably all that the Hitler press resorted to against the Jews.

As proof we need but one example of correspondence "coming from Italy", published in the Stalinist organ appearing in the Italian language in Paris. In this correspondence, from a "well-known literary personage, a prominent Italian anti-fascist", according to the journal, the German people (not the Hitlerites, but all the German people) were insulted outrageously. The entire content of the article had as its aim to show that the "tedeschi" (the boches) are nothing but a pack of swine, and for the good of humanity they must be treated like swine—have their throats slit open with a knife. Publication of this truly vile article aroused a storm of protests from Italian emigres, and this forced the editors of the journal, after the article had been published and given glaring publicity, to express hypocritical reservations in three lines!

It is against the "Trotskyists", however, that the Stalinist hate manifests itself without cease. In this there is no interruption, no "pause". Fascists can become "brothers", Hitlerites can be transformed into "companions", but the Trotskyists always remain the number one enemy of the Stalinist bureaucrats. In no press in the world, except that in the U.S.S.R., is the "anti-Trotskyist folklore" as abundant and as varied as in that of the Italian bureaucrats. It is not that the Italians cudgel their brains more than their confreres in other countries to find something original—far from it—but merely that they copy the Russian press with greater abandon. They are hard put to it, to justify their beefsteaks.

For some time, however, it has been a question of something other than folklore. A whole series of facts and symptoms demonstrate that the Italian Stalinists are planning to go much farther. Already the suppression of the anarchist leader Berneri (he, too, is a "Trotskyist") and of his comrade Barbieri at Barcelona show the mark of origin. It is among the Italian Stalinists that the electors and the executors of these cowardly assassinations are to be found. The reaction of the Stalinist press to a statement which appeared in the socialist journal *Nuovo Avanti* on the death of Berneri is a *confession*. But there is more. The "Trotskyists" who are in the prisons and Mussolini's islands of deportation in Italy are constantly the victims of aggressions during the day and during the night of the Stalinist "mafia" which has been constituted in those places. Those who are at liberty are openly pointed out by the Stalinist press to the fascist *Ovra*, to which they communicate the names of the Trotskyists and the addresses at which they may be found. The "Trotskyist" Damen (he was in reality a Bordigist), veteran of Italian prisons because of his anti-fascist activities, was again arrested several months ago at Milan following minutely-detailed denunciations of the Stalinist informers. In emigration, whenever occasion presents itself, "Trotskyists" are denounced, their last names given, their first names, and their pseudonyms, so as to bring about their expulsion at the hands of the police. Just recently, following an incident of a political nature which occurred in the Italian section of the League for the Rights of Man in Paris, the Stalinist press distinguished itself in this vile work of acting as police spies. Entire lists of the names and first names of militants returning from the Spanish trenches were published in the Stalinist press. These militants, in general, find themselves in France without papers and passports, and the police track them down so as to throw them out of the country. The publication of the names and first names of these individuals has as its aim to force them to "be peaceful" and not to denounce the beastliness perpetrated by the Stalinist bureaucrats in Spain against the revolutionaries. As a follow up, the "Trotskyists" receive anonymous threatening letters, with a death's head drawn in the center. This is the same procedure formerly used by the "brothers in black shirts" in Italy to terrorize proletarian militants and especially their families. Others are "charitably" warned not to return late at night if they want to avoid surprises. Others still find themselves spied upon by suspicious looking individuals. All this shows that the Stalinist *Ovra* exists also on Italian soil, that it is at work preparing itself for redoubled blows.

Why is all this done? Aside from the low, but nevertheless very real considerations of beefsteak and the general tasks which are assigned to them by the G.P.U., aside also from motives of a personal order, that is a biography filled with betrayals and cowardice of some of the bosses who hold, or give the appearance of holding, the reins of the Italian Stalinist Party, the underlying causes of the particular hate of the Italian bureaucrats for the "Trotskyists" are exposed above.

Our Italian comrades, to the greatest extent possible within the extremely limited means at their disposal, denounce this incoherent and traitorous policy. The Italian workers, especially those who return from the trenches in Spain and from the U.S.S.R., turn their backs on these miserable charlatans who play at juggling with their "fascist brothers" and who in all important problems have played and continue to play the game of Mussolini. In Italy, in the prisons and in the isles of deportation, if one excepts a few functionaries preoccupied with the support of their families and with their future positions, the revolt is general against those who have been the shameless profiteers of their sacrifices. The revolt is sufficient so that these bureaucrats with the souls of slaves vow their eternal hatred of the "Trotskyists". This does not, however, prevent our Italian comrades from accomplishing their revolutionary work with firmness and with success.

Mahoney Bill and Today's Tasks

THE PRESENT ARTICLE on the Mahoney Bill, by Jules Geller, was written in reply to the article by David Cowles which was published in our last issue. It has seemed to us well worth while to conduct this discussion of a problem which is not merely of some importance in itself, but has an even greater interest as symptomatic of similar issues now arising, and destined to continue to arise, with increasing frequency on the State and national scene.

We agree with comrade Geller that Cowles' article was defective from the point of view of its agitational approach. By a too strained concern with the detailed and technical defects of the Mahoney Bill, he failed to give sufficient recognition to the undoubtedly progressive aspects of the mass response to the Bill. It is this response which dictates the agitational point of departure.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that comrade Cowles' fundamental analysis is correct, and that Geller's analysis is seriously at fault. In effect, comrade Geller states that revolutionists should give enthusiastic support to whatever proposals excite the adherence of the more progressive workers. His criterion is altogether *subjective*, and is given quite badly: "What determines our choice in supporting or altogether rejecting such legislative measures, should be an analysis of the Bill's general subjective effect on the workers."

This criterion seems to us inadequate, and dangerous. In the light of it, employing every one of Geller's arguments, we should have declared for support of Roosevelt in the 1936 elections, and of the New Deal candidates in the current elections. Or, to take another legislative measure as an example, we should have propagandized in favor of the objectively reactionary Executive Reorganization Bill.

The subjective standard is insufficient. Revolutionists can give support only where the subjective positive response from the progressive workers is linked to an objectively progressive perspective, only where the central and explicit *aims* are consistent with the revolutionary program. In this respect, the Mahoney Bill, along with its similarities, provides an instructive contrast to both the "war referendum" and the California Pension Plan. With the explicit aims of these latter—a democratic referendum on the issue of war, and an adequate pension for the aged—we are one hundred percent in agreement, and we therefore support these measures unambiguously. Even here, of course, our support is critical: we must explain the inadequacy of the means proposed for the achievement of the aims, and we must link the struggle for these aims to a more adequate and militant general program.

But the explicit aims of the Mahoney Bill are not at all of the same character: in part they are indeed thoroughly reactionary. It is not merely a question of "inadequacy" or "unworkability"—comrade Geller is quite right in pointing out that any program conceived in terms of a continuing capitalism is inadequate, and in criticizing comrade Cowles for over-stressing the details of the Mahoney Bill's ineffectiveness. The Mahoney Bill, however, proposes what really amounts to a dressed up kind of "poor farm" or "work house". Comrade Cowles showed this by explaining the meaning of its prohibitions of the entry of the products of the State institutions into the general market and its restrictions on the consumer-freedom of those working in the State institutions. Its statement that the workers shall receive the "full value of their collective product" is not, as Geller interprets it, "a slap at the profit system", but a revival of the same utopian demagoguery which Marx submitted to so devastating an attack in his "Critique of the Gotha Program". Such plans are not at all what revolutionists have in mind when they demand

the re-opening of the idle factories under workers' control. The truth is that if we accept the illusory aims embodied in the Mahoney Bill we are not furthering the projection of the workers into struggle against capitalism but diverting them *from* struggle against capitalism into fruitless by-paths.

Comrade Geller points out that, whatever the Bill may say, in the minds of the workers it represents an effort to open up the idle factories and thereby reduce unemployment. It is this which indicates the specific tactics which we should pursue with respect to it. We naturally agree with the sentiment for opening the factories and reducing unemployment. In discussions on the Mahoney Bill, therefore, we should first of all make clear our agreement and solidarity, and then go on to propose the major amendments which would make the Mahoney Bill a vehicle for realizing those purposes. To disregard or simply oppose the Bill would be to withdraw from the mass movement which has grown around it. To support it in any less critical sense would be to succumb to an impermissible opportunism.

The EDITORS

THE MAHONEY STATE INDUSTRIES BILL, endorsed by the legislative committee of the St. Paul Trades and Labor assembly, and referred for action at the recent convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor to the committee on unemployment, has aroused a lively discussion in wide circles of the labor movement.

In the last issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL David Cowles took up the question of revolutionary tactics toward the bill, opening a discussion that can lead to a more thorough and clear understanding of the tasks of the revolutionary movement in the present period of capitalist collapse. Cowles' general approach to the Mahoney bill, which is aimed at giving jobs to all the unemployed by means of state-owned industries, reveals an incorrect appraisal of the bill's political worth to the labor movement in search of a correct program.

Agitation, Our Primary Task

It follows from a revolutionary analysis of the social consequences of the desperate straits of capitalism that the primary task of a living and potent revolutionary party is to wage an intensive campaign of agitation around a program of transitional demands.

In the course of this agitation, we shall from time to time make a choice in regard to specific measures brought forward by the labor movement. What determines our choice in supporting or altogether rejecting such legislative measures, should be an analysis of the bill's general subjective effect on the workers. Can it serve as an effective agitational medium? Will discussion of the bill's main points help to close the gap between the workers' backward political ideology and the needs of the day and the epoch? Will action, designed to put the measure into effect bring conflict with the very foundations of capitalism?

The Mahoney Bill more than meets the test. The economic soundness of such a bill or legislative proposal is secondary. For any proposal aimed at alleviating the economic crisis in any decisive degree is incompatible with contemporary capitalism.

The criterion by which to form an opinion as to our position, therefore, is not will the bill actually work—but how will it aid or deter the progressive transition of the workers political ideology. This is the criterion which Cowles failed to apply in his criticism of the Mahoney Bill. If he had judged the bill by an analysis of its subjective effect on the workers, and not merely by a cold and formal application of economic platitudes, he would not have come to the conclusion that the bill can only act

as a "boomerang". He competently proves in his article that the bill is self-contradictory and "Utopian". But almost every demand that arises today out of the angry and bitter ranks of the working class, and which aims at the very simple goal of a decent living for everyone is "Utopian", unworkable and full of contradictions. For these are demands which only socialism can answer.

It is an unfortunate fact that the workers have not yet learned that socialism offers the only solution to their plight. They express their discontent awkwardly and in half tones. The Mahoney State Industries Bill is one of these clumsy expressions of the workers' determination to find a way to break through the barriers of the system which condemns them to idleness and poverty in the midst of plenty.

The Mahoney bill will no more provide jobs for the unemployed than a referendum on war will stop the next imperialist slaughter. But agitation around the bill will give voice to the workers demand for jobs, just as agitation around the question of a war referendum expresses the workers genuine anti-war feelings.

The Bill's Place in the Labor Movement

If it is progressive to arouse the workers to a consciousness of the bankruptcy of capitalism, then support of the Mahoney Bill is progressive. Instead of applying the microscope to the bill's most minute provisions, the labor movement in Minnesota has been testing its value in life. The bill has already afforded revolutionists an opportunity to speak on the vital questions of jobs for the unemployed, the opening of idle factories, workers control of industry, and the general stupidities of the profit system.

The Mahoney Bill cannot be intelligently studied except in the light of its impact on the minds of workers, who are in search of a solution of the economic and social situation. Sides have already been taken. The most progressive workers, the most conscious of their class role, are for the bill. The labor conservatives and the reactionaries have lined up against the bill. It has brought about this fundamental rift, because it touches upon the fundamental contradictions of our social order.

To call up the ghost of Owen in refuting this bill is to meet with contempt the efforts of an awakening working class. We cannot brand such efforts as "escapism" and find our place at the head of the masses. If there is some similarity between the schemes of Owen and the Mahoney Bill, there is also a decisive and all-important difference. And the difference is in the era, and the political and social atmosphere in which the bill has appeared.

It is no insignificant fact that the Mahoney Bill today is a live issue in the labor movement, and that "Owen's Escapism" never managed to "escape" the milieu of the tea-table. And how do we explain the fact that two or three years ago when Mahoney introduced his bill it was dismissed as the scheme of a crackpot, and today it is discussed in dozens of unions?

The explanation of these facts is that the working class is on the move, propelled by the social crisis. When Mahoney first introduced his bill three or four years ago, he was met with uninterested tolerance by the labor movement. Workers were still mainly interested in wages, hours and working conditions. Today they are striving to reach a higher plane. In the drawing rooms of "socialist" intellectuals, when Mahoney's bill was first made public several years ago, it created a temporary sensation. Today these same intellectuals attack the bill as "impossible", "dangerous", "Utopian".

This year the proposals embodied in the Mahoney bill have struck home to hundreds of workers, while it is "viewed with alarm" by the reactionary press, the liberals and conservative leaders of labor. Opposition to the bill is rapidly crystallizing among these forces, and its defeat and burial is possible if not probable. What was not so long ago a harmless dream is today

a dangerous weapon in lining up the workers against the established order. It is the developing clarity of social antagonisms that has conditioned this turnabout of opinion.

The considerable support the bill has received in St. Paul and Minneapolis tells volumes about the workers' growing disillusionment, their gradually developing understanding of the decay of the profit system, and their willingness to listen to new slogans, and to seek new roads to a better order. In the discussions in various unions on the Mahoney Bill the main points grasped by the progressive-minded worker are first, the proposal to supply jobs for all the unemployed, second, the opening of the dead and deserted factories, and third that these factories are to be owned and operated by the state without a profit. The above general ideas have sunk into the trade unionists' minds.

Do we support these general demands? Of course. And we must support them as concretely proposed in the Mahoney Bill, for in the minds of workers, they are one and the same. At the same time, however, we must criticize the bill's shortcomings. But our emphasis must not be upon its mechanical details, but upon its main objectives. No revolutionist who lives in the mass movement could hesitate a moment in making his choice.

"No amounts of wages are specified." Cowles complains. Quite true, the bill merely states that the workers shall receive the "full value of their collective product". This phrase is a slap at the profit system.

"The bill makes no provisions outside of an initial million dollars." Also true. But the bill lays down the general principle that its aims are to provide jobs at productive labor for all the unemployed in Minnesota, to put idle men to work in any and all idle factories, at every kind of industry, on a non-profit basis.

There are of course qualifying phrases and shortcomings. But as a basis for education, agitation and action the bill is valuable. It goes so far as to provide for workers councils in the state-owned factories, to ensure democratic control of the factories. Many questions have been asked about this point, and in a union where a revolutionist is present, you may be sure the idea is not only supported but elaborated. For the first time in a union, workers councils are discussed. How will they work? What is their purpose? A discussion of the Mahoney Bill on the floor of a union affords an opportunity to press for the most progressive principles. But we must give support, in order to talk and be listened to.

It is not mere coincidence that the most conservative labor bureaucrats have attached themselves to arguments against the bill very much like the arguments presented by Cowles' article. A trade unionist remarked to me after reading Cowles' article that he was going to study it very closely in order to anticipate the arguments which would come from the right.

It is difficult for a labor official to come out flatly against the Mahoney Bill. Yet its general aims are dangerous and "radical". He therefore descends to carping about the details of the bill, its language, its contradictory phrases. He prefaces all his remarks with the statement that he is one hundred percent with the objectives, the "spirit" of the bill. But he somehow keeps referring it to committee for "study" and "rewriting". He goes through these machinations because he senses that the bill serves to arouse union members to the rotten and absurd injustice of the system of private industry.

We, however, cannot allow ourselves to subject the bill to an analysis which disregards the very effect which the conservative so correctly fears. If we follow such a path, we shall completely miss our opportunities, and our agitation will remain within the bounds of a stultified and sectarian "Marxism".

It is the task of bolsheviks to see these expressions of the workers' discontent in relation to the dynamic forces of the class struggle, and to recognize what affords us a medium for a progressive agitation.

We can set about proving to the satisfaction of scholars that

nothing but socialism will work. But meanwhile the masses will have been set into motion by the slogans of fascism. It is our task to give the workers eyes with which to see the road. Properly utilized, the main principles of the Mahoney Bill can serve as signposts along the way.

Can a revolutionist get up in a trade union meeting and in a discussion of the Mahoney Bill proclaim stentoriously that it will not work, that it is self-contradictory? Workers to whom the main principles of the bill appeal will immediately ask the question, "Are you for it or against it? Are you for opening the idle factories or aren't you? Are you for giving jobs to the unemployed or aren't you? And if not why not?"

It seems obvious that a revolutionist must support the bill.

The amendments suggested by Cowles are in general correct. At the proper time they should be brought forth and agitation on the next step higher will be carried on.

In this period we must be alive and vigilant. Alive to the opportunities to bring forth our transitional slogans. The

Mahoney Bill affords such an opportunity. Vigilant, lest we support measures which do not lead along a progressive road. In the period we are entering all sorts of proposals, and demagogic appeals will be circulated among the masses. We must choose very carefully the measures which have real meaning for the labor movement, and which fit into the pattern of our slogans.

The Cowles' article supplies the vigilance. But his stress upon the details of the Mahoney Bill, and his complete unconcern with its agitational possibilities, reveals that he is not aware of the main tasks of the revolutionary movement, nor of the real meaning of social decay in the present period.

The Socialist Workers Party, particularly in Minnesota, has already taken a position on the Mahoney Bill, and that is to support it, to extract from it the best and most fundamental slogans, and by carrying on an energetic agitation around these slogans, to stand at the head of the workers movement toward a clash with the capitalist system.

Jules GELLER

BOOKS

The Story of the C.I.O.

THE STORY OF THE C.I.O. By BENJAMIN STOLBERG. Viking Press. New York City. 1938. \$2.00. 294 pages.

Benjamin Stolberg has for almost twenty years been reporting the labor scene for leading newspapers and magazines. He knows his subject at first hand; he expresses himself with clarity, and with such vigor that those who agree applaud vigorously and those who disagree are often infuriated. Although this introduction is reprinted from the jacket cover of his book, "The Story of the C.I.O.," it is substantially correct. Stolberg has written a timely analysis of the most significant social movement in America since the Civil War. No progressive unionist worthy of the name can claim knowledge of the labor movement unless he has digested the material in Stolberg's work. Its specific virtue is its polemic against the Stalinist union-wreckers within the C.I.O. "Stalinism is a danger in the C.I.O. For one thing, it is not interested in American Labor as such; and for another thing, its violent red-baiting sabotages all genuine radicalism, without which a progressive union movement cannot grow," Stolberg warns.

Stolberg makes a pitiless analysis of A.F. of L. in the N.R.A. days. "The Hutchesons and Whartons, the Freys and Tracys, who run the A.F. of L. hate industrial unionism for exactly the same reasons the corner grocer hates the A. & P. Industrial unionism would drive them out of business." But industrial unionism is a life and death question to the great masses of workers in this epoch of monopoly capitalism based on large-scale industry. All the invective of which Stolberg is master is hurled at the black and treacherous record which marked the course of the A.F. of L. leaders in recent years. He does a good job, weakened only by his undue delicacy in portraying the records of the C.I.O. lead-

ers, and John L. Lewis, in particular. Stolberg overestimates too, the role of those leaders in the fight for industrial unionism within the A.F. of L. until the C.I.O. was formed in November 1935. The pressure of the rank and file in auto, steel and rubber was a heavy factor in changing Lewis from a passive exponent of industrial unionism to a belligerent fighter for it. The rubberworkers, and to a large extent, the autoworkers had rid themselves of the dead hand control of the A.F. of L. bureaucrats before the C.I.O. was founded.

Little Steel

Stolberg has one weakness. He is inclined to see the trade union movement mainly through the eyes of the leadership. This is especially apparent when he discusses the campaign of the S.W.O.C. in Big and Little Steel. Perhaps nothing reveals so Stolberg's position as the fact that he writes, without cracking a smile, about the S.W.O.C. convention in December 1937, "the delegates expressed their complete confidence in the leadership of the S.W.O.C., so much so that no one even thought of reorganizing the Steel Workers Organizing Committee into a national union, writing its own constitution and electing its own officers." It happens to be a matter of record that various steel lodges introduced resolutions precisely on these points but Philip Murray and the top C.I.O. officials were able to side-track them.

The Little Steel strike petered out, Stolberg points out. It was a set-back to the C.I.O. The strike was lost because of overconfidence, the stupidity of Stalinist secondary leaders, the viciousness of the Girdler opposition, the strike-breaking of Governor Davey, Governor Earle, etc. All this Stolberg explains. But not one word is mentioned about a certain Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, president of the United States, "friend of labor" who consoled the widows of the Chicago massacre with a flourishing

quotation from Shakespeare. "A plague on both your houses!" Stolberg ignores the strike-breaking role of the federal government. Besides, who wired Governor Davey and gave him the excuse to bring in strike-breaking National Guards? John L. Lewis. Who turned back 3,000 rubberworkers from Akron marching to protect the picket lines in Youngstown and Canton? The C.I.O. top leaders. The class-collaboration policy of the C.I.O. cost 70,000 steel workers a terrible defeat. Stolberg is too discreet on these questions.

A comprehensive survey of vigilantism is one of the outstanding sections of this book. The author succinctly outlines the notorious "Mohawk Valley Formula" which broke the Remington-Rand strike and was used successfully in Little Steel. A thorough understanding of the dangers of vigilantism is indispensable to every revolutionary worker. Stolberg shows how vigilantism is the basis for American fascism but again, however, he fails to point out the short-comings of the C.I.O. leaders in fighting vigilantism. "Brilliant campaigns in auto and rubber organized the workers," he writes. "Vigilante forces were defeated in Akron, Flint, Anderson and elsewhere. It was precisely here that top C.I.O. leaders were not in direct charge. Why not explain how labor licked its enemies there?"

Stalinist Factionalism

Stolberg stumbles badly when he essays the role of prophet while on the auto situation. "The back of Stalinist factionalism in the union has probably been broken." This was written shortly after the expulsion of the Stalinist clique in the executive board of the U.A.W.A. Subsequent events, however, show a contrary trend. It is impossible, in the space of a book review, to take up the many questions in the autoworkers union fight. But Stolberg errs in his uncritical support of the Martin group, as when Homer Martin becomes, in his judgment, "the symbol of the new progressive trade union leader".

In his section on factionalism and on the role of the Stalinists in various C.I.O. unions, Stolberg largely repeats what he said in the series of articles that appeared

last spring in the Scripps-Howard press. They are polished up considerably, and the accumulated evidence against the C.P. is a powerful case against their union-wrecking activities. Harry Bridges, West Coast C.I.O. director, is revealed in all his infamy. John Brophy is described, "like the character in Dostoevsky's *Idiot*, he is surprisingly wise and brilliant in flashes, but utterly child-like and naive in social politics." A perfect Stalinist stooge! Stolberg makes the same error in describing the East Coast Maritime situation that he did in discussing the auto union struggle. Joe Curran, Jack Lawrenson, Moe Byne and the other Stalinist coterie are well-exposed. But the revolt against this misleadership didn't crystalize in the form which Stolberg outlines. The Jerry King-Mariner club bloc has done nothing to live up to Stolberg's expectations. Quite the contrary. Heywood Broun, president of the American Newspaper Guild, and his associates, John Eddy and Carl Randau, are given a sizzling and well deserved ride by Stolberg. His portrayal of Broun as a Stalinist stooge is a classic.

Opposition to the Stalinists is coming mainly from the C.I.O. rank and file. The militant American worker was profoundly stirred by the third Moscow trial. He is beginning to appreciate from his own experience, that the Communist party is not a radicalizing but a red-baiting and reactionary force in American labor. And he is repelled by its Machiavellianism and complete disregard for all union democracy. "In the Transport Workers Union, the Newspaper Guild, Fur Workers Union, the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, and to a lesser extent in the International Woodworkers Union — which unions total a membership of some 270,000 — some opposition is developing to Stalinist tactics. Only four C.I.O. unions are under the complete control of Stalinist officers. They are the American Communications Association; the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians; the United Office and Professional Workers; and the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers. These unions give themselves a total membership of some 185,000. In fact they have at most some 60,000 members." This is Stolberg's summary of Stalinist control in the C.I.O.

Prospects

What's ahead for the C.I.O.? Stolberg believes that if the C.I.O. holds its own in the immediate future it will be because the rank and file has driven the Stalinists from office and replaced them with progressives. Should the C.P. win with Lewis' aid, a decline of the C.I.O. is indicated. The C.I.O. is not, he thinks, getting ready for independent political action in 1940, but insists that the future success of the C.I.O. partly depends on its backing a labor party. "If the C.I.O. goes on organizing energetically, if it permits complete trade union democracy everywhere and autonomy to its national and international affiliates; if it tolerates every kind of radical or revolution-

ary dissent except political disruption; if it goes in for a labor party sooner rather than later; and if it plays a shrewd game of peace as against an indiscriminate game of war against the A.F. of L.—then It Can't Happen Here. Otherwise—anything may happen." We might add, that these ifs will only become facts when the C.I.O. rank and file is cognizant of the need for carrying out this program and forces its adoption.

Viking Press withstood an organized pressure campaign of the Stalinists to prevent publication of this book. Its appearance is another blow at their machinations within the trade unions. It places their activities in the spotlight and they prefer to work in the dark. Even though Stolberg may sound much like Norman Thomas when talking about the Trotskyites, and he binds himself too closely with the top leadership of the C.I.O. by glossing over unmistakable faults, his book is definitely a contribution to the welfare of the labor movement.

B. J. WIDICK

Toward A Decision

DER ENTSCHEIDUNG ENTGEGEN. By JAROSLAV CERNY. Druck, Polensky and Coudek. Praha XII. 1938. 191 pp.

Under this title there has appeared in Brun, Czechoslovakia, a book of 191 pages in the German language devoted to an analysis of the world situation, the internal condition of Czechoslovakia and the problems of the world proletariat. The author of this book, Jaroslav Cerny, who published this work on the assignment of the "Vanguard" group, stands fully on the positions of revolutionary Marxism. It is natural therefore that he is also a convinced partisan of the Fourth International. It is just as natural that the bourgeois, social-democratic, and Stalinist press should completely neglect this outstanding work, deserving of the most careful attention.

This note in no way pretends to take the role of a critical article on Comrade Cerny's book. To this task I hope to return later. I wish to point out here that I do not agree in everything with the author. Thus his estimate of the last economic rise seems to me greatly exaggerated. But this is just a question of the analysis of the factual material, and now that the United States has again entered into a deep crisis it is much less difficult to judge the preceding rise than in the days when Comrade Cerny was writing his book. There are several other partial questions which in my opinion require additional treatment. But all these, after all, are only details which do not violate our basic solidarity with the author of the study.

However, there is one question of a timely political nature which must be clarified immediately. Cerny writes: "So far as the Trotskyites are concerned, they have shown themselves in the last ten years to be the only Marxist current which correctly estimated fascism, demanded in time a proletarian united front for struggle against it, while Stalin was at that period still calling

social-democracy the twin of fascism. This estimate of Trotskyism was shared not so long ago by quite a few functionaries of the Second International, among them by Otto Bauer." Here one should add that the left social democrats began to view us with "benevolence" beginning with the Third Period of happy memory, when our Marxist criticism was directed in the main against the ultra-left goat leaps of the Comintern. But from the moment when the Comintern made what seemed at first glance a sudden, in reality however, an absolutely inevitable turn to the basest opportunism, the left social-democratic functionaries, not excepting the late Bauer, hastily became semi-Stalinists and thus turned hostilely against the Fourth International. An analogous zig-zag was made by Messrs. Walcher, Fenner Brockway, and other "left" imitators of Otto Bauer.

"We do not doubt for a moment," continues Comrade Cerny, "that in the future also the Trotskyites will continue to make a very valuable contribution to the process of revolutionizing the international proletarian movement and in the re-creation of its world organization." If the programmatic unity of the author and the "Vanguard" group with the Bolshevik-Leninists can therefore be considered as firmly established on all basic questions, the organizational side of the matter appears much less clear. In this connection the author writes: "We do not think, however, that it would be correct to create a new 'Trotskyite' party. . . . The world revolutionary proletariat must create a new and therefore a Fourth International. However, it will be created not outside the big proletarian organizations, but through them and on the basis of them. In this view we differ from the official Trotskyites." The great practical significance of this statement needs no proof. And precisely because of this we would wish a clearer, that is, a more concrete formulation of the question. Cerny and his group, as may be judged from the book, continue to remain in the Czechoslovakian social-democracy. We have never been principled opponents to the formation of fractions of the Fourth International within reformist or centrist parties; on the contrary, for many countries we considered this stage unavoidable. The experiment passed through in several countries brought undoubtedly positive results, which nevertheless did not by far transform our sections into mass parties. How long our co-thinkers can or should remain a fraction of the Czechoslovakian social-democracy is a question of concrete conditions and possibilities and not at all of principles. That is why the motives which prompted the author to counterpose his group to the "official Trotskyites" are not clear to us. In our opinion it can be only a question of a division of labor, of a temporary distribution of "spheres of influence" but in no case of counterposing two organizational methods.

From the history of the Third International we know a case where the communist fraction succeeded in gaining the majority of a socialist party and included it officially

in the Comintern; this was the case in France. Of course such a case is theoretically possible in the building of the Fourth International. Does Cerny want to say that his closest co-thinkers have a chance of converting the Czechoslovakian social-democracy? From here, from afar, this perspective seems to be more than doubtful. In any case there cannot be any question of extending this method to all countries in the hope of building the Fourth International directly on the "basis" of present social-democratic or Stalinist, "big proletarian organizations".

However, if Cerny wants to say that revolutionary Marxists, those who make up independent sections of the Fourth International as well as those who temporarily work as fractions within two other Internationals, are obliged to concentrate their main effort within the mass organizations, and in the first place in trade unions, we would be in full and unconditional solidarity with him on this. Those "partisans" of the Fourth International who under one excuse or another remain outside of mass organizations can only compromise the banner of the Fourth International. Our roads are not the same.

The purpose of this note, we repeat, is not to re-tell or give a critical evaluation of the rich and valuable content of this book of Comrade Cerny. We wish only to draw the attention of our sections and of all thinking Marxists in general to this study. The second part of Cerny's book is wholly devoted to the "problems of the working class movement in Czechoslovakia". The theoretical organs of our sections should, in my opinion, bring this second part, if in brief, before their readers.

I recommend most warmly Cerny's book to all Marxists, to all class-conscious workers who know the German language.

Leon TROTSKY

Balabanoff's Memoirs

MY LIFE AS A REBEL. By ANGELICA BALABANOFF. ix+319 pp. *Illus.* New York. Harper & Brothers. \$3.75.

The memoirs of Angelica Balabanoff make up a sad book. Not because, like so many of her contemporaries in the radical movement, she has lost interest in the struggle or her socialist convictions, for she ends her recollections with a staunch re-affirmation of her ideals. "My belief in the necessity for the social changes advocated by that [international labor] movement and for the realization of its ideals has never been more complete than it is now when victory seems so remote. . . . The experience of over forty years has only intensified my socialist convictions, and if I had my life to live over again, I would dedicate it to the same objective." It is a sad book because it reveals that for all the passionately revolutionary spirit that animated her in four decades of activity in the working class movement, she did not succeed in mastering the simple lesson that Lenin tried to teach

her friend Serrati at the Second Congress of the Comintern in 1920:

Comrade Serrati said: we have not yet invented a *sincéromètre*—this is a new French word which means an instrument for measuring sincerity—such an instrument has not yet been invented. We do not even need such an instrument, but we already do have an instrument for judging tendencies. It is a mistake on comrade Serrati's part—I should like to speak about this later—that he did not apply this long familiar instrument.

It is such a failure—or inability?—to replace subjective judgments, based on trifling personal incidents, by political judgments, that brought her own political life of the last two decades particularly to such a tragically futile conclusion. The same failure results in a deep discoloration of the pages of her memoirs.

Rebellious daughter of a wealthy and reactionary Russian family, she left her native Ukraine for Western Europe to take up studies which soon led her into active participation in the socialist movement. Moved by a genuine compassion for the exploited and oppressed, and a powerful spirit of indignation at all iniquity, she became, after joining the pre-war Italian Socialist Party, one of its most stirring and popular agitators. Her teachers, friends and associates were the Old Guard of Italian socialism—Antonio Labriola, Turati, Treves, Modigliani, Lazzari, and later, Serrati and Mussolini. Of the last-named, then a neurotic bitter young exile in Switzerland, she became the patron, nursing him politically into leading positions in the party, until he became a member of the Central Committee and editor of the official organ, *Avanti!* Her pictures of the later Duce, of his timorousness and braggadocio, his characterlessness and inspired mediocrity, are savage and telling.

Master of several languages—she was a talented translator at international assemblies—and associate of the internationalist left wing which, with Mussolini as its spokesman, effected the expulsion from the party of the patriots in the period of the Tripolitan war of 1912, she became, when the World War broke out, a central figure in the movement to reconstruct the collapsed Second International. The Zimmerwald and Kienthal anti-war conferences of the internationalist socialists—she was secretary of the Zimmerwald International Socialist Commission from its inception—were to a large extent due to her persevering work. She joined the Bolsheviks on the eve of the revolution and in 1919 was chosen by them as first secretary of the Communist International. She broke with the Comintern, and sided with the Serrati wing of the Italian Socialist Party, when the latter refused to adopt the famous "21 points" and to break with the reformists of the Turati-Treves-Modigliani group. For the last 15 or more years, she has been the leader of that tiny fraction of Italian socialism which embraces all that is left of the once mighty "Maximalist" group, which its real leader, Serrati, abandoned before his death to rejoin the Communist International.

Her break with Lenin and the Bolsheviks

—her estimate of them forms, next to her evaluation of Mussolini, the bitterest part of her volume of portraits and judgments—was inevitable; and the reason why remains, to her, uncomprehended down to the present day. There lies the nub of the tragedy of her political life and of her book. The torrential sweep of the Russian revolution sucked her into the Bolshevik party, but only for a brief period of time. Looking back upon it in 1938, and sitting in lofty judgment on the Bolsheviks, she explains the collapse of the Third International by the moral leprosy of Zinoviev—symbol of all that to her was inherently vicious in Bolshevism; the degeneration reflected in the recent trials "was developed under Zinoviev himself" and the frame-ups and confessions "were implicit in the development of the Bolshevik method, the Leninist strategy, since the Revolution . . . the Bolshevik leaders were *capable of anything* to achieve their own political and factional ends. . . ."

Both the analysis and verdict have already served as the pathetic theme for reviews of the book in the petty bourgeois press, in which the dastardly immorality of the Bolsheviks is sanctimoniously and invidiously contrasted with what Professor Douglas calls the "fundamental sincerity" of Balabanoff, "one who believes that the means as well as the ends of economic action are important".

The explanation lies, however, elsewhere. Balabanoff's book is astoundingly devoid of *political* characterizations; it is filled with pictures of good men and bad men, honest men and crooks, blunderers and seers; and after the narration of all her experiences in various groups and movements, Balabanoff terminates her book without informing the reader of what are her specific political program and her political associations. Yet, while she does not apply political criteria to herself, it does not follow that such criteria are not applicable to her.

In international socialist politics, Balabanoff never was a communist but rather a representative of that wing of Menshevism led by Julius Martov. Its chief characteristic was a strong literary radicalism, which sometimes went so far as to bring it into peripheral touch with Lenin's thoroughgoing Marxism, but which rarely went so far as application in political life. The leaders of radical centrism could characterize the right wing with no lesser accuracy than did the Bolsheviks, but unlike the latter, who took seriously the proletarian revolution and the politics and methods leading to it, they could not bring themselves to a radical suspension of collaboration with the right wing. That is why even the most radical of Mensheviks, Martov, could "agree 95 percent" with the Bolsheviks, yet tax them with being "professional splitters", and devote 95 percent of his blows at Lenin and 5 percent at the right wing with which he scarcely agreed at all.

This is the reason—Balabanoff is not Martov, to be sure, but she suffers from the same political malady—why she could not remain in the Comintern, and not the in-

trigues, real or alleged, of Zinoviev. It is also the reason why her memoirs, even where they deal with personalities—and they deal with little else—are, with all respect to Professor Douglas' talk about "fundamental sincerity", hopelessly one-sided, splashed and distorted beyond balance and proportion. All the Bolsheviks are limned with splashes of black, shading off into blotches of mud; the social democrats, as a rule, are painted in nostalgic pastels.

Knowing his notorious weaknesses, one cannot be the advocate of Zinoviev; yet, throughout the early period of the Russian Revolution and the Comintern, he was the man, next to Lenin and Trotsky, who restored revolutionary Marxism to its rightful place in the world labor movement and who helped train up a whole generation—not excluding Balabanoff, for a time!—in its principles and traditions. Yet he emerges from her memoirs only as "the most despicable individual I have ever met".

On the other hand, however, Filippo Turati, leader of the Italian right wing, whose socialism Benedetto Croce aptly characterized as that of a "democrat à la Lombard", and who, by his politics, was more responsible than any other man in the movement for the paralysis of the Italian working class which made possible Mussolini's triumph, is very gently defended by Balabanoff. "His approach was often misinterpreted in other countries because it was so typically Italian [!]. Many Italian intellectuals like to appear sceptical of theoretical axioms even if they are not. . . . Thus it was that Turati came to be considered [!] a theoretical sceptic and even [!!] an opportunist." The author's approach, at any rate, cannot be misinterpreted. . . .

Her description of events suffers also, and to such an extent, from her biased "approach", that stories calculated to be of telling significance about Bolshevik depravity end by having a significance only for evaluating her memoirs. In telling of the slowness of the Moscow courier in bringing her reports to Stockholm, where she was Bolshevik propagandist in 1917, she quotes a letter from Lenin:

Dear Comrade: The work you are doing is of the utmost importance and I implore you to go on with it. We look to you for our most effective support. Do not consider the cost. Spend millions, tens of millions, if necessary. There is plenty of money at our disposal. I understand from your letters that some of the couriers do not deliver our papers on time. Please send me their names. These saboteurs shall be shot.

One gentleman-reviewer has already expressed his outraged horrification at this bloodthirsty despot who so lightly shot couriers merely for delaying with their dispatches. But surely Balabanoff is quoting from memory, and when it is borne in mind that she quoted quite a different letter eleven years ago, the conclusion is reached that—how shall we say it?—a political slant can play distressing tricks with one's memory. For in the German edition of her memoirs, *Erinnerungen und Erlebnisse*

(Berlin, 1927), the same incident is more innocently reported with the following letter from Lenin, also in quotation marks:

Bravo, bravo! Your work, dear comrade, deserves the highest recognition. Please do not spare any means. That the material is furnished you in such an insufficient manner, is inexcusable. Please give me the name of the courier who is guilty of such gross, inexcusable negligence.

If letters are quoted from memory, it is still customary to omit quotation marks; and if they are quoted from a text at hand, not even the elapse of a decade permits a writer to quote it so differently on a second occasion as to include sentences about "tens of millions" (no trifle that!) and the summary execution of negligent but innocent couriers (also no trifle!). Otherwise, the author runs the risk not only of shocking the sensibilities of bourgeois reviewers, but also of arousing the feeling that her political objectives have, *volens volens*, superceded her political objectivity, to say nothing of objectivity of the ordinary kind; and this is a failing which, we learn from the author, is the specific characteristic of the immoral Bolsheviks.

The feeling is deepened by other, and just as typical, discrepancies between the author's memoirs of 1938 and those of 1927.

According to the present edition, the Stockholm conference of the Zimmerwalders adopted a manifesto calling for a general strike in support of the Russian Revolution, an appeal which was not to be made public until endorsed by the constituent parties of the Allied countries. Radek, however, typical Bolshevik, began to insist that Balabanoff publish the appeal forthwith; "our mutual and unanimous understanding, our pledges and promises, and my own enormous responsibility meant nothing to Radek, and throughout the month of October he bombarded me with protests and demands". Meanwhile, Luise Zietz, representative of the German Independents, came to Stockholm to "prevent the premature publication of the manifesto in view of the precarious position of her party".

Torn between the threatened extermination of left wing socialism in Germany and the demands of those who spoke in the name of the Russian Revolution, I was utterly miserable, but I felt that there was only one course to pursue—to keep my pledge and obey the unanimous mandate of the Zimmerwald Commission. Shortly after I had given Radek my final decision the manifesto was published in the Finnish paper controlled by the Bolsheviks. . . .

Fortunately for Radek and the Bolsheviks, their moral turpitude does not stand out so heinously if we go by . . . the 1927 version of what happened. According to it, Radek did indeed insist upon the publication of the appeal in view of the terribly urgent situation in Russia and did threaten to publish it on his own responsibility. Zietz did indeed appeal, in a telegram to Balabanoff and then at a meeting of the Zimmerwald Commission, against its publication. But, we read in 1927, "however weighty were the reasons which Luise Zietz adduced, it was impossible for us to accept

them, for political reasons on the one side and formal ones on the other. Disappointed and perhaps also enraged against me personally, comrade Zietz left Stockholm. . . . At the same time I received a letter that comrade Ledebour [leader of the Independents] was not in agreement with the mission that Luise Zietz had undertaken in Stockholm in the name of the Independent Party."

Immediately thereafter, however, came the report that the Soviets had taken power. Balabanoff decided to make the appeal public telegraphically. "All the obstacles that had stood in the way of the publication of the Zimmerwald manifesto only a few hours ago, had now fallen away with the great historical deed. . . . That my collaborators in the International Socialist Commission would share my standpoint, of that I had no doubt; hardly had morning come than I telephoned them and obtained their complete consent."

And because the only member of the enlarged Commission who opposed immediate publication was Rakovsky—not Balabanoff!—"I must say that my personal relations to Rakovsky from that time on were no longer as friendly and spontaneous as before."

Not less difficult to reconcile are the two distinctly different versions of the story that Trotsky complained about the difficulties put in the way of his return to Russia from the United States in 1917. In the English edition, we learn that on his arrival in Russia, Trotsky was particularly bitter because the Bolsheviks had tried to prevent or delay his return out of factional considerations, which would be just like the Bolsheviks, wouldn't it? "His interpretation seemed to me rather implausible then, but after my own later experiences with the Bolsheviks, I was not so sure of this." In the 1927 version, however, Trotsky was, it is true, just as bitter; but his feelings were directed then at Robert Grimm, the Swiss social democrat, to whom Trotsky had turned with the request to have the Swiss government agree to let him pass through on his way home; and because it failed to grant Trotsky permission, "Trotsky hinted that good will was lacking on the part of Grimm or others". In 1928, Grimm receives the pardon of silence.

Numerous similar examples could be cited from the two conflicting sets of memoirs, and all of them pose the question of why an intervening decade of recollections sharpens so severely all judgments of Bolsheviks and moderates so charitably all judgments of social democrats, whose perfectly putrid rôle during and after the war—the period of the author's greatest activity—must surely have left a deep impression upon her. The answer is the one given by the late Henri Guilbeaux, who knew her throughout the Zimmerwald period in Switzerland:

Even though she flattered herself at being above the battle of the revolutionary Russian factions, she had a very clear point of view. Belonging to none of the factions, on the pretext of working for the restoration of unity, she was a Menshevik with all her soul.

It is, alas, this *political* reality that shapes and colors—more simply, misshapes and discolors—her memoirs, a tendency which is only strengthened by her literary collaboration with a duet of Mensheviks of California cultivation. But whatever its effects on the historical value of the book in relation to the points raised above—and the effects are disastrous—its value as an example of the “dialectical interdependence” of politics, morals, and the powers and tricks of memory, is not to be denied.

Max SHACHTMAN

Mann in Uniform

THE COMING VICTORY OF DEMOCRACY.

By THOMAS MANN. 67 pp. Alfred A. Knopf. \$1.00.

Before the conglomeration of platitudes, outworn social theories and downright falsehoods in this little book one stands amazed. Can this be the thought of the man whose literary works, with their studies of human nature and psychology, have made him one of the few great writers of our age? The appalling ignorance of social thought and history revealed is only thinly covered by the eloquence of its author—much as, we are forced to say, the fiery demagoguery of a Hitler cloaks the reaction and deceit underneath.

In these days of feverish re-armament and war preparations, the noble crusader's tongue serves well in the task of deluding the masses of people who, through instinct and experience fear from the debaucheries of a new imperialist war. The spontaneous reaction of the world's masses to the signing of the Munich pact should have convinced the war-makers that only the utmost in the way of fraud and coercion will induce humanity to march again. To this end does Thomas Mann now work. “If *even* Mann, the pacifist, is for the war, it must be a *good* war!”

In general, the approach of Dr. Mann to all social problems is basically emotional and often borders on mere hysteria. He is apparently quite untainted by contemporary scientific method. It goes without saying that Marxism is equally foreign to him. We should not, however, neglect consideration of the more reactionary and dangerous ideas presented by him. In more vulgar form they have long been the stock-in-trade of all pro-war agitators in the democratic-imperialist nations.

That fascism threatens the democracies; that fascism and democracy “dwell on different planets” and are unalterably opposed; that collective security can work; that people's frontism yields sufficient reforms; these are his basic ideas now torn to shreds by the Four-power pact. But their advocacy is not new; we are familiar with their source. It is only his generalizations and asides on political and social theory; his definitions of basic ideologies; his final and tremblingly vague pointing to a path out that leads us to the complete edifice of his thought.

Thus, he opens his remarks with the in-

credible reference to America as the classic land of democracy where “democracy is an all-prevailing matter of course”. Even in the narrow sense—let alone the matter of truth or falsity!—this is incorrect, for England has always been known as the land of pioneer democracy. Mann offers us the time-honored, shallow definitions of democracy which are characteristic of past humanist creeds. “Democracy is timelessly human”; “the idea (truth, freedom and justice) will triumph over force”; “the inalienable and indestructible dignity of mankind”; democracy respects man's “original sin, his spirituality or conscience”; etc.

And how does democracy best express itself? Herr Mann is anti-democratic even in the classic sense of the word. For he makes it perfectly clear that to him democracy means the rule of an intellectual minority, an aristocracy of the mind possessing aristocratic attributes and a special, mysterious spiritual sense. The lower classes, says Mann, must accept the leadership of the better elements. Mob movements are base, barbaric. When Mann approaches the concrete problems of modern democracy, it is merely to endorse the program of Social-Democracy and liberal reformism. The Belgian Vandervelde is quoted with approval. Blum, Masaryk and our own F.D.R. form an ideal triumvirate of aristocratic democrats.

Developing his argument, fascism—which to Mann is an emotional (human) tendency—has this advantage over democracy. It is youthful, novel, new, *revolutionary* (!) It is dynamic, anti-traditional, rule by the masses, aggressive and militant. And to a man who is “no sans-culotte, no Jacobin, no revolutionary,” whose “whole being is that of a conservative”, all this is distasteful. Is it necessary to point out that each and every one of his objections to fascism could likewise be applied to socialism (bolshevism)? Mann knows this well, for part of his tirade against fascism contains the statement that it is “a bolshevism of the ignoble”!

Of the historic nature and source of fascism, Mann cannot claim the slightest understanding. He can only utter subjective truisms and empty rhetoric. “Oppression is not only the ultimate goal but the first principle of fascism. . . .” Fascism in power is “disgraceful, contemptible, honorless. . . .” Its methods consist of “a lust for human degradation”. How close is all this to current cheap-jack theories which make of fascism a lunacy or aberration of the mind! How useful to the Stalinists and other demagogues of the democratic war-camps and how remote from the scientific Marxist understanding of fascism as a *form of capitalism*, product of the latter's endless crisis!

And what is fascism economically? Stepping out of the prophet's role for the moment, Mann informs us that it is practically identical with bolshevism; that its aim is *not* to save capitalism but to destroy it; that its war-economy is nothing but a “low” form of socialism! Mann chooses to be blind to the concentrated, monopolistic capitalism existing in Italy and Germany

and to ignore the continued rule of private property in the fascist nations.

At a recent Stalinist mass meeting for the purpose of “saving Czechoslovakia”, Dr. Mann appeared as a militant crusader for war. There is nothing surprising in this. Every line of this book says as much. The war-mad Stalinists attending the meeting put on a great demonstration at the end of his address. “For several minutes the Garden was a bedlam of sound as the crowd cheered and clapped. . . .” (*New York Times*). “Hitler must fall. This and nothing else will preserve the peace.” These were the words that set on fire the patriotic blood of the assembled friends of democratic capitalism. Hitler must fall, yes, but through the revolutionary action of the German masses. Mann's method would lead but to another and more stringent Versailles treaty which, in turn, would yield an even more aggressive Hitler. But Thomas Mann, conservative democratic, will always remain blind to this as likewise to the fact that the very democracy whose virtues he praises, when and if it ever goes to war against fascism, will not only ravish the few scraps of liberalism that remain but become the image of what it is fighting against.

S. STANLEY

Statement

Statement of the ownership, management, circulation, etc., required by the Acts of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933, of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL published monthly at New York, N. Y., for Oct. 1, 1938.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Martin Abern, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, New International Publishing Co., 116 University Place, New York City.

Editors, James Burnham, Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector, 116 University Place, New York City.
Managing Editor, None.

Business Manager, Martin Abern, 116 University Place, New York City.

2. That the owner is: New International Publishing Co., 116 University Place, New York City; Martin Abern, 116 University Place, New York City; James Burnham, 116 University Place, New York City; Max Shachtman, 116 University Place, New York City; Maurice Spector, 116 University Place, New York City.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

(Signed) Martin Abern, *Business Manager*.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20th day of September, 1938. (Seal) Ida Weinstein, Notary Public, Kings Co. Clk.'s No. 147, Reg. No. 266; N. Y. Co. Clk.'s No. 440, Reg. No. O-W-274; Bronx Co. Clk.'s No. 30, Reg. No. 98-W-40; Queens Co. Clk.'s No. 527, Reg. No. 2444. Commission expires March 30, 1940.

Correspondence

(Note: Comrade Demby recently returned from a trip to Europe where he had an opportunity to observe the labor and revolutionary movement.)

"EVERY COMRADE in Europe, partisan of the Fourth International or even bitter opponent (excluding, of course, Stalinists) who can read English, reads THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and eagerly awaits the next issue. What impressed me most was the universal acclaim with which THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is received. It is everywhere regarded as the outstanding Marxist journal in the world. The comrades read it from cover to cover and discuss its contents. In fact, issues are passed around from one to the other and put to great service. I have seen comrades in most of the countries of Europe go without meals and pool their pennies in order to raise enough money for a subscription to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.

"Considering the number of comrades and sympathizers who can read English, the circulation of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL in Europe is certainly much higher than in the United States. Actually, it has done far more for increasing the prestige of the S.W.P. than anything else we have done. Further, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is the best organizer that the Fourth International has. Not only individual comrades, but in some cases, entire groups have been won to the Fourth International on the basis of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, a copy of the magazine having found its way into their hands in some way or other. I only wish that our own comrades would appreciate THE NEW INTERNATIONAL as much as the European comrades do, and as much as THE NEW INTERNATIONAL deserves."

Frank DEMBY

Both Comrade G. and myself are members of the Australian Labor Party, becoming so after disillusionment with Stalinism. The bulk of left wing elements here and we believe throughout Australia disagree with your position on the Workers' State in Russia—we regard Trotsky as rationalising his reluctance to recognise the nature of the counter-revolutionary victory of an apparatus which has developed into a joint stock trust controlling a servile state. In Sydney there is more activity of a left opposition nature than here. But there they have repeated the Stalinist line on the waterfront (the union to which I belong)—amalgamation with the strikebreakers of 1917 and 1928 and the scabs who have since reinforced them. The Waterside Federation is consolidating without the scabs. The A.L.P. defeated conscription in Australia in 1916 and again in 1917. In 1917 it declared openly in favor of ending the war and ever since has declared its opposition to this country taking part in any other war. The last Federal Elections were fought by them very largely on the neutrality issue

and opposition to conscription; also they pledged themselves to put the question of war to a plebiscite before any action was taken. The Stalinists are at present carrying on a campaign of infiltration and disruption against them with a limited measure of success—the object being to force the alteration of the peace platform in the direction of Collective Security through the League of Nations. An original Ludlow amendment in Australia would not be nearly so utopian as in U.S.A.

G. and myself do not agree with Trotsky on Morality. To the capitalists as a class we do not conceive of the workers as having any moral responsibility; but to take up a position to our fellow-workers of moral superiority—of regarding them as children to be told anything that suits us at the time it suits us—No. That is egotism more fitting to Stalinism. On this point and on the nature of the Russian State THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is tending towards a very dangerous surrender to Stalinism. That way went Zinoviev and Kameneff. At best it can only confuse. For myself I have had some twenty-five years activity in the A.L.P. and the Victorian Trade Unions and the problem here is the need, with the leftward tending workers, of exposing the pseudo-nature of the revolutionary claims of Stalinism. Some of the issues of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL you sent us we had had before, but although on order the person supplying us sold our later copies elsewhere. G. and myself have no organization apart from the A.L.P., but we are trying to dispose of that which you send us through our circle of friends, myself personally carrying any loss.

Yours in Unity,
A. J.

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. 15th St.; 12th St. and University Pl., N.E.; Candy Store, 75 Greenwich Ave.
Forty-second St. at Fifth Ave., S.W.; at Sixth Ave., S.E.; at Sixth Ave., S.W.; at Seventh Ave., S.W., opposite Sterns; 103 W. 44th St.; 46th St. and Broadway, S.E.; Times Bldg. Newsstand, 42nd St. and Broadway; Columbia University Book Store; Brentano's Book Store; N. Y. U. Book Store, 18 Washington Pl.; Store, 58 West 8th St.
Essex and Delancey Sts.; Bookstore at Grand and Attorney Sts.; Candy Store, S.E. 9th St. and Second Ave.; Biederman's Book Store, 12th St. and Second Ave.; Wigerson, 145th St. and St. Nicholas Ave.; 110th St. and Columbus Ave.
BRONX: Jerome Ave. and 170th St.; Jerome Ave. and 167th St. (opp. Loew's Theatre); Sorkin, 208th 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, 509 1/2 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 Cahuenga, Hollywood, Calif.
Newsstand, 7th and Washington, Oakland, Calif.
Newsstand, 12th St., bet. F'way and Washington, Oakland, Calif.
Newsstand, in Andrew Williams Market, Oakland, Calif.
Newsstand, F'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., 300 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.

Clippings

Their Morals and Ours

A lady named Lillian Symes who writes in the *Socialist Call* (July 23, 1938) and who is interested also in the labor movement, declares:

Stung by these exposures of early Bolshevik morality (which does not, of course, excuse the later variety), Trotsky recently undertook to answer all these non-Stalinist critics in a long article called "Their Morals and Ours". It is an amazing attempt to rationalize and defend the Kronstadt massacre of 1921, the suppression of all non-Bolshevik revolutionaries, Lenin's and his own slandering of opponents and the wiping out of the Workers' Opposition within the Bolshevik party. It is a typical Bolshevik performance which will impress no one but his followers. Too much is now known on these subjects.

It is only on the ground that she knows "too much" about the subject that one can explain Miss Symes' morality, which apparently permits attacks upon unread articles. For Trotsky's "Their Morals and Ours" contains only one (1) passing reference to Kronstadt ("For the same reason Pharisees of various hues return to Kronstadt and Mahkno with such obstinacy..."); no (0) reference at all to the suppression of all non-Bolshevik revolutionaries; no (0) reference at all to Lenin's and Trotsky's slandering of opponents; and just as little (0) reference to the wiping out of the Workers' Opposition. The Symes performance is also typical, but not of Bolsheviks.

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.
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.

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 Afghan 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, 286 Drummond St., Carlton, Melbourne, Australia.
Pales. Press Co., 119 Albany 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.

Y. P. S. L. CONVENTION GREETINGS

Readers will be glad to learn that they can send \$1 personal greetings to the Tenth National Convention of the Young People's Socialist League, which is being held in Chicago during the Thanksgiving weekend. This convention, designed to transform the Y.P.S.L. into a fighting mass revolutionary youth organization, needs and deserves the support of readers.

Our sole means of financing our Convention will be the magnificent two-color printed program book, dedicated to the heroic martyrs of the Fourth International (Klement, Sedoff, Wolf, Reiss, Moulin and the hundreds of others who have laid down their lives in the struggle for the socialist emancipation of mankind). The dedication article is written by Max Shachtman. Outstanding among the other features of the program book are greetings from Leon Trotsky, in the form of an article entitled, "The Rôle of Revolutionary

Youth," and greetings from our various sections in Europe now engaged in the daily life-and-death struggle against fascism and imperialist war.

You will want to own a copy of our program book. You can guarantee yourself a copy and, at the same time, do your bit in assuring the success of our all-important Convention, by sending in your personal greetings NOW. We are still taking ads: full page, \$10; half page, \$5; quarter page, \$3. But we are making a drive for \$1 personal greetings, which will entitle you to a free copy of the program book and the inclusion of your name amongst the supporters of the revolutionary movement. Send all greetings to: National Convention Arrangements Committee, 160 N. Wells St., Rm. 308, Chicago, Illinois.

The National Convention Arrangement Committee

WE ASK YOUR AID NOW!

In the October number of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, we told our readers that the magazine faced the danger of *suspension* unless its supporters came to its aid financially. The high cost of producing such a large magazine gradually has been taking its toll of our slim resources. . . . Well, briefly, the expected aid has not yet appeared. Hence, we cannot promise the appearance of the December number, unless financial support reaches us immediately. Your support is requested in two ways:

1. Send in a Subscription.
2. Send a Contribution to the Sustaining Fund of the magazine.

Address:

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

RUSSIAN OPPOSITION BULLETIN

(Organ of Bolshevik-Leninists)

September-October Issue Now Available

Featuring
Articles by Leon Trotsky

Order from:

Rae Spiegel, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

FASCISM & BIG BUSINESS

By DANIEL GUERIN

A brilliant and thorough-going analysis of the evolution and strategy of fascism in Italy and Germany from the revolutionary Marxist viewpoint. The author stresses that it is not enough to understand fascism, but that appropriate means must be taken to combat it.

The volume will be edited by Dwight Macdonald who will supply special notes relating the emergence of fascism in Europe to events now taking place in America.

300 pages—Publication Date: About October 15th

Price on publication \$2.00—Advance orders \$1.25

ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

100 Fifth Avenue, New York