

The New _____ **INTERNATIONAL**

July • 1942

NOTES OF THE MONTH

REP. MAY'S SPEECH ODELL WALLER
PM ON GERMANY

WHICH WAY FOR BRITAIN?

By Harry Allen

Discussion on the National Question

TWO PROLETARIAN SOLDIERS

By Max Shachtman

Review of Books by

LORWIN • WERTH • GRATTAN
McCARTHY • CORBETT

SINGLE COPY 20c

ONE YEAR \$1.50

Have You Seen the

PENNY LABOR ACTION

*—it's better
than ever—*

featuring stories on

**WAR
LABOR
NEGROES
WORLD NEWS
Editorial Comment**

Subscribe NOW!

Name.....

Address.....

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

**RATES: 60 Cents a Year. \$1.00 in Canada,
Foreign and New York City**

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. VII

No. 5, Whole No. 64

Published monthly by NEW INTERNATIONAL Publishing Company,
114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea
2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for 5
copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c
for 5 and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at
the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: ALBERT GATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Notes of the Month:

REP. MAY SPEAKS OUT

ODELL WALLER

PM ON GERMANY

By A. G. 163

Articles:

WHICH WAY FOR BRITAIN?

By H. Allen 167

TWO PROLETARIAN SOLDIERS

By Max Shachtman..... 171

ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN
EUROPE

174

AGAINST NATIONAL OPPRESSION

175

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL QUESTION?

By J. W. Smith 176

WORLD WAR I IN RETROSPECT—II

By H. Allen and R. Stone..... 179

A NOTE ON JAMES T. FARRELL

By R. Fangston 182

Archives of the Revolution:

ON THE "FALLEN WOMEN" OF LIBER-
ALISM

By Rosa Luxemburg..... 184

Books in Review:

A LIBERAL AND THE WAR

By Lawrence O'Connor 186

MOSCOW CORRESPONDENT

By Mary Casting 187

BOURGEOIS NEW WORLDS

By Albert Gates 189

OPPORTUNISM DOWN UNDER

By Henry Judd 190

AND WHAT COMPANY

By H. J. 191

KARL MARX ON INDIA

192

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME VIII

JULY, 1942

NUMBER 6

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Rep. May Speaks Out

As the days roll into weeks and the weeks into months, the front in World War II widen and increase; its conflicts grow more intense. Millions of soldiers are locked in battle. The war on seas and in the air involves ever greater forces. The employment and destruction of material goes on as if this decisive element of modern war is inexhaustible. All the nations of the world, massed millions of humanity, are crushed by the weight of the struggle for profit. And yet there is no end in sight. As a matter of fact, for Americans, the war has not yet truly begun!

In Europe, in Africa, in Asia, war has been going on for years. The economies of these areas, the peoples, the armed forces, have been living through a gruesome hell. But in the Western Hemisphere, in the United States especially, every thing is in *preparation*. Economy remains in a process of transformation. Production is still being altered for total war purposes. The armed forces have not been thoroughly mobilized or trained. In this part of the world, the people have merely been inconvenienced—the hardships are still to come.

But even before the war has really begun for Americans, the ranks of the bourgeois rulers of American society are split into many segments on two vital issues of the conflict: war aims and the length of the war. The truth is, it is no longer possible to excite the passions of the people merely by the hurling of shibboleths against the skies. To one degree or another, the masses want to know, not only what this war is about, but what are the aims of the powers. Will humanity experience another bloodbath merely to re-travel the roads of 1914-39? And how long will this thing go on? How long will it be necessary to tighten one's belt, to alter one's existence, to shed the blood of the people?

Absence of Unity

Even though the bourgeois rulers are more vitally concerned with the concrete problem of the total reorganization of the national economy, which they have not yet been able to achieve, they must take time out to answer the questions which really concern the people. The absence of unity among the various groupings in the bourgeoisie needs no additional proof other than their failure to agree on the multiple problems and measures before legislative and administrative bodies in Washington. It is not enough to explain this situation by saying: the politicians are playing politics as usual.

There is a more fundamental reason behind the inability of the Administration and the ruling class to accomplish quickly the steps necessary to put the United States on the

high road of a total war footing and that is the lack of a unified concept of the war, its object and the measures required to win it.

At first the speech of Vice-President Wallace, which characterized the war as a struggle for the "common man's century," was received with a grim silence by the press and the leaders of the American bourgeoisie. This silence is now followed by abuse and ridicule. For there are an infinite number of purposes for which the bourgeoisie is fighting. Principally, they are fighting to destroy the power of a renascent German imperialism, the main threat to the world economic and political position of American capitalism. It is generally overlooked that the war is not so much a war between Germany and Great Britain-Soviet Union as it is a war between Germany and the United States. Roosevelt understands this and the most acute leaders of the financial and industrial ruling class understand it. They are not fighting to save the "democracies." They are not fighting to save China, to insure a quart of milk for every man, woman and child in the world, to overthrow the power of monopoly capitalism, or greed, or barbarism, or half a hundred other purposes. Those who do not understand this, understand nothing about this war.

The most potent weapon in the struggle against fascism cannot be employed by the democratic imperialisms—the social and political weapons, the propagandistic weapons of the fight for a new social order of economic, political and social freedom, of the struggle for socialism. Against socialism, the bourgeois rulers of all the countries in the world would unite to defend their common booty. The New Dealers, the professional "democrats," the liberals notwithstanding, the war against the Axis is a military struggle, pure and simple. The conflict is a test of economic and military power—and nothing else!

May on the Length of War

But such a conflict may be endless and there is a growing suspicion among the people that this war may come to no definitive conclusion. Certainly, the Administration and the military leaders of the United States, as well as the United Nations as a whole, know that this war will be a long and bloody affair. Imagine, then, their consternation when Representative Andrew J. May, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, spoke out and said that the war might end "probably in 1942 and unquestionably in 1943."

The occasion for this remark was to assure the people that there would be no need to draft the youths of 18 to 20 years and married men, that the job could be done with the present army and with the induction of the remaining single men on the draft rolls. May's remarks brought angry comments from the Administration and the military staffs and experts. On what basis did he make his prediction?

As chairman of an important House committee, presumably in the know, May's remarks could carry enormous weight. Did he have some information not generally known? At least

he intimated as much. But this was extremely embarrassing to the war effort. The War and Navy Departments, busily at work trying to create a powerful military force for eventual mass employment to turn the tide of a war which is now unquestionably favorable to the Axis powers, were greatly chagrined by what was undoubtedly a blow against their efforts. The military experts were at a total loss of how to explain their predictions of a long and bloody conflict in which victory was by no means assured, when an "authority" forecast a quick end of the war.

A complete objective analysis of the state of the war can lead to no other opinion but that the representative was talking completely through his hat, spreading marmalade to create good feeling and false hopes among the people. Hanson Baldwin, the nation's outstanding journalistic military observer, who predicts a war of at least seven years' duration, wrote in the *New York Times* of July 9: "Mr. May's remarks about the possibility of a quick end to the war finds no basis in any generally known military, political, economic or psychological facts. . . . The present military situation justifies no assumption except that of a long, hard war—a war in which we shall not only have to become far 'tougher' than we now are in order to win, but also have to go all-out' to prevent defeat."

Ernest K. Lindley, the able chief of the Washington bureau of *Newsweek*, wrote in the issue of July 20: "Actually Mr. May's prognostication has no discoverable sanction among the well-informed."

These two commentators forecast a long war. Both assert that the military authorities will have to take all available manpower, married and single, young and old. The global war will be a great devourer of human material. It will be an even greater devourer of material. It is becoming clearer every day, even for those who do not wish to see, that all of American industry and agriculture will be chained to the war, producing almost exclusively goods for the multiple fronts. And American manpower will be shipped to all the corners of the earth before this war is won.

The American masses are not yet prepared for this kind of war. They are not ideologically prepared for a long, destructive conflict. That is why the Administration is so disturbed. It still lacks unified support, a common aim, the necessary will. The fundamental reason for this is that twenty-five years after World War I they are re-fighting the same battles, the same basic forces, for the same basic imperialist goals!

Odell Waller

Odell Waller is dead. His life was taken in an electric chair to which he was sentenced by a poll tax jury in the state of Virginia. By this act the symbol of our democracy was raised a little higher.

The case of the dead sharecropper became a nation-wide issue. For more than two years, chiefly through the efforts of the Workers Defense League, Waller was kept alive. Appeals to the higher courts were unavailing. The Supreme Court, now regarded as a New Deal judiciary, or as a "great liberal institution," refused to consider the case on *technical* grounds, i.e., on the grounds of an error by the trial attorney!

The case itself is shrouded in confusion. Odell Waller, a poor Negro sharecropper, admitted that he shot and killed his white planter-boss, Oscar Davis, in an argument over their respective shares of his tobacco crop. It was claimed by the

defense that Waller interpreted a movement of Davis' hand toward his hip pocket as reaching for a gun and that he shot first. It *seems* that the case was one of first degree murder. That, at least, was the position taken by the prosecution and the rulers of the state of Virginia.

And so, once again, a Negro was tried by a jury of "his peers," this time consisting of ten white farmers, one white business man and one white carpenter, in a state where the Negro suffers inequality and the decades-old prejudice of the South. The verdict of the jury could have been foretold.

We have made a rough citation of the legal aspects of the case merely to introduce the subject because we do not believe that this case could or should have been decided on "legal" grounds. The case of Odell Waller was one of tremendous social import, for it again sharply posed the position of the Negro in American society and the reactionary forces which keep alive the powerful racial prejudice which exists and is artificially nurtured in this country.

The Waller case called attention to the condition of semi-peonage which befalls so large a section of the Negro people in the Southern and "border" states and which is also the lot of a large number of white farmers. The condition of servitude under which these people live is not far removed from the slavery of the pre-Civil War days. Negroes and poor whites work land for their bosses and obtain a share of the products of their long and arduous toil. More often than not, the landlord decides the cropper's share and cheats him in a hundred different ways. The gluttoned landlords idly await the fruits of the toil of the sharecropper. The fact that there are white sharecroppers does not make this condition of semi-peonage any more palatable. It merely goes to show that the landlords and profiteers are not greatly concerned with how and from whom they profit.

The Plight of the Sharecropper

Sharecroppers are the lowest paid of American toilers. They have few rights and little or no means of fighting for democratic, economic and social rights. Their lives are completely brutalized by the extreme poverty under which they live. The landlord, the vigilante and the gun rule the cropper areas. The Negro, especially, must fight, in the most literal sense, for his very existence. Behind the landlords stand the petty officials, the armed deputies, the legal powers and the governing officials. Thus, all the cards are stacked against the poorest of those who work the land in order to live.

If in the Waller case it is true that Davis himself was a tenant farmer who employed this poor sharecropper, it does not help the case of the Southern Bourbons. It only emphasizes the demoralizing and degenerating effects of the sharecropping system. In this case, one tenant farmer parcels out the land he works on to another sharecropper and a fight ensues over their collective meager rations. Thus, the vicious system of exploitation wends its way.

Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr., was within his power to change the verdict of the jury. But after several reprieves and following what he called a complete examination of the facts of the trial, Darden refused to act in any way which might have saved Waller's life. It was reported that the President had sent a personal message to the governor—but the content of the message is unknown. The announcement, however, is intended to show that Roosevelt and his Administration cannot be held responsible for the action of a governor acting under the doctrine of states' rights.

There are however, some interesting sidelights to the case and these concern the efforts of the Workers Defense League and a committee of leading Negroes to see the President and other Administration officials for the purpose of obtaining their intervention in the case. The President could not be seen! Vice-President Wallace, the ideological champion of New Dealism and the advocate of a "new world for the common man," the genuine believer in the "Four Freedoms," fled from the committee in a highly agitated and embarrassed manner. Eleanor Roosevelt, who sought thrice to get the President's ear, finally acknowledged defeat.

What powers lay behind this White House drama? It is obvious that the Southern bloc had warned Roosevelt to keep hands off the case of Odell Waller! And the White House conceded to the demand! The reasons are plain to see. Roosevelt governs on the basis of a political fusion with the most reactionary, semi-fascist elements in the country. The prosecution of the war and the success of the war economy, the retention of some of the achievements of the New Deal (those not already violated and abolished by congressional actions) rest, in a large measure, upon support of these elements. Rather than risk a head-on collision with these forces, the Administration plays the game. If only for this reason, it is not decisively important how the President personally feels about the Negro question. For the same reason, it is not too significant that the New Dealers, and a large part of the Administration, would like to overcome Jim Crow and general discrimination, not only against the Negro, but against all other racial and national minorities, in industry, in the Army and Navy, and in all other aspects of American social and political life. They are part of an economic and political system which gives rise to the existence of these conditions, and since they live and act within the orbit of this system, since their own political existence, power and actions are the result of the worst kind of compromise between bourgeois reformism and reaction, one cannot expect them to act in any way which violates their genesis—small matters notwithstanding.

Southern Rulers Dominant

The adamant position taken by the Southern bloc is worth investigating. Aside from the fact that they are, as a group, the most backward, ignorant and feudal-minded reactionaries in the country, the fundamental explanation for their conduct lies in the field of economics. By this remark we do not overlook the environmental conditioning of decades, the effects of the system of slavery, ended only seventy-five years ago. We are not unaware of how the post-Civil War generations have been educated in the Southern schools or by their immediate family ties, of how the anti-Negro and general race, national and religious prejudices have become an integral segment of the cultural growth in the Southern states. These prejudices, spread beyond the borders of the South to the entire country, are by and large maintained, artificially and otherwise, by the practices of the entire ruling economic class, particularly in the South.

The power of the Southern landlords, industrialists, bankers and professionals, rests upon low wages, intense exploitation, poor housing, sub-standard foods, and these are maintained by keeping the poor, the worker, the small farmer, the tenant and sharecropper, white and black, in a state of subjection in which race prejudice is the strongest single factor of division. Anything which threatens the economic, social and political rule of the Southern Bourbons is met with an automatic unity on their part that is well-nigh unshakable in

the absence of a united opposition. But their greatest strength lies in the halls of Congress, where every progressive measure is met with their censorship or rejection. Their political power, based upon the existing electoral system, is far in excess of their real strength in the country.

Only one party rules in the South—the Democratic Party. Its representatives have a veritable life tenure in Congress and in the Senate. In the legislative halls, where seniority rights prevail, the Southerners are chairmen of almost all of the leading committees. They can make or break legislation. And they do! That is why no lynching bill and no anti-poll-tax bill have as yet been put to a vote. But that is also the reason why the most reactionary legislation can pass in the congressional halls.

*

The Waller case is important because it has brought to a head a situation which nails to a cross the infamy of the Southern statesmen. But not only the Southerners. Where were the Northern statesmen, the Western statesmen, the great Administration leaders? Where were the propagandists of the "people's war," the believers in the "common man," the believers in the "Four Freedoms"? All of them acknowledged defeat! They confessed their impotency in the face of rabid reaction. More than that, they confessed their utter bankruptcy!

That is why A. Philip Randolph said, after vainly trying to get an audience with Roosevelt: "The President and the government have failed us."

But listen for a moment to those responsible for the execution of Waller. Listen to the august governor of the state of Virginia fulminating against those who sought to save Waller's life: "*I regard such propaganda campaigns as extremely detrimental to the public interests. The only possible effect is to sow racial discord at a critical time when every loyal citizen should strive to promote unity.*"

That is the way of these gentlemen. To come to the defense of a poor sharecropper, to oppose discrimination and Jim Crow is to "sow racial discord." No, it is not those who enforce this barbaric system in the South who sow racial discord, it is those who fight against it! Adding insult to injury, the governor wraps himself in the flag and behind the war by denouncing the objectors because this is "a critical time when every loyal citizen should strive to promote unity!"

The Norfolk, Va., *Ledger-Dispatch*, in an editorial of July 1st, ecstatically says: "To Governor Darden for having seen clearly and acted fearlessly—all honor!"

The Danville, Va., *Bee* accused those who sought clemency for Waller of having constituted "another form of mob law," and defends the orderly processes of law! The movement in defense of Waller was characterized by this same newspaper as a "sociological movement"—perish the thought!

In the midst of the agitation around the Waller case, the ignorant Representative Rankin of Mississippi kept up a running barrage against those who "desire to defile the purity of the white race," especially in the South (!), by accepting unmarked containers of Negro blood for the armed forces. He too, did it in the name of avoiding racial discord! He did it in the name of Americanism and in the interest of the war against Hitler!

If one examines the professions and business of these gentlemen who compose the Southern ruling class, he will find that well-defined economic interests dominate their actions. In the South you find capitalism in the raw. Class relations are so fixed that there is no requirement yet for the "niceties"

of capitalist rule in the North. But this condition is changing there with the growing might of labor and it is this which strikes fear in the hearts of the Bourbons—fear lest their barbarous economic rule will be threatened! That is why it was necessary for them to take Waller's life—to demonstrate their power, their readiness to fight any encroachment upon their "rights." The execution of Waller was a demonstration by the Southern ruling class.

PM On Germany

The New York newspaper *PM* may appear to be an oddity to many people. A great deal of writing has been contributed in an endeavor to explain this "phenomenon" in American journalism. The upper strata of the financial and manufacturing circles have a venomous hatred for its muckraking exposures of their high-handed profiteering through special means of exploiting the workers, particularly through the present war production program. The reactionary politicians hate it no less for its exposures of their rôle in the legislative halls of Washington and the economic interests which they serve—this is especially true of the Southern bourbons, whose power in Congress far exceeds their specific weight in the country as a whole.

But *PM* earns not only the enmity of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Liberals, pure and simple trade unionists, socialists, revolutionary Marxists find it difficult to accept *PM* for what it says it is.

The paper's best friends are the New Dealers, the die-hard Rooseveltians, the Stalinists and the trade unionists who are the captives of the Stalinists. For *PM* is an American counterpart of the radical-liberal oftentimes observed in Europe. Its pretentious independence of thought, fearlessness and objectivity are suspect by the fact that it follows the line of the Stalinists on all decisive questions. Since the involvement of Russia in the war against Hitler, its line in this direction has become clearer and there is little doubt left as to the origin of its major inspirations.

Thus, its liberalism, its defense of democratic rights, of the Negroes, the general trade union and liberal movement is proscribed by its real political position as a camp-follower of Stalinism (many of its writers are not merely tainted with this cancer, but are drenched in it—the noble editor notwithstanding). Thus, *PM* shrinks from clarity and creates a great confusion of ideas by its half-truths and deliberately misleading editorials and features.

The Story of Germany

An article printed some weeks ago, entitled "Big Business Wins Complete Control in Nazi Germany," written by Kurt Singer (referred to as a Swedish journalist) and its own Victor H. Bernstein, is a typical example of what we refer to above. The article opens with the announcement that the replacement of Herr Wagner as price commissioner of the Third Reich by a Herr Fishboeck "marked the final victory, within the Reich, of Germany's industrial plutocrats—the steel magnates and I. G. Farbenindustrie, the Aryan 'husband' of Standard Oil—in their struggle for power, profits and monopolies against small business and the German state."

The article, which has an air of "Marxism" about it, goes on to describe the process by which big business triumphed under Hitler. It says, for example:

"The German industrialists did not want an excess-profits tax. *It was dumped.*

"The German industrialists did not want limitations on profits. *The limitations were dumped.*

"The German industrialists did not want the ceiling on wages to be lifted. *It remained fixed.*

"The German industrialists resented the sharing of war profits with small industry. *Small industry is now disappearing in Germany.*" (Emphasis in original.—A. G.)

How Big Business Triumphs

Let us stop here for a moment to see what it is *PM* is really saying. The impression which the writers are trying to convey is that Germany is economically different from Great Britain or the United States (in their minds, one of the main reasons for supporting the war in the latter countries). But they are wrong in declaring that "Germany's industrial plutocracy" fought for power against "small business and the German state." Small business was licked in Germany many years ago. It has been in a subordinate position in her economy since the turn of the century. The war has only accentuated and brutalized this process. But what is true for Germany is also true for all other imperialist nations, America, England, France, Japan, etc.

What the writers say about the plutocratic victory over the German state is ludicrous. Fascism rose to power in Germany as the servant of big business. And the state in Germany was always the servant of big business, but it was never so intimately welded to the interests of the financial and industrial ruling class as under Hitler. The victory of fascism in Germany signified that the plutocracy succeeded in destroying the resistive powers of the proletariat and thus guaranteed uninterrupted profits for its class. The theory of *PM* leads to only one conclusion: that there was a struggle between the German ruling class and the fascist state in which the former triumphed. This, by the grace of God, never existed.

Furthermore, the list of the demands of the industrialists, all of which were acceded to, are not peculiar to Germany. They express part of the essence of the interests of the bourgeoisie all over the world, and the above "demands" are identical to those made and won in Great Britain and the United States. The only mitigating factor in the latter countries is that the inter-bourgeois political conflicts, and the bourgeois-proletarian class struggle has not yet been solved in the completely reactionary (fascist) manner as in Germany. But the economic principles of the two orders are identical and that is why the fundamental paths traveled by these countries is *similar* and in many cases *identical*. Only those who look upon Germany as a new social order, or those who describe the Germans as the protagonists of a "world revolution" (*PM*) are confused and . . . irritated.

What of America and England?

But what about the American bourgeois? Or the British? They do not want an excess-profits tax. So they emasculate all proposals in such a direction and are guaranteed in advance that in the post-war period they will be returned a large share of what is now siphoned off for the purpose of partially paying for the war.

Limitations on profits are a farce in the United States and Great Britain, even as *PM* has often pointed out.

If the German industrialists do not want the ceiling on wages in that country lifted, the British working class already has a ceiling on wages and the American ruling class and the Administration are fighting for a more severe ceiling than now prevails in a practical way.

If the plutocracy in Germany does not want to share its profits with small business, what of the American and British plutocracies? Or is it possible that everyone has already forgotten the findings of the Truman committee, or the frantic wailings of the small business men at home? The *tendency* toward the disappearance of small business in Germany has a corollary in the same tendency here and in England (see *The New International*, March, 1942).

The article in *PM* goes on to cite that despite Hitler's promise that "None will make gold from the ruby blood of our fellow heroes," was profits have enormously risen in the face of large taxes (this has a familiar ring!). The writers cite the growth of income for German industry as taken from the Nazi publication *Wirtschaft und Statistik*. These figures are based on tax returns and are in billions of marks:

Year	Net Income
1932	.53
1935	2.96
1937	6.21
1939	8.14
1940	10.18

The article then goes on to describe the methods employed by big business to increase "invisible" profits and how the government gives industry special considerations in contracts, all of them calculated to increase profits. Here, too, the methods are similar and identical to those pursued in the United States and England.

One might reasonably ask: What is the purpose of the *PM* article, what is it trying to prove? Merely this, that in England and the United States, as democratic capitalist nations, a more liberal policy prevails—the *tendencies* in these two countries, while identical to those in Germany, are not yet as extreme in all their ramifications.

The significant nature of the article, not intended by the authors, is that it does identify the economies of the leading capitalist powers. If big business has won complete control in Germany, it is well on the way to achieve it in the United States and England. In any case, it is triumphant and dominant in the "democratic" nations and one can, with equal justification, point to the developments in these countries as one with Germany. As the war economy develops at home, the identification of American economy with that of Germany will be infinitely clearer.

A. G.

Which Way for Britain?

The course of the war so far should make it clear even to the wishful thinkers that dependence on the bourgeois democracies for a genuine struggle against the fascist order is illusory, in fact fantastic. That is, it is not possible for democratic capitalism, even under the pressure of the working class and exploited masses to transform this war from its present imperialist character into a bona fide political and military struggle against the fascist form of capitalism. This is evident from the example of Great Britain, which has now been at war with Germany for more than two and a half years.

Great Britain is one of the imperialist democracies whose end as a dominant imperialism is *surely* determined should German nazism be victorious and *may* be determined even if the United Nations are victorious. Note Britain's steadily lessening hold on its empire during the course of the war, with America steadily achieving dominance in Canada, the West Indies and Australia. Note also that the recent report of the Phelps-Stokes Foundation on African Affairs (*New York Times*, June 23) suggests that the American government shall have a special administrative department on African affairs—a clear indication that American imperialism is taking over supervision of sections of Africa, as well as of the rest of the world. In this connection, it is interesting to note also the virtual admission by the Federation of British Industries (*New York Times*, May 30) that British imperialism in the post-war period depends solely or mainly upon American charity. The report reads in part:

We must bear in mind that at the end of the war the United States will be the most important economic unit of the world. The success of reconstruction will depend largely on the part America is prepared to play in it. It is essential that the United Kingdom and the United States should have an agreed policy with which the empire can associate.

This amounts virtually to begging American imperialism for some inkling as to the latter's post-war plans with which British imperialism can be associated.

Britain's hopes, from a strictly capitalist point of view, lay in retaining its hold on the British masses in support of the war, and in winning the backing of its colonial possessions (no easy task any longer! *Vide* India!) in the struggle against German fascist imperialism. The achievement of these objectives, so desperately needed by British capitalism, dictated a course of serious concessions to the colonial countries and to the British proletariat. But has this been the case? Certainly not!

Britain Has Conceded Nothing to Colonial Peoples

In respect to Britain's outstanding colony, it is all too clear that the British imperialists have resisted every inch of the way any challenge to their political, economic and military hold on India. Stern necessity, after more than two years of German and Japanese victories, today compels Great Britain, with extreme reluctance, to make "concessions" (promises of dominion status to India *after* the war!) in the hope that the Indian masses will bring their support to Britain in the latter's struggle against Germany and Japan.

That the British bourgeoisie endeavored to utilize a so-called left labor man, Sir Stafford Cripps, to make its proposals more palatable is in line with the historic method of using "labor" fronts to put over either unsatisfactory propositions or outright treachery. The ordinary coin of the British bourgeoisie is seen by all to be too patently counterfeit to pass any longer. That, so far, the British proposals have been rejected on various grounds, attests to the fundamental changes in prospects and perspectives created for the Indian masses as a result of the war. It is a fact that *the Indian masses do not need these "concessions" from their historic oppressors. They have but to take them now, and even more.* Should they decide unqualifiedly to pursue their future course without dictation from British imperialism, they can proceed by *their own strength* to establish their political independence and economic and social emancipation.

As far as Britain's "democratic" objectives in the rest of her colonies are concerned, it is necessary to cite a few facts, not as familiar as those concerning India. A London dispatch published in the *Amsterdam Star-News* (New York Negro newspaper), April 4 reports that the British government has just sponsored a measure "*in support of forced labor in Kenya Colony, Africa.*" The African labor conscripts are to be brought to "work on private European farms." The report concludes by saying that "*the century-old plan of the exploitation of African labor... is still the foundation of the economic and political policies of the British government and ruling class.*"

From another direction, there is to be observed the growing demand by the British possessions in the Caribbean countries (West Indies) for immediate independence. In recent weeks the spotlight has been thrown on the British (and American) exploitation of native labor in the Bahamas at the rate of 81 cents a day! In the Nassau "riots" which grew out of this exploitation, British garrison troops shot into the demonstrators, killing two and wounding more than 30 others.

Wherever the setting sun of the British Empire shines, the story is the same. *The British bourgeoisie is attempting by extreme brutality to retain its exploiting privileges as disillusionment with British imperialism increases.* This disillusionment will be followed by the struggle for full independence and freedom.

The British Bourgeoisie and Fascism

The masses generally, not only in Great Britain, but throughout the world, have no illusions on the historic rôle and practices of "perfidious Albion." Yet by persistent propaganda it has been possible to delude a good many people that Great Britain today is making important concessions to the British workers; *maybe it is even on the road to socialism without the need for the British workers to remove their exploiters.* Hence, it is said, (e.g., British Labor Party Report, May, 1942) the British workers should take advantage of this situation, first by full support for the military defeat of Germany, and then by making their demands on victorious British capitalism. Again, for the most part, this is standing matters on their heads.

The plain and stark fact is that Great Britain is fighting a war for its imperialist existence. *Britain is not fighting fascism as a social order, but as a rival imperialism.* The fight against fascism is only a by-product of the imperialist struggle and would be abandoned quickly by British capitalism if it could be assured of retaining its empire. Is more needed to show this than the policy of ex-Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin and the British Parliament toward Hitler in the years before the outbreak of war? This was a policy of good will and conciliation with Hitler's fascism. Chamberlain continued that course. The present Premier, Winston Churchill, is a friend of fascism, both Italian and German, by his own frequent declarations. On January 21, 1937, Churchill said:

If I had been an Italian I should have been wholeheartedly with you [the fascists] from start to finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism.... I will say a word on an international aspect of fascism. Externally your movement has rendered a service to the whole world. Italy has provided the necessary antidote to the Russian poison. Hereafter no great nation will be unprovided with an ultimate means of protection against cancerous growths.

On November 11, 1938, Churchill is still saying:

I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among nations.

All these men have followed a steady course of *not just appeasement and conciliation but understanding of Hitler's anti-labor rôle.* It was only Hitler's hope or belief that he could gain *everything* by a smashing military victory and conquest that compelled the British to retaliate by war in defense of its vested imperialist interests. To conceive of the British bourgeoisie turning its imperialist war into a "democratic" war, much less a struggle against fascism in its political aspects, is to fly in the face of not just proven Marxist theory, but the facts of life, the course of the war.

The British Bourgeoisie and the British Masses

There are false illusions and notions that the British ruling class has made important concessions to the workers during this war. But this is not the case. The British workers have had to make persistent demands, engage in protests and also in strikes in order to enforce and try to maintain the economic and political rights they have achieved through decades of great struggles against their masters. British work-day losses through strikes still amount to 2,122 every day. In 1940 there took place 850 strikes involving 284,000 persons. In 1941, in the second year of the war, the number of strikes increased to 1,162 and the number of persons involved to 334,800 (*New York Times*, April 20).

The British rulers have, of course, used the exigencies of the war to justify their restrictions on the British people. But look at the struggle of the British workers to obtain decent and bombproof shelters in protection from German air raids. They are still not secured. Look at the continued great distinctions in the standards of living. Those that have wealth continue to live luxuriously. The Black Market exists for the bourgeois extractors of surplus value. Will the British government smash its Black Market which it could do so simply by wholesale arrest and imprisonment of these entrepreneurs of disaster and hunger? No! Yet the experience of Soviet Russia during the days of Lenin and Trotsky shows that a workers' government is capable of largely destroying the effectiveness of these cruder vultures of society, by real efforts to smash the clandestine merchant marts.

The war has not, moreover, stopped the colossal profits of the British bourgeoisie despite the great taxations for war needs. For instance, in the *New York Times* of April 11 it is reported that dividends of 55¼ per cent (!) will be paid stockholders of a large Malayan tin company. The scorched earth policy in the Far East will not impoverish *British stockholders, who will be "reimbursed" because demolition was carried out on government orders.*

Furthermore, the much-vaunted high excess profits taxes in Great Britain provide guarantees that not all the accumulated capital of the British bourgeoisie will be lost after the war. (Indeed, the Conference Board on American Industry recently asked the American government to imitate the British system, according to the *New York Times* of June 8.) The British tax system "takes care" of "wartime profit incentive" by providing for post-war losses and "errors in wartime accounting" to be deducted from present excess profits taxes. Obviously the British bourgeoisie is making very sure that it will not lose anything after the war from any excess profits taxes which they may have to pay now *as a sop to the British masses.*

What about the democratic rights of the British people? Since 1935, when Stanley Baldwin, Conservative, was Prime Minister of Britain, there have been no general nation-wide

elections for Parliament. Only a few by-elections have been held, and where some sort of opposition to the British government policy in the war manifested itself in such by-elections there has been something of a dither and insinuations by Churchill of treason.

Note the concern because Fenner Brockway, national secretary of the Independent Labor Party, an organization which has been considerably outspoken on several significant aspects of the character of the war, as well as on its conduct, contested a recent by-election. Obviously, the fear is that such by-elections, with their discussion of war issues and war conduct, might result in more freedom of expression on the war than the ruling class likes, even if only in a single constituency. (Brockway polled 25 per cent of the total votes in Cardiff East or 3,311 votes against 10,030 for the War Secretary, Sir James Grigg. This is a not insignificant achievement, showing that the British masses are thinking more and more along socialist lines to resolve the issue of the imperialist war, including the common people's real desire for the complete freedom of India.)

Class Legislation in Britain

Far more significant is the fact that the British Trade Union Act remains in force to this very day. This act was decreed by Parliament after the great strike of the Triple Alliance Unions (the alliance of the railroad workers, transport workers and miners) in 1926 had brought British capitalism literally to its knees. *The British Trade Union Act can be used at any time by the British government to crack down on any militant action, demonstration or strike struggles by the British workers. When the act will be used in any significant sense remains to be seen. That will depend on the attitude, militancy and aims of the British workers. What is important is that the Trade Union Act remains as the law of the land in relations with the British labor movement and can be invoked at any time.* This act is as reactionary a piece of anti-labor legislation as a labor-hating bourgeoisie ever designed. It is comparable to the British "DORA"—Defense of the Realm Act—which was used so often to clamp down on dissidents, political and others, in the First World War. If there were any real semblance to democratic and socialist trends in Britain, British labor would have surely demanded, and British capital would have had to yield, the *immediate repeal* of the British Trade Union Act, a real chain around the neck of the British workers.

Rather than in a socialist direction, the course of the economy of Great Britain is toward totalitarianism or fascism.

The recent "nationalization" of the coal mines by the British government is a *striking example of this trend in the economy*. Nationalization of the mines has been a long-standing demand of the miners. In May of this year, 10,000 miners were on strike in Britain for wage increases. Within the last six months, 36,000 workers have been *transferred* to the mines at a *wage loss*.

The national board set up to manage the "nationalized" mines is "merely consultative." "Management will be left in the hands of the present pit managers, who will *continue* to serve the owners though they are now subject to removal by the government. *There will be no fundamental alteration of the financial structure of the mining industry*" (*New York Times*, June 4). The "nationalization" plan has been described by A. Sloan, Scottish laborite, as "a shabby substitution foisted on the country." Clement Davies, independent,

asserted that the scheme was "quite irresponsible class legislation" (*New York Times*, June 11). In a single sentence of the *New York Times* of June 4, the class nature of the "nationalization" is proved. The sentence reads: "*The Conservatives are pleased.*"

The economic bases of the corporate state or fascist economy are thus being laid by the British capitalists. That a fascist political movement in Britain today has no significant base or influence is of course no guarantee against its drastic outbreak when the need of the capitalist-imperialists is dire. Through the vigilance and militancy of the British working class, certain democratic and trade union rights have been maintained. But at the same time there is not only the above-mentioned restrictions on general parliamentary elections but also the recent threatened ban on the Fourth Internationalist left wing (Trotskyist) paper as well as the ban on the *Daily Worker* (Stalinist organ) still standing from the days of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Only if the proletariat intervenes and consciously aims for political power in its own right, with the object of establishing a socialist society can this trend be circumvented. Only under such conditions could the war against Germany take on a progressive character. But that requires the end of subordination of the British workers to the military and political requirements of British capitalism. In the development of their labor unions and political organizations in this direction, the British workers will find that their capitalist class will stop at nothing to prevent their economic and political expropriation by the working class.* They will endeavor to set up their own fascist régime before they will bow before such a consummation of the workers' struggle.

The British bourgeoisie will have recourse to any domestic or foreign measure to prevent an upsurge or overturn by the workers, and thereby a loss of the bourgeois power to exploit and oppress. Better less than none at all will be the British imperialist cry where vested interests and privileges are concerned.

A Labor Party Government or a Workers' Government

But suppose a Labor Party government were to take over in Great Britain. Could the workers then give full or critical support to the military struggle against Germany? That would depend on *its policy and program*. A government of Bevin would not encroach on British imperial rights; it would not make fundamental encroachments on the British bourgeoisie as a ruling class; it would not confiscate capitalist properties; it would not abolish or enormously restrict the political rights of the British ruling class; it would not institute immediate measures for the complete release of British colonies and possessions from political and economic subordination to England. Such a Labor Party government could only be regarded as the executive committee of the British bourgeoisie.

This is the whole history of labor partyism and social democracy through the years. The German social democracy in 1918-19 saved the German Republic for the German bourgeoisie. Ramsay MacDonald, of the British Labor Party, bolstered English capitalism in the post-war crisis of 1920-21 by forming a "Labor" government. Today, in England, Bevin himself

*After the First World War the British ruling class regarded the Triple Alliance of the powerful British labor unions as a greater menace to its existence and privileges than the European Triple Alliance, because the former represented a real threat to its complete existence as a social class.

virtually admits that he acts only as the labor lieutenant of the British bourgeoisie. Defending himself against labor critics in Parliament on May 21, Bevin said:

I don't care whether I lose my seat in the government or my seat in the House. I came into the government to help win the war. When that is done, let others go on to build the peace if they want.

In times of social crisis, the trade union bureaucrats (e.g., Hillman and Bevin) perform the task of dissipating the discontent of the working masses for the bourgeoisie. When the job is done they are ready to step aside, or are put aside by the bourgeoisie, as no longer needed. Without a revolutionary socialist program for workers' power and workers' construction of a socialist society, these labor lieutenants have no alternative but to hand back the government to the bourgeoisie when the job of suppressing and allaying the militancy of the workers has been accomplished.

The Socialist Appeal to the Masses

It is elementary that the British workers who are daily faced with the bombs of German fascism, give consideration to the military struggle. Their dead and wounded cry out aloud for vengeance against nazism. But their hope is not in support of a Churchill government or in a fake "Labor" government, but in a movement for a *workers' government having a clear socialist program*. Such a movement would aim to establish now—in the midst of the war—the replacement of the Churchill government by a *revolutionary socialist government*. Then, through the medium of a powerful socialist propaganda, a socialist government would appeal over the heads of the fascist Hitler government to the German masses—soldiers and working people—to overthrow Hitler and establish their own socialist government as the way to stop the war and achieve a lasting peace and a new, socialist order of society. That is the road for the British workers to take.

Many important and effective ways are open to a revolutionary government to reach the ears of the working people in other countries over the heads of the imperialist rulers, in time of war as in peace. The Bolsheviks in the early years of the October Revolution under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, demonstrated what could be done. Outstanding are the peace negotiations conducted between Soviet Russia and imperialist Germany at Brest-Litovsk. Trotsky, the head of the Russian delegation, insisted upon open negotiations and thus made known to the entire world throughout the parley the nefarious demands of imperial Germany on workers' Russia.

Various other means, adopted by Lenin and Trotsky, could be employed by a British workers' government to reach the German working class at home and in the trenches. British military units would be ordered to fraternize with and to conclude immediate temporary armistices with opposing military units. German war prisoners would be given a short but intensive course in socialism and then sent back to the German lines to educate and win the German soldiers to the cause of the British workers' government and to turn against their own rulers and oppressors. Planes would drop leaflets with socialist propaganda behind German lines, etc.

Equally, or *above all*, by its domestic program, a socialist policy on industry, the land, labor rights, political rights and so on, a workers' government would be the inspiration for the German workers' revolutionary insurgence against Hitlerism. Such appeals over the heads of the Hitler régime cannot be defeated or crushed by the Gestapo or by military ruthlessness, as so many liberals claim.

Contrast these measures of a revolutionary socialist government with the recent "appeals to revolt" of the democratic capitalist (Roosevelt) and laborites (the British Bevin and the American Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers Union) to the German masses. These "appeals to revolt" are, first of all, implicit or explicit accusations directed against the masses of Germany and of the Nazi-occupied countries for "acquiescence in and support of" Nazi rule. They offer no socialist program for the revolt of the masses in the enemy countries against their rulers; and no proof that American or British democracy will be progressive (i.e., socialist and non-imperialist) either in relation to the workers at home or in relation to a conquered country. And finally, their sole "appeal" lies in their setting up as an example—democracy *à la* America or Britain.

Workers' Fatherland and International Labor Solidarity

A British workers' state can be a reality in the course of the war, depending on the swift unfoldment of events. Such a state, unlike the present régime or social order, would be worth defending with one's life. The conditions making entirely possible the formation of a British workers' or socialist government are not within the scope of this article, however.*

The historic example of Soviet Russia alone should give real hope and confidence that a British workers' government could prevail against all odds despite opposition from rival imperialisms—(German or American). An appeal by a genuine socialist government to the German soldiers and working people would not fall upon deaf ears—or history is meaningless, especially German revolutionary history.

International solidarity on scores of significant occasions has proved very real in material and political wealth and strength, and has not just been a slogan or a manifesto. The workers of the world—American, German, British, et al.—rallied in many decisive ways to the support of the Russian Revolution, especially during the days of Lenin and Trotsky, in the struggle to maintain the Russian Workers Republic against the military and economic onslaughts of the world's imperialist rulers. They would rally again, militantly, to the workers of any nation that took over power in their own name.

Let the Indian masses push ahead with their struggle for national independence and economic and social freedom, and it can be said unconditionally that the workers of the world will give real support, material and political, to the Indian cause. Let the *British or German masses* establish a revolutionary socialist government and the workers of the world will demonstrate their class solidarity.

From the depths of this devastating carnage of imperialist war will emerge the renewed and revitalized international solidarity of all the exploited, a resurgence and growth of the revolutionary movement and the sharp enhancement of the prospects for the establishment of world socialism. All the more reason, therefore, for the working class in every country—in the United States, Great Britain, etc.—to learn the lessons of the imperialist war. They must come to understand the origins of the Second World Imperialist War and the course and trend of the democratic imperialists in order to prepare themselves for their day on the morrow.

H. ALLEN.

*For a review of England's political crisis, see an article by Henry Judd in the June, 1942, issue of The New Internationalist.

Two Proletarian Soldiers

N. Riazanov

The shocking and apparently authentic news report of the death of N. Riazanov (known in the early years of the Russian socialist movement by his first pseudonym of "Bukvoyed") is reported in the June issue of *Unser Tsait*, the periodical of the foreign bureau of the Polish Bund in New York.

Riazanov's death occurred two years ago! It has become known abroad only now, reported by an old Soviet functionary traveling outside Russia, that the old soldier and scholar of Russian socialism died at the age of 70 in the northern wastes around Archangel, whence he had been banished some time earlier by Stalin.

He was born in Odessa in 1870, named David Borisovich Goldendach. At the age of 17, while still a student at the Odessa Gymnasium, he entered the revolutionary movement and helped organize the first workers' social-democratic circles. In Odessa, and later on in Kishinev, he became known as one of the ablest organizers and teachers of the movement. Hundreds who were to become the pioneers of socialism in Russia, both among workers and intellectuals, received their first solid training in Marxism from Riazanov.

In 1891, at the age of 21, he was arrested for his revolutionary activities and sentenced by the Czar's henchmen to four years' imprisonment. Most of that time he spent in the notorious "Kresty" prison in St. Petersburg. Like most of the comrades of his time who were incarcerated by the Czarist police, he spent his prison years fruitfully; he even liked to tell later that his years in "Kresty" were the happiest, or in any case the most peaceful, period of his life. Working on a systematic study plan, he absorbed a wide and profound scientific knowledge in prison—this was possible for many revolutionists under the tyranny of the Romanovs even if it isn't under the tyranny of their contemporary imitators in the Kremlin.

For five years after 1909 he lived abroad. In the early struggle in the Russian social democracy, he was not firmly in the camp of the revolutionary *Iskra* people—Lenin, Martov, Plekhanov—but occupied a "conciliatory" position between them and the so-called "Economists." He even founded a group—*Borba*, the Struggle—which aimed to bring these two irreconcilable tendencies together on the basis of a criticism of both. In vain.

The storms of 1905 brought him back to Russia, where he resumed his activity first in his native Odessa and then in St. Petersburg. The man who became renowned as the most eminent scholar of modern Marxism made a name for himself in the period of the Revolution of 1905 as an organizer and founder of the trade union movement of Russia. In this period, too, he was the conciliator rather than the firm party man, seeking to bring Menshevism and Bolshevism together and, because of the intransigence of the latter, leaning toward the former.

Abroad again, in Germany, with the setting in of the reaction, a new period began in his life. As early as 1901, he contrived to gain access to the archives of the German social democracy, the repository of the literary remains, correspondence, etc., of Marx and Engels, among others of their time.

His scholarly scrupulousness, his indefatigability, his almost savantism—so rare even then, to say nothing of our own time—earned him a commission and a subsidy from the German party authorities to go through the rich and dusty archives of Marx and Engels in order to make available to the socialist public the unpublished works of the two great teachers. He plunged into his work with a will, a thoroughness, an enthusiasm, which did not flag for a moment throughout the rest of a life which he thenceforward devoted exclusively, save for a few "interruptions," to the same task.

Riazanov's Theoretical Work

For the American movement in particular, so much deprived of vital works of Marx and Engels, the fruits of the work done by Riazanov are still to be tasted and appreciated. But the old pre-war bound volumes of Kautsky's *Neue Zeit* in Berlin and Adler's *Kampf* in Vienna are filled with Riazanov's discoveries of old and forgotten articles and manuscripts and letters, often brightened with the light of the scholar's commentaries and glossaries.

He literally bristled with esteem for Marx and Engels, and one might almost say that the defender Marx had in Engels after the former's death, they both had in Riazanov. Yellow with age, but undimmed in vigor, are the pages of polemics in the pre-war Marxian journals of Central Europe in which the bristling Riazanov fought out his defense of Marx from the gentle reproaches of comrades like Franz Mehring, scholars in their own right, who found that the old blows delivered against Ferdinand Lassalle and Mikhail Bakunin had not been justified. Yet Riazanov was not a mere Marxologist, an iconographer, a blind worshipper, and he proved that on more than one occasion.

As the war drew near, he saw his dream of a definitive edition of the works of Marx and Engels vanishing. He was not to resume work on it for years to come. Still in emigration, he adopted a position on war which closely approximated Trotsky's. Lenin was not sparing in his criticisms of "Bukvoyed's" inconsistencies, and the war writings of the great Bolshevik leader refer more than once, and not too complimentarily, to Riazanov. A reconciliation was to come, sooner than both expected, no doubt.

In February, 1917, the Czarist régime came to an end. With others, Riazanov returned to Russia and began again his work in the trade unions. Unlike 1905, this time he joined with the Bolsheviks and became a member of their party. A qualified agitator, he took part in the preparation of the October Revolution and became a commissar of the new Bolshevik government. But in the Bolshevik party, as well as outside of it, he leaned toward the right. In the early critical weeks he inclined strongly toward the group of Zinoviev and Kamenev. Along with them and other conservatives, he opposed Lenin and Trotsky with the slogan of an "all-inclusive socialist government," that is, a capitulation to the Mensheviks and the social-revolutionists. Along with a group of right-wingers, he even resigned from the Bolshevik government.

It was probably this series of errors, revealing a certain ineptitude in moments of political crisis, which prompted his virtual retirement from active party life, his decision to resume the work into which he had plunged in Berlin before

the war. With Lenin's ardent support, he founded the Communist Academy in Moscow and then the famous Marx-Engels Institute. With all the resources he needed placed at his disposal by the state, the Institute became one of the most impressive and unique establishments in the world. Begging, borrowing, acquiring by purchase or contribution, he and the staff he directed so ably soon brought from the four corners of the world almost everything ever written by Marx and Engels, everything published by them in any language, everything written about them, everything written by those to whom they referred in their writings, along with all possible periodicals of the labor and revolutionary movements of their time. The Institute was a gold mine for students of Marxism, and of the revolutionary movement in particular.

Bureaucracy Takes Revenge

He sternly, and no doubt sorrowfully, refrained from participating in the factional struggle that broke out in the Russian Communist Party in 1924 between Trotsky and his comrades, on the one side, and the growing bureaucracy, on the other. Because he did not understand who stood on the side of Marxism and its revolutionary, internationalist tradition? That is inconceivable; it is even known that this was not the case. Like so many others—the Hungarian, Eugen Varga, was an example—he knew only too well how preposterous was all this nonsense about “socialism in one country.” But he held his counsel and his tongue. Perhaps he feared the consequences to his beloved Institute if he took the position which his conscience and all his socialist training would dictate, for surely he could not have had any illusions about the revenge the bureaucracy would immediately take against him and his heart's child if he spoke up. He arrived at a compromise with himself, from all we know, and apparently with the bureaucracy. He did not speak up for the Opposition; but he did not speak up for the reaction, either.

In his particular case, it was perhaps better so. Not that he was spared to the end. But in the few years that intervened between the opening of the fight and his final “liquidation,” he accomplished such a work as almost excuses anything else he might have done or failed to do. He wrote his excellent book on *Marx and Engels* and his equally splendid introduction to the *Communist Manifesto*. But more: he published in Russian and German the first two (there may have been more than two in Russian; I am not sure) volumes of the *Marx-Engels Archive*, now unfortunately out of print in any language. And still more: he finally brought out the first volumes of the work that was so long in preparing, the definitive edition of the works of Marx and Engels, again in Russian and German.

What impressive scholarship they revealed! What meticulous scrupulousness! Every detail, even the most trivial, so painstakingly checked, even to the point of the pedantic! Such delightful typographical care! And most important of all: the texts of Marx and Engels presented in their original form, not only German where they wrote in German, French or English where they wrote French or English, but all the words they wrote as they wrote them! How utterly unlike, therefore, the old pre-war editions of Marx published by the German social democracy, where Marx's more peppery phrases were either omitted or diluted for philistine consumption, his more blunt and savage and human language Bowdlerized, his more pointed revolutionism rounded off. In Riazanov's edition, the works of Marx and Engels were literally restored. What a pleasure and an education it is to the serious student who is

now able, for the first time, to enjoy the full juiciness of, for example, the four big unexpurgated volumes of the correspondence between our two masters!

During the Opposition Struggle

In 1931 it came to an end. The Stalinist bureaucracy is not to be appeased by silence. It demands adulation, assurances not only of docility but also of servility. That they evidently could not get from Riazanov. He was silent; and worse, he let Marx and Engels speak eloquently from out of the past against the murder of Marxism committed daily by the new rulers of Russia. But topping all his crimes was his noticeable failure to emulate that multitude of his contemporaries who blackened patient paper with solemnly written tracts arguing that of all scientists Stalin was the greatest, of all writers Stalin was the greatest, of all philosophers Stalin was the greatest, of all Marxists Stalin was the greatest. Such words were obviously too coarse to pass Riazanov's lips, and surely he could not get himself to insult so monstrously the memory and tradition of Marxism to which he was dedicated.

So the bureaucracy rid itself of him. In the 1931 frame-up against the Mensheviks, Riazanov's name was dragged in. It was all very obscure; all about “dealings” with Kautsky or Martov or God knows who else—which boiled down to anyone who knew anything about Riazanov, to negotiations he carried on with Kautsky or persons like him all over the world for the acquisition of this or that precious manuscript so that it too might be made available to the socialist world and, probably, to the fact that in his Institute he offered refuge to now non-political Menshevik scholars who would collaborate with a man with Riazanov's pure reputation but with nobody else. At bottom, Riazanov had to go because he did not lick the boots and sing paeans to the upstarts and ignoramuses who seized the power from the Russian proletariat.

The Institute was turned over to the type Stalin preferred, men like Adoratsky and worse. What else could happen than did happen? They killed the Institute and with it the greatest work undertaken by it, the Marx-Engels edition. A desultory, sloppy volume or two was produced after Riazanov, and then nothing—to this day. It was renamed “Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute,” but it might as well have been called “Factory for Proving the Genius of Our Boss.”

Riazanov disappeared. From time to time after 1931 rumors would reach us that he is “in the provinces,” in disgrace, allowed to go to a library and do a bit of reading and writing but of course not to have anything published. But there can be little doubt, especially from what is so well known about Russia, that his Czarist jailors in “Kresty” prison were liberals in comparison with the assassins of the revolution who kept him under lock and key at the age of 61. What they really did to him; how he died—these things we may never know. But we know this much already: responsible for the death of this noble soldier of the revolution, this luminous scholar who was everything that Stalin is not, is the despot who personifies the Russian régime today.

H. Sneevliet

In the middle of April of this year, the press in Europe announced that “Henricus Sneevliet, founder and chairman of an illegal political party in Holland, and seven collaborators have been sentenced to death and executed at The Hague on a charge of sabotage.”

The report definitely and tragically confirmed what had been rumored for some time since the Nazi occupation of Holland—that Henk Sneevliet and his comrades had remained at their posts of battle even after the German steamroller flattened out Holland, that he was intent upon continuing the work of organizing the working class to which his whole conscious life had been devoted.

Sneevliet was one of the few remaining personal links between the revolutionary present and the revolutionary past. If ever there was a miasmatic reformist atmosphere in which to grow up in the workers' movement, it was the atmosphere created by the opportunists who led and developed the Dutch social democracy. No wonder—whole strata of the Dutch working class were corrupted and bribed by their lords, who ruled an empire in the Far East of such lush richness that at this very moment they are willing to lay down every life at their disposal—their own excepted—for its reconquest. Sneevliet was, therefore, either very fortunate, or forged of different metal, or both, for he eschewed reformism long before the First World War and became, from the beginning of his activity in the Dutch labor movement, a comrade-in-arms of that valiant and militant band of revolutionists who rallied around the left-wing organ, *Tribune*—Anton Pannekoek, David Wijnkoop, Henriette Roland-Holst and others. Comrade of theirs, he was also a comrade and friend of the best Marxists in Europe of the time, of the imperishable Rosa Luxemburg in the first place.

A Fighter Against Imperialism

His radicalism was not of the contemplative type. Raised in a land that was rotten with imperialistic prejudice, especially toward the darker-skinned "inferiors" of the Indies from whom it extorted fabulous riches, he was nevertheless of that rare and durable revolutionary temper which led him to work at undermining the rule of his masters precisely at the most vulnerable and most forbidden spot—the Dutch East Indies themselves. How many men, even revolutionary men, of the world-ruling white race do we know who have gone deliberately to the dark villages and plantations of the colonial peoples for the purpose of mobilizing them against their "superiors"? Of the very, very few, Sneevliet was one, and one of the very best.

The white revolutionist—not a true Dutch Jonkheer, but at the very least still a "Mijnheer"—proceeded to the Dutch East Indies, to the burning islands of Sumatra and Java to organize the first important revolutionary socialist movement among the native slaves of his own country's overlords. The work, perilous, dramatic, painfully difficult, politically invaluable, spiritually satisfying (how I wish Sneevliet had committed to paper some of the stories of his work in the Indies which he once told me throughout a night and into the dawn, stories that rivalled anything in the literature of romance), exercised a powerful attraction upon him and he continued it for years after the Dutch colonial administration banished him from the Indies and forbade his ever returning to them. The Jonkheers were outraged at this blatant treachery by "one of their own" who stimulated and organized and taught the early class-conscious movement of the East Indian natives against the foreign invader and exploiter.

Toward the end of the war, or right afterward (I do not remember exactly at the moment), Sneevliet found himself in China, where he established contact with the revolutionary nationalist movement of the Chinese bourgeoisie, with the Sun Yat-Sen who was to become the idol of the Kuomintang,

and with Chen Tu-hsiu, leader of China's intellectual renaissance who was to become a founder and then the leader of the Chinese Communist Party. He was with the first Bolshevik emissaries to China and helped establish relations between that country and the young Soviet republic; he was with the first congress of Chinese Bolsheviks to launch the Communist Party.

At the Second Congress

We find him in Moscow in 1920, a delegate to the Second World Congress of the Communist International from the Communist Party of the East Indies, appearing under the pseudonym he then bore, "Ch. Maring." Together with Lenin, M. N. Roy and others, he functioned in the famous commission which drew up the fundamental theses of the International on the colonial and national questions; he was the commission's secretary and there is no doubt that much that is contained in those theses was based on the rich experiences he had accumulated in his work in the East, perhaps the only one in the entire commission who had such experiences, for even Roy at that time was little more than a communistically-varnished Indian nationalist without much experience beyond the German-subsidized propaganda for Indian independence he had carried on during the war from a Mexican retreat.

The policy of concentrating upon work in the reformist trade unions encountered stiff resistance in Holland from Sneevliet and his friends. They had under their leadership the NAS (National Labor Secretariat), a left-wing, semi-sindicalist trade union movement which existed, on a small scale, alongside the big unions controlled by the Stalinists. It is not hard to imagine the overbearing, bureaucratic tactics employed by Zinoviev, Lozovsky & Co. to "convince" the Dutch comrades of the proper tactics to employ. Others might have been more successful, above all in other circumstances. But the real circumstances were the noticeable beginnings of the degeneration of the International. Sneevliet rebelled against it. He broke with the Comintern and became an increasingly aggressive critic of Stalinism.

With his comrades, he formed the small but entirely proletarian and militant Revolutionary Socialist Party of Holland. As the struggle in the Communist International between Stalinism and Trotskyism came to a head, Sneevliet and his comrades moved closer to the latter. In 1932-33, and especially after the miserable collapse of Stalinism before Hitler, a union was consummated between Sneevliet and the RSP and the International Left Opposition. Together they proclaimed the need of organizing and launching the Fourth International. In this declaration the signature of Sneevliet and his party was of considerable importance and weight.

Sneevliet had just come out of prison in Holland. After the famous "mutiny" of the militant sailors on the Dutch cruiser *De Zeven Provinciën* in the Far East, Sneevliet, the fire of the memories of his work in that world blazing again, came boldly and intrasigently to the defense of the mutineers. Justice, as represented by the ministers of Her Most Gracious Democratic Majesty, Queen Wilhelmina, flung him into prison. A veritable storm of protest broke loose among the workers, not only among Sneevliet's tough longshoremen and building craftsmen, but even among social-democratic workmen. Even though the RSP was a very small organization, its candidate-in-prison, Henk Sneevliet, was elected to the Dutch Parliament by 48,000 votes!

Sneevliet remained in the Trotskyist movement for only a few years. I cannot say that he was flexible and easy to argue

with. On the contrary, he was somewhat prickly, stubborn and even a little imperious, that is, he had qualities which are such great virtues . . . when hitched to a good cause and a wise course. They were not always so hitched with him. In addition to a whole series of minor internal conflicts in the International, and in his own party, Sneevliet came into sharper struggle with the rest of the movement over the question of policy in Spain, particularly over the opportunistic policy of the POUM. The conflict led to a rupture which was never healed. Sneevliet drifted gradually away from the Trotskyist movement and toward the orbit of the British ILP. He was associated with it at the end.

Could he have fled Holland when the Nazis came in? There is no certain answer, but in all probability, with his connections among workers, he could have. But he didn't. Should he have fled? There was a Nazi price on his head, he was a marked man, he could not hope to hide out forever. In any case, again, he did not flee. I do not pretend to know what there was in him that prompted him to stay—his proud con-

tempt of those labor leaders who had been doing nothing in Europe for the past several years but fleeing from land to land, their funds carefully sent on ahead of them; his long, fierce hatred of fascism and an indomitable determination to keep fighting it out with the Nazis to the bitterest end; or the inability of the old soldier to quit even that post which the enemy has surrounded. Again, he stayed.

I am proud to remember my meetings with Sneevliet and his comrades at headquarters in Amsterdam's Paramaribostraat. They were a generation older than mine; sturdy and well-set like Sneevliet, or lean and long-boned like P., you saw in them a group of scarred, stiff-spined and unbreakable warriors. The dreadful picture of these obdurate revolutionary Hollanders before the Nazi firing squad is relieved only by our certainty that these sons of the proletariat stood there with such undramatic defiance that not even their executioners could fail to feel: This army we shall never conquer.

Never!

MAX SHACHTMAN.

On the National Question in Europe

Introductory Statement

In line with its long-standing policy of opening its pages to discussions of vital problems of revolutionary Marxism and world politics, The NEW INTERNATIONAL has for some time been publishing contributions by various authors on new aspects of the national problem, particularly in connection with the situation that has developed in a number of European countries that have fallen under the domination of German fascism. We have also published relevant material on the same question from contending theses presented to the membership of the French section of the Fourth International.

In the current issue we continue the discussion with a rebuttal article by F. W. Smith. In addition we are reprinting from *Labor Action* of October 20, 1941, the section of the political resolution adopted by the second national convention of the Workers Party, which summarizes the position of that organization on the national problem as it presents itself in Europe today. The course of development in Europe since this resolution was written a year ago has emphasized the validity and durability of the analysis and views contained in it.

As this resolution, as well as other contributions to the discussion, indicates, the perspective of the European and therefore of the world revolution is bound up inseparably with the development of the national and semi-national movements throughout Europe. Bound up with it in the very first place is the perspective for the restoration and reconstruction of the completely crushed and disoriented labor and revolutionary movements. To ignore the existence of these movements and of the objective conditions which have brought them into existence; to deny the enormous significance and the revolutionary potential of these popular movements by reference to a quotation from Lenin a quarter of a century ago on the national question in Europe being essentially a question of the past—this is not Marxian "orthodoxy," it is simple, unadorned idiocy.

A "Discussion" in the SWP

The problem is indeed too big and urgent to be ignored by the most hardened. It has therefore forced its way into the ranks of the Socialist Workers Party in spite of all official efforts to keep it out. For months the German section of the International sought to have its views on the national question in Europe published here by the Cannonites, an elementary right. To this day, it has sought in vain. What monstrous heresy is supposed to be represented by its views—except for some formulations that do not affect the fundamental question they are entirely Marxian, sound, realistic—is not known. Perhaps their points of agreement with the views of the Workers Party. Perhaps the fact that publication would promote discussion, which would be most disturbing to the smug equanimity of the theoretically sterile Cannonite leadership. Whatever may be the reason, the fact is that repeated representations of the German section have failed to this day to get their views before that section of the revolutionary public represented by the readers of the Cannonite press.

Nevertheless, what passes for a discussion in the SWP is taking place on the question. We say "what passes for a discussion" because it resembles much more what the Stalinists call an "enlightenment campaign." That is, the membership does not, and really cannot, discuss, for it is not given the necessary material upon which to base a discussion; it is merely "enlightened" as to what the party policy is. To make matters worse, the membership is led to believe that published articles, for example a recent one directed at the Workers Party by Wright, represents the "official party line," when, in reality, there are SWP leaders who disagree with Wright's fundamental argument but refuse to make their views known to the membership, much less to the public, exclusively out of considerations of bureaucratic prestige.

The Need for a Living Marxism

Meanwhile, of course, in accordance with the practice of the Cannonites, the radical working-class public remains totally unaware of these discussions, even pseudo-discussions, and the myth of the monolithic party is perpetuated.

Rejecting in its totality this method of "discussion" and this procedure in educating members as well as sympathizers of the revolutionary movement, The NEW INTERNATIONAL intends to continue with the publication of discussion material

on this most vital question of the day as well as on others like it. Bureaucratic suffocation of views and differences of opinion and discussion, bureaucratic pretenses at and pride in monolithism—these are not in the tradition of living Marxism. This rich tradition was embodied and continued in the twenty years of struggle against these bureaucratic abominations by the Bolshevik-Leninists, or Trotskyists. We will uphold the tradition in the future as in the past, not only against the Stalinists but even against their imitators-in-miniature.—Editor.

Against National Oppression

Resolution of the Workers Party

These conclusions are of great importance in appraising the international perspectives of the social revolution. The notion that wherever Hitler sets foot the very possibility of popular movements, much less revolutions, is automatically wiped out, has nothing in common with our thinking but is typical of the political mythology of the democratic intelligentsia and the turncoats from radicalism who turn to stone at the mere picture of a Panzer division. The fact is that nowhere has Hitlerism been able to establish a régime in the countries that it has conquered which has even the outward solidity of the régime in Germany. None of the Quisling or semi-Quisling governments set up by Germany enjoys the slightest mass popularity and even such "old" and "established" régimes as Mussolini's have had to be given military and police support at home by Hitler. In other words, all the indications available to us show that Germany has been and will continue to be unable to consolidate its victories in the conquered territories on even a remotely peaceful and "normal" basis, but rather keep maintaining a rigid, intolerably burdensome and exhaustive police régime wherever it raises its flag.

The growing restlessness and even guerrilla warfare in the occupied countries, particularly in Poland, Serbia, Norway and France, contain the promise of mass popular and even revolutionary movements in the visible future, and no matter how bloodily Hitlerism may seek to suppress them in their initial stages or in their first open attempts, it is out of these irrepressible movements that will arise the forces that will sound the death knell of the imperialist war-mongers and oppressors. Considering the circumstances in which these movements are arising and developing, it would be a fatal mistake on the part of the revolutionary internationalists to ignore them or fail to influence them. These movements are so deeply rooted in the conditions and thoughts of the masses, almost all of whom detest their foreign oppressor and some of whom are even shedding or have already shed the prevailing illusions about their pretended "liberators" in the camp of Anglo-American imperialism, that is, the "liberators" who continue to exploit and oppress the colonial peoples of the world as they have done for decades.

Bourgeois Control of National Movements

It is inevitable, particularly in light of the state of the labor movement today, that these elementary popular move-

ments of discontentment and rebellion should take petty bourgeois and patriotic forms in the first stages of their development. It is not surprising that the imperious exigencies of war should even impel Anglo-American imperialism to encourage and even initiate such movements (as by the "V" campaign); or that these movements should tend at the outset to come largely under the influence of imperialism.

But because of the very nature and the inherent possibilities of these heroic popular movements, this is only added reason why the Marxists in every country must not only pay the most detailed attention to their progress but seek, if possible, in the very midst of them, to influence them and direct them along proletarian and internationalist lines, to free them from the reactionary grip of the imperialists who seek to dominate them, and to link them with the labor and revolutionary movements in the countries where the latter are still able to operate more freely. Above all must we realize the rôle of Stalinism in attempting to lead these movements away from revolutionary struggle toward reaction.

For the Victory of the Third Camp

This task, which is inseparably connected with the victory of the Third Camp in the war—the victory of the workers, peasants and colonial peoples—cannot be accomplished by a disdainful or doctrinaire ignoring of these movements because of the primitive political state in which they are now to be found. Neither can it be accomplished by abandoning the independent class line of the revolutionary proletariat and uniting with the impotent and perfidious bourgeois democrats in exile who pretend to be the chosen representatives of the suffering peoples and who aim to keep the conspiratorial movements within imperialist, pro-war channels. Quite the contrary. It is only by keeping intact our independent class program and organization, the Workers Party and the Fourth International; it is only by relentlessly exposing and combating Stalinist treachery, the Beneses, de Gaulles, Sikorskys and their ilk that we can hope to influence these movements and help guide them to a struggle for true freedom and peace.

At the same time and especially with an eye toward the future, we must intensify our propaganda against the war aims of the democratic imperialists. They have already announced

(Roosevelt and Churchill in the "Charter of the Atlantic") that they intend to establish their "peace" by means of a European and world police régime, aimed not only at keeping their imperialist rivals under heel, but at suppressing the inevitable popular democratic and revolutionary movements

that are sure to arise with arms in hand at the end of the war, if not before it ends. The masses must thus prepare to resist, under their own flag, not only the super-Brest-Litovsk "peace" of Axis imperialism, but the super-Versailles "peace" of Allied imperialism.

What Is the National Question?

A Discussion Article

History never develops backward.—Zachary Jackson.

...if the *European* proletariat were to remain impotent for another twenty years; if the present war were to end in victories similar to those achieved by Napoleon, in the subjugation of a number of virile national states; if imperialism outside of Europe (primarily American and Japanese) were to remain in power for another twenty years without a transition to socialism, say, as a result of a Japanese-American war, then a great national war in Europe would be possible. This means that Europe would be thrown *back* for several decades. This is improbable. But it is *not* impossible, for to picture world history as advancing smoothly and steadily without sometimes taking gigantic strides backward is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong.—Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 203 f.

There is almost a temptation nowadays to apologize for putting a quotation from Lenin at the head of an article. Many persons do not like Lenin quotations. You can be sure that some preacher will come along to enlighten you that quotations decide nothing, that the reality changes, that conditions must be examined concretely, that Marx and Lenin were smart fellows for their day but their theories must now be scrutinized again and, if necessary, also revised.

All this is fine and proper. More than that, it is obvious. Anyone who thinks that it is enough to "refer to what Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky said," without concerning himself with the reality, is of course no Marxist; he is simply a fool. Marxism is not a society of quotation experts who give each other's references as authorities, but a revolutionary doctrine which must prove itself over and over again in the thunder and lightning of history, as Rosa Luxemburg once so nicely put it.

When, therefore, someone comes along and delivers tedious speeches that "the economic and social structure of the society never is the same," that "history never develops backward,"* and "we cannot repeat," "we have to examine the problem anew," then the answer is simple: go ahead. Do you want to revise Lenin? If you please. No objection. Do not stop at speeches on the changeability of the reality and the evanescence of theories. Show us what was wrong in Lenin's theory or what became wrong with the passage of time, bring forward facts that contradict the old conception and tell us what explanation and what policy you put in the place of the old. Revise, in the name of God, but revise *honestly*. That means, first, *read* Lenin before you revise him, and try to *understand* him. In spite of the fact that "the economic structure never is the same," there are certain little similarities between 1915 and 1942; for example, we still live in an epoch when the ruling classes of a few great powers, apart from the

toilers of their own nation, imperialistically oppress millions of members of other people in addition and that we have a World War for the imperialist partition and domination of the world. It is therefore not entirely useless to take the trouble of re-reading the polemics carried on by the shrewdest heads of the international labor movement in 1915-16, partly around the same arguments with which many people nowadays believe they have discovered America—pardon me, Europe—such as that there can no longer be any national movements in the epoch of imperialism, that the struggle for national liberation wants to turn back the wheel of history, and more of the same.

Why Is the Struggle Against Oppression Progressive?

In my article I not only put forward Lenin's standpoint on the national liberation movement in the epoch of imperialism, but I also explicitly put the question of whether developments since his time have confirmed or refuted Lenin's position. On the basis of a number of considerations, I came to the view that the struggle of the oppressed peoples can still play a revolutionary rôle and that it is objectively even easier to shift it into the stream of the socialist world revolution than it was in 1914-18. These considerations may be briefly summarized as follows:

The struggle against national oppression and for the self-determination of the peoples is a part of the struggle for the realization of complete democracy. The demands of democracy originally stood on the banners of the bourgeois revolution. Yet the bourgeoisie—because it is an exploiting class—was never in a position to realize complete democracy; it was able to carry out democratic measures only conditionally, limitedly, exceptionally. In the epoch of imperialism and of the decay of its class rule, it is compelled to liquidate even this incomplete democracy. The exploitive class of the bureaucrats, wherever it comes to power, cannot maintain itself except by a terroristic dictatorship either. Democracy, both in relations between men and between peoples, can be realized today only through the victory of socialism. On the other hand, without the most consistent fight for all democratic demands, without the all-sided introduction of democracy, socialism cannot triumph. This is not true because Lenin and Rosa wrote it so beautifully—the bitter experiences of the last twenty years and especially the degeneration of the Soviet state have more than graphically confirmed it.

Further: we still live in the epoch when the ruling classes of a few great powers doubly and bloodily enslave millions of members of oppressed peoples. This national oppression is at the same time social exploitation of the worst kind. The difference with 1914 is primarily that this oppression has become more universal, sharper, more brutal, that very advanced peoples suffer under it alongside of the backward peoples, and

*It should be plain to any child in what sense I (and the above-cited quotation from Lenin) used the term "backward development of history": that problems once solved may appear once more on the agenda of history. In our case it is the liberation of a number of European nations from national oppression. There are also other cases. No rational person will deny that the once already existent but later destroyed labor movement of Europe must be created anew. "History never develops backward" is just a phrase.

that in Europe too it takes on forms that we used to characterize as "colonial" (forced labor, mass expropriations and mass evictions from the land, banishment, special rights and special courts for the members of the ruling nation, ostracism of the "inferior races," punitive expeditions that raze whole villages). Against this exploitation and oppression, the masses of the subjugated peoples carry on a bloody struggle which assumes a multiplicity of forms, from passive resistance to civil war.

At the same time rival imperialist powers are engaged in a war for world dominion. Each of them seeks to exploit all the antagonisms in the camp of the adversary, and also to bring under its leadership the resistance of the nations oppressed by the adversary. Should that succeed, and should the war simply end with the victory of one of the coalitions, there will be no equal rights and no self-determination of nations, national liberation will be realized to an even lesser extent than in 1918, one national oppression will give way to the other. Only socialism can bring the emancipation of all peoples.

The masses exploited by imperialism link their social aim—even if unclearly—with the struggle for national liberation: freedom from slave labor, from disfranchisement, from exploitation in general; however backward they may be, the workers and peasants of the occupied territories are not fighting for the return to their former owners of the factories and landed estates expropriated by the enemy, but for a better social order—even if often unclearly conceived. This struggle is a just, progressive struggle, and every socialist must support it. The bourgeoisie and bureaucracy of the oppressed nations are fighting, on the other hand, for the restoration of their privileges to exploit their "own" people and, if possible, a little "sphere of influence" in addition. But as it begins to see the impossibility of a genuinely independent state existence of the small peoples, it transforms itself more and more into a mere agent of imperialism, by which it promises itself at least a share in the exploitation. By the continuing expropriation of the possessing and half-possessing strata in the occupied countries, by the proletarianization of ever broader masses, its social basis begins to disappear, in many cases (as in Poland) it consists of little more than a "foreign committee" in the form of the government in exile. On the other hand, between 1918 and 1942 the masses have been able to convince themselves graphically that the bourgeois, "Versailles" solution of the national question leads only to catastrophe. Thus, more than ever before, more than in 1918, socialists have the possibility—taken objectively—of switching the anti-imperialist struggle of the oppressed peoples on to the rails of the socialist revolution, provided...

Provided they do not regard this struggle, which is moving millions and is beginning to shake the structure of the imperialist world system, as a bourgeois affair at which you turn up your nose in theory, and leave to the agents of imperialism in practice.

Comparison of the Years 1848, 1914 and 1942

Zachary Jackson seeks to demonstrate that Lenin's policy in the national question in the years of the First World War, based upon the analysis of the imperialist epoch, is no longer correct. In order to demonstrate this, he cites examples—from the pre-imperialist epoch. It is hard to believe, but the author of the learned lecture on the necessity of concrete analysis blandly mixes up two epochs, that of the rise of capitalism, of the bourgeois national revolution, and that of imperialism, of the proletarian world revolution.

He describes fairly correctly the epoch of the bourgeois national wars, which falls approximately between 1789 and 1871. The task at that time was to create independent national states, to unify Germany, Italy, to free Hungary, Poland, in order thereby to clear the *field for capitalist development*, for the development of the classes, the proletariat included. That was progressive, the socialists should have supported the bourgeois development against feudalism in order thereby to gain an arena for the class struggle. National unification and liberation were still essentially an affair of the bourgeoisie—both in Italy and Hungary, which Jackson cites as examples.

But in 1914, it was already different, essentially different. By that time the national states had already become a hindrance instead of an arena for the development of the productive forces. The bourgeoisie was already incapable of carrying its bourgeois-democratic revolution to the end, even in backward countries like Russia. In 1914-18, it was no longer the bourgeois national revolutions that stood on the order of the day of society, but the proletarian revolution. It was not a national economy that had to be constituted, but a world economy. And the central slogan of the socialists could no longer be: unified Hungary, Italy, Germany, but the United Socialist States of Europe and the whole world.

Yet, *in spite of this*, Lenin saw in the struggle of the oppressed peoples for national liberation a just and progressive struggle. In spite of this, he called, in his impolite language, anyone who was indifferent to the struggle, a "traitor to socialism and internationalism." In spite of this he put forward the slogan of self-determination of the nations. Perhaps because he regarded the creation of countless national states as his aim? Naturally not. But rather because he saw in the struggle of the oppressed peoples a mighty lever for the overthrow of imperialism. Because he knew that the masses can be won for the socialist solution of the national question. And because he understood that these masses can be won over to a voluntary union in a socialist people's federation only if the proletariat shows them *by deeds* that it is fighting for their emancipation from the imperialist yoke.

Socialists are obliged to fight at all times against national oppression and exploitation, otherwise they are not socialists. But in 1848 they had to participate in the struggles for national freedom in order to overturn feudalism and to open the road for the further development of capitalism. In 1914, on the other hand, they had to participate in the movements for national liberation in order to prepare for the end of imperialism and capitalism. In 1848, feudalism was still the main enemy; in 1914, it was imperialism. Is this so hard to grasp?

After he has happily jumbled up the struggle against feudalism and against imperialism, Jackson declares that all types of national oppression are not feudal. We appreciate the enlightenment. Both in 1914 and in 1942, it was a question of the struggle against imperialism—that was our point of departure. And we cannot forego the observation that while "consulting a Marxian dictionary" really cannot replace the "analysis of a concrete situation," it does at least help to avoid the mixing up of elementary conceptions.

My opponents equate the struggle for liberation from national oppression with the struggle for the establishment of national states in the system of imperialism. This is exactly as false as to equate the struggle for "complete democracy" (in Lenin's sense of the word) with the struggle for bourgeois democracy. The national liberation of all peoples, just like complete democracy, can be realized only by socialism. Have my

opponents forgotten that in addition to the illusory bourgeois "national liberation," in quotation marks, there is still a genuine socialist liberation of the peoples? When the masses fight against national oppression, they are right. We must not stick our heads into the sand, but fight alongside of them and point out the socialist solution.*

Is There an Underestimation of the National Question?

The danger, seen by Smith, that a Marxist would refuse to concern himself with the struggle for the oppressed nations and treat it with disdainful contempt, seems to me not very great,

writes Jackson. Unfortunately, he is mistaken. Naturally, this danger is not so great among the class-conscious workers who are participating in the struggle in the oppressed countries of Europe. And perhaps among *them* the danger is greater than—especially under the influence of Stalinism—they will make too great concessions to nationalistic thinking. Had I been writing for *them*, I should have placed more emphasis upon *this* danger.

However, that there is really precious little understanding of the questions of the national liberation struggle in the groups that acknowledge Marxism has been shown by the experiences since the appearance of my first article. The German Cannonites, who are the only German group that shows at least an understanding of the question, could sing quite a song about this. But things aren't better elsewhere, either. What should you say when you have to listen in a society of comrades who acknowledge revolutionary socialism to the uncontradicted assertion that Hitler unfortunately does not wipe out radically enough the national differences, and introduces the German unity language too slowly? What should you say when you hear that the reason for the mass shootings in the occupied countries is not the national resistance but the fact that the Nazis are eliminating everybody who is superfluous in the process of production? How can you fail to start when you hear the bland assertion that there is actually no national movement in Europe because 90 per cent of the reports on it are faked by the British propaganda? And what should you think of the "argument" that there is no national movement in France because the French grow angry only when the Germans take their potatoes from them? As if there was ever a national oppression which was not at the same time economic exploitation.* When you have to listen to such a collection of nonsense, you cannot have the same calm faith of Jackson that there is no under-estimation of the national question.

Zachary Jackson is a serious and intelligent man; he does not present such childish arguments. But with him too there

*From this we see how pointless was Jackson's remark that, with me, participation in the struggle against national oppression is "a clever calculation or a clever exploitation of prevailing moods of the masses." This is precisely the conception against which I polemized in my first article. We are against national oppression not because it pleases the masses but because we are internationalists. "The center of gravity of the internationalist education of the workers in the oppressing countries must absolutely lie in the propagation of the right of separation of the oppressed countries," says Lenin. "Without this, there is no internationalism. We have the right and the duty of treating any social democrat of an oppressor nation who does not carry on this propaganda as an imperialist and a knave." Clear enough that for him it was a principled question and not a tactical maneuver.

*It falls into the same category when the writer on "Europe in Revolt" *Labor Action* of July 6 reports on the hunger riots in France and makes the witty observation: "This kind of demonstration does not fit very well into the pattern of those who would have us believe that 'underground Europe' is chiefly concerned with 'a united front of all classes' for the re-establishment of national states of the pre-war type." This is a classic example of an unserious polemic, because it is clear to a little child that hunger riots are not in contradiction at all with national resistance. In addition, the polemic is dishonest because it seeks, though the writer knows better, to create the impression that the supporters of participation in the struggle for national liberation are for the re-establishment of pre-war national states.

is unfortunately the tendency to argue out of existence the struggle against national oppression. Let us read attentively:

Of course, we are the implacable enemies of fascist oppression. . . .

Very fine!

. . . But because socialists are enemies of fascism, *special attitudes*. . . .

This isn't bad, either.

They are not only for the liberation of their own nation. . . .

Right, and everyone would now expect: "... but against the oppression of any nation," but instead national oppression vanishes completely and we get a general phrase:

. . . they are against any kind of fascism. Therefore [this "therefore" is priceless] they recognize that *Germany is not less oppressed than other nations*. (My emphasis—J. W. S.)

And thus is the trick performed—there is no national oppression! If it were true that Germany is no less oppressed than other nations, there would really be no national question in Europe and all our discussion would be unnecessary.

If someone were to assert that England is not less oppressed than India, Abyssinia is not less oppressed than Italy, he would be looked on with pity. On the ground of what "concrete analysis" did Jackson arrive at this contention for Germany? He has perhaps never heard that millions of foreign workers are forced to work cheaper than the Germans? Does he not know that there are different food rations for Germans and for members of oppressed peoples, and that the German population is better fed at the expense of the starving masses of the subjugated territories? Hasn't his "concrete analysis" yet discovered that in a number of occupied countries there are two laws, one for Germans and another for "natives," that a German can strike a Pole or a Czech with impunity but that a return blow may be punished by death as an insult to the German nation? Has it reached his ears that the social difference between those of the German race and many inferior races is so great that a German woman who sleeps with a Pole may be incarcerated for years?

If Jackson does not want to dispute these concrete, very concrete facts, then he cannot deny that the following words from Lenin still apply:

Is the *actual* condition of the workers in the oppressing nations the same as that of the workers in the oppressed nations from the standpoint of the national problem?

No, they are not the same.

1. *Economically*, the difference is that sections of the working class in the oppressing nations receive crumbs of the *super-profits* which the bourgeoisie of the oppressing nations obtains by the extra exploitation of the workers of the oppressed nations. Moreover, economic data show that a *larger* percentage of the workers of the oppressing nations become "foremen" than the workers of the oppressed nations, i.e., a *larger* percentage rise to the position of the *labor aristocracy*. This is a fact. *To a certain degree* the workers of the oppressing nation share with *their* bourgeoisie in the plunder of the workers (and the masses of the population) of the oppressed nations.

2. *Politically*, the difference is that the workers of the oppressing nations occupy a *privileged* position in many spheres of political life compared with the workers of the oppressed nations.

3. *Intellectually*, or spiritually, the difference is that the workers of the oppressing nations are taught, at school and in everyday life, to regard the workers of the oppressed nations with disdain and contempt. (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIX, p. 242.)

Zachary Jackson has forgotten not only Lenin but also the concrete facts. It is therefore no wonder that he reduces the struggle in the occupied countries exclusively to two elements: to the "war job" of the British agents and to the general struggle against totalitarian slavery. The struggle against national oppression has thus vanished completely from his concrete

analysis—and that is only logical: if there is no imperialist exploitation, no *heightened* oppression of the oppressed peoples, there is no longer any reason for it. There would then remain only this to ask, why there is actually everywhere in the occupied territories unrest, passive resistance, sabotage and many times even guerrilla warfare, and not in Germany, which is supposed to be “not less oppressed,” when the British agents are surely not less interested in unrest and explosions in the Ruhr region than they are, for example, in Norway. And you might come to the stupid conclusion that the German workers are “by nature” more obedient than the toilers of other countries, in view of the fact that, suffering under no less oppression, they stir incomparably less....

Jackson is entirely right when he emphasizes that the socialists must take part in the struggle against national oppression with their own slogans and methods of struggle, and that it is their task to combat the imperialist influence within this struggle. I am in complete agreement when he says that they reject, for example, the slogan of “Down with the Boches,” and put in its place the slogan of fraternization with the German proletarians in uniform. I pointed out in my first article that they give the struggle against national oppression a different content and a different goal than those which the national bourgeoisie and the agents of imperialism seek to give it. Once the attitude of indifference and of underestimation of the national liberation struggle is overcome, we will speedily unite on all this.

But in order to put through all our fine slogans, we must first take part in the struggle. For he who stands on the side-

lines, will have nothing to say at the decisive moment on the future development and the masses will not take his good counsels very seriously—just like the counsels of him who philosophizes beautifully about socialism but stands on the sidelines in the conflict over the “lousy” wage increase of 10 cents an hour. And that is why the *first* question is still whether, when the masses, even if unclearly and full of prejudices, fight against imperialist oppression, we fight alongside of them or we seek a thousand learned evasions in order to remain passive. When things reach the point of an uprising against the occupying power in Norway, Poland or France, then neither the Norwegian, Polish or the French, not even the German, socialists will be spared the need of answering the question: on what side do you stand, most honorable one? Are you with the oppressor or with the oppressed? Or do you think that this struggle is no concern of yours, do you feel yourself above it all because the oppressed masses are full of prejudices?

Permit me to give the floor again to Lenin:

To imagine that social revolution is *conceivable* without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without the revolutionary outbursts of a section of the petty bourgeoisie *with all its prejudices*, without the movement of non-class conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords, the church, the monarchy, the foreign nations, etc.—to imagine this means *repudiating social revolution*....

Whoever expects a “pure” social revolution will *never* live to see it. Such a person pays lip service to revolution without understanding what revolution is. (*Works*, Vol. XIX (p. 301.)

J. W. SMITH.

World War I in Retrospect-II

The Period of “National Unity”

[In the first section of this article, published in the June number of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, we described the French labor movement in the period preceding World War I. The apparent strength of the labor movement and the mass opposition to the impending war were contrasted with the impotence of the French CGT and the Socialist Parties of the Second International. In this second section of the article, the false theories of the trade union and socialist leadership are proved by their utter helplessness and betrayal in the face of the catastrophic events of the imperialist slaughter.]

Then came the assassination and the Austro-Serbian break. *The juggernaut was beginning to roll*. Again Jean Jaurès, hoping to prevent war, rushed to the French government to receive assurances of peace—which were duly proffered, as before.

An emergency session* of the International Socialist Bureau was quickly convened at Brussels which was attended by Morgari (Italy); Hardie (England); Roubanovitch (Bulgaria); Vandervelde (Belgium); Troelstra (Holland); Haase and Rosa Luxembourg (Germany) as well as Jaurès (France). Jaurès declares: “It is our duty to *insist that our government* speak with force to Russia so that she abstains.”

Therefore, Jaurès rushes back to the French government, only to find that he has been deceived; that the war is really on and that *the bourgeoisie intends to pursue its course to the end*. Jaurès still stoutly maintains that the socialists will con-

tinue to campaign against the war and its further extension. The French Under Secretary of State, knowing that the die is cast, insolently tells Jaurès: “You do not dare; you will be killed at the next street corner.”

Prophetic words. The next day, July 31, 1914, Jaurès is assassinated. *Thus ends a period*. Of the sincere Jaurès it has been said that he was killed by his enemies and betrayed by his own party. With his death and that of the great German revolutionary leader, Bebel, Trotsky has said: “*Their deaths marked the line where the progressive historical mission of the Second International ended*.”

Two days later, August 2, just two days before the fateful August 4, Mueller, the representative of the German Social-Democracy, arrives in Paris. But, as he advises the French comrades, *he is only on a visit for information!* He has no authority to help formulate decisions, actions or policies on behalf of the German Social-Democracy. All communications were cut. *Each Socialist Party, therefore, reserves the right of freedom of action*. From his subsequent report back to the Germans one receives the impression that the French socialists would proceed to vote the war credits in the French Chamber as demanded by the French government.

Events Move Rapidly

What has been the rôle of the French CGT during these eventful days? On Monday, July 27, the CGT calls for a demonstration in Paris, to take place on the following Thursday.

*This was to prove the last international link between the Second International socialists for the duration of the war.

But the masses are impatient to demonstrate their opposition to war. So, on that same Monday night, a demonstration of tens of thousands mills in the streets. Despite extreme violence and brutality on the part of the police, the demonstration goes on. It is not possible to stop or break it up. The syndicalist press comments on the "*mobilization of the police and government against the workers.*" Their press further asserts: "War is impossible because the people will not permit it."

But feeling continues to mount. Patriotic pressure and hysteria are on the increase. Innumerable street fights break out between the nationalists and the socialists.

Because the feeling is so high and rises steadily, the CGT's call for a demonstration is advanced one day, to Wednesday. *But the government proscribes the gathering. Police are given orders to oppose with all necessary brutality the holding of any meetings in the vicinity.* The neighboring transportation stations are all closed early in the evening. Arrests are made of anyone attempting to go to the meeting place. Nevertheless, many little meetings are held.

The CGT then issues a manifesto: "Down with War! War is no solution." But the manifesto also says that the French people will cooperate with the governments who work for peace; and further says that *Austria bears the guilt* for the break and the consequence of war.

The CGT manifesto further calls upon the proletarians of all lands to unite for peace, but it *puts the main emphasis on the democratic right to demonstrate in favor of peace.* Thus, when a policy of offensive action is required, the CGT, on the defensive, puts its main emphasis on its democratic rights or civil liberties.

While the CGT is calling and proposing to demonstrate for peace, the outstanding exponent of peace in France, Jean Jaurès, is assassinated. Yet even after the assassination, Leon Jouhaux, head of the CGT, says: "*The hour is grave, but not desperate.*" The cause of peace still has numerous partisans in the world."

Following this, the CGT and the Socialist Party decide to call a joint international demonstration against war on August 9.

However, developments are now too fast to permit of proposals for anti-war action a week off. Nationalist and governmental pressure for war becomes greatly accentuated. Nationalism, chauvinism and social-patriotism swiftly overcome the officialdom of the CGT and the French SP. *The capitulation to the "Union Sacrée," to national defense and national unity is rapid and complete.* "The fact of war, unbelievable as it is, must be admitted." The fighter against war, Jaurès, lies on his bier. The call is issued for a *peaceful demonstration* at Jaurès' funeral. Thus, the officialdom tries to cool the temper of the mass, who want a real struggle against the war itself.

Then: "It is not the German people we hate, but German militarism," declares Leon Jouhaux. "It is not the German people we hate, but German Nazism," (Green, Murray, Hillman, et al. in supporting the imperialist war of today). Official syndicalism, represented by the president of the Confédération Générale, Jouhaux, fades away in twenty-four hours. "He denied the state in peacetime, only to kneel before it in time of war," said Trotsky.

By August 14, Jouhaux is calling upon the French workers to profit by the blockading of Germany to build up French imports and exports; but still he says: "This is not a war of conquest; it is a war of defense and liberation."

Jouhaux "Explains" His Betrayal

Syndicalist Jouhaux follows in the footsteps of another betrayer of labor, ex-syndicalist and now war Premier, Briand.* Like the strike-breaker Briand, Jouhaux, too, offered his "explanations" for his betrayal of labor. These explanations in essence were:

1. If the German unions had followed the same action as the French syndicalists in trying to force the hand of the Kaiser, the war would not have occurred. Farthest from Jouhaux's mind was the necessity for the labor leaders and ranks to *put offensive pressure on their own government at home* to take serious measures to maintain peace.

2. Karl Legien, German secretary of the International Secretariat, had made no reply to Jouhaux's proposal for joint action at the Brussels meeting. In other words, thinks Jouhaux, a betrayal by Legien justifies a betrayal by Jouhaux.

3. The German social democrats had voted war credits.**

A Ministry of National Defense is set up in France. Jules Guesde† and M. Sembat, socialist leaders, enter the cabinet. This is only August 26, three weeks after Austria's attack on Serbia.

The repercussions elsewhere were swift. Emigrés from Russia, such as the outstanding Marxists, Plekhanoff, Axelrod and Deutsch, and the anarchist, Peter Kropotkin, turned social-patriotic at once, declaring support of the war and, of course, for Czar and Fatherland; as the German social-democrats were for the Kaiser and the Vaterland; the French socialists for France and the Bourse; the British Laborites for God Save the King and Country, not to mention The City and the British Empire.

But fourteen social-democrats, to their revolutionary honor, walked out of the Russian Duma and refused to vote support of the war. And in Serbia, the unwilling victim and incident for setting Europe on fire, a united Opposition stood out against the war.

In France, the CGT proceeds to print the same false news about Germany as the capitalist press: "Germany is famine-stricken"; "Germany is powerless militarily," and so on.

Indeed, the CGT press becomes even more docile than the capitalist press. Endeavoring to prove that national unity exists, it ignores the dissension within its own ranks. It fails to report Jouhaux's functioning in the Committee for National Aid, apparently realizing that large numbers of its ranks would not rejoice that their labor leader performs anti-labor deeds. The CGT press fails to publish Pierre Monatte's‡ letter of resignation.

Worse yet, from the standpoint of proletarian honor and dignity, the CGT press mutilates the letter of Rosa Luxemburg.

*Aristide Briand, syndicalist leader, aided the government and French bourgeoisie to break the strike of the railroad workers in 1910 by nationalizing the railroads and then declaring that it was "illegal" to strike against the government. Briand's progress in capitalist politics thereafter was rapid, culminating in the war premiership in October, 1915.

**The German social-democratic Reichstag fraction voted 78 to 14 in their fraction meeting for war credits to the Kaiser-Junker war, and in the Reichstag utilized the unit rule to have all the social democrats vote the credits. Haase, who turned out to be an independent social democrat, or centrist, had voted against war credits in the fraction meeting but was the spokesman for the majority social democrats in voting war credits in the Reichstag. Liebknecht, also an opponent of the war, voting against war credits in the fraction meeting, obeyed party discipline in the Reichstag for the last important time. Later he became a leader of the Spartacus or revolutionary socialist group.

†Jules Guesde, Marxist leader of the French SP, "who had exhausted himself in a long and trying struggle against the fetishes of democracy, proved to be capable only of laying down his untarnished moral authority on the altar of 'national defense.'" (L. Trotsky.)

‡Militant and revolutionary leader in the CGT. Comment on Monatte letter below.

bourg to the English socialists in which she analyzes the causes of the war and the failure of the international socialist movement to measure up to its duties and responsibilities in the war crisis. The CGT press printed only sections of her document, and then in such a way as to make it appear that all the blame for the collapse of the Second International lay on the German social-democracy.

S-D Cowers on Its Belly

It goes without saying that one should not minimize the shocking betrayal of the German social-democracy. Revolutionists, such as Leon Trotsky, had no illusions about and were far from idealizing German social-democracy. They did not expect revolutionary initiative and drive from the Second International leadership. Yet the capitulation of the German social-democracy hit hard. Trotsky states in *My Life* that he "*could not even admit the idea that the social-democracy would simply cower on its belly before a nationalist militarism.*" And the far-seeing and critical Lenin at first refused to believe the report of the Reichstag meeting of August 4 (in which the social-democrats voted for war credits) and suspected that the *Vorwärts* containing the report was a fake issue published by the German general staff.

The Austrian social-democracy likewise surrendered its principles without a struggle. Some of the leading circles, really nationalists with but the thinnest veneer of socialist culture and ideology, were actually pleased with the war. The Adlers, Victor, the elder, and Friedrich, the son, had greater realization of the effects of the war, although they were confused in their analysis. As a protest against the war, Friedrich Adler shot Count Stuerghk, the Austro-Hungarian Premier, an act of futility and despair, politically opportunistic and potentially dangerous. Marxists have long understood that individual terrorism is not only futile, but generally furnishes the excuse for an attack on labor in the name of law and order.

Illusions prevailed in socialist circles that the war would be a short one. They proceeded on the assumption that it was impossible for the bourgeoisie of the various countries to utilize their resources indefinitely, and in addition a long war increased the danger of social revolution to the bourgeoisie. Life has since taught us all that imperialist war and devastation can go on for years, with the primary destruction wreaked in agony, misery, hunger and death on the common people—until such time as the masses themselves consciously consider what to do about war or peace; and *find the solution in peace through the social, the proletarian revolution.*

Before proceeding to the beginning of disillusionment with the war within the ranks of the labor and socialist movements in Europe, comment is in place concerning the essential attitude of these movements toward war and the social order.

Illusions in German S-D Concepts of Power

The right wing of the socialist movement, it is clear, had early arrived at a reformist, parliamentary conception of the development of the working class and the objective of a socialist society. The German social-democracy is the best example of this. The substantial social and economic reforms achieved through parliamentary means only confirmed the greater part of the SD leadership in its long-accepted revisionist and evolutionary theory of social change through evolution. Their fundamental ideas unquestionably penetrated the mass of the

ranks of the social-democracy and the German labor movement. The essence of this outlook, as indicated before, was that the capitalist state would evolve peacefully into the socialist people's state. In time, this basic outlook of the social democracy on the development of the existing social order into the socialist society *grew into the illusion that their substantial and growing parliamentary strength would prove sufficient even to prevent German capitalism from venturing into actual imperialist war.* Equally false and reactionary in its consequences was the fact that the achievement of substantial reforms over a period of years caused the social-democratic leadership more and more to regard Germany as the first international foundation for a socialist order. From this developed finally the "defense of the Fatherland" and justification thereof for allegedly socialist reasons. The right wing never did accept the ideas and practice of revolutionary socialism, and thus their betrayal was perfectly consistent with their ideology. But the working class cannot be concerned with such abstract consistency. "By their deeds shall ye know them." History correctly pillories the German social-democracy as traitors to the working class at the time of the greatest crisis for the working class movement—that is, war.

The centrist view was best represented by Marxists such as Karl Kautsky, theoretician of the German SD and in fact accepted internationally as the inheritor of the ideological legacy of Marx and Engels. Kautsky gradually passed from an international revolutionary position on the nature of capitalism and the road to power by the working class to a centrist and in time even entirely revisionist theory on many important questions. Kautsky's authority carried enormous weight among all sections of the international socialist movement. Leaders looked to him for leadership.

As late as 1912,* only two years before the outbreak of the First World War, Kautsky approached very closely to the Bolshevik position on the decisive questions of the working class movement. But his position swiftly unfolded thereafter, from a centrist adaptation to the war to vitriolic opposition to revolutionary ideas and practice, as exemplified by the Bolshevik Revolution. He who had defended Marxism in his polemics with Eduard Bernstein became finally the driveling apologist for the rotten deeds of imperialism. He avowed that capitalism was decaying steadily. Therefore, the working class should develop staying power and, by peaceful political experience, would steadily develop its strength and powers. Capitalism would wear itself out in the process. Thus Kautsky's views only helped to inculcate a pacifist and passive outlook among the workers.

"National Socialism" Yesterday and Today

Of more than passing interest, *indeed of crucial significance TODAY*, is Trotsky's explanation of the conception of national socialism, or the theory of socialism in one country, which motivated and dominated the outlook of the German social-democracy and the French Socialist Party—the leading socialist movements on the continent. This theory could only lead in practice to adaptation, capitulation and betrayal (whether consciously or not is here unimportant) of the proletariat to the Mammon of imperialist war. Instead of the battle of Armageddon, the Second International delivered the European masses to Gethsemane.

Moreover, it is not digression but supplementation and necessary conclusion, to show by analogy the even more ter-

*See the brochure, "The Road to Power," by Karl Kautsky.

rible rôle which has been performed by Stalinism in peace and war during the past fifteen years in Russia, China, Germany and indeed internationally. Here it is not necessary to do more than to suggest to the reader a substitution of certain terms in order to draw the significant and decisive lessons that the working class and revolutionary movement must learn for today and for tomorrow's struggles: The suggested substitutions are placed in brackets in the text.* Here is to be seen by all who will look the living example today of confusing and betraying the working class, accentuated a thousandfold in the false theory and criminal practices of Stalinism.

"To approach the prospects of a social revolution within national boundaries is to fall victim to the same national narrowness which constitutes the substance of social patriotism. Vaillant to his dying day considered France [USSR] the promised land of social revolution; and it is precisely from this standpoint that he stood for national defense to the end. Lensch and Co. (some hypocritically and others sincerely) considered that Germany's [USSR] defeat means first of all the destruction of the social revolution. . . . In general it should not be forgotten that in social patriotism there is, alongside of the most vulgar reformism, a national revolutionary Messianism which deems that its own national state, whether because of its 'democratic' form and *revolutionary conquests* [October], is called upon to lead humanity toward socialism or toward 'democracy.' If the victorious revolution were really conceivable within the boundaries of a single more developed nation, this Messianism together with the program of national defense would have some relative historical justification. But as a matter of fact this is inconceivable. To fight for the preservation of a national basis of revolution by such methods as undermine the revolution itself, *which can begin on a national basis but which cannot be completed on that basis* under the present economic, military and political interdependence of the European states, was never before revealed so forcefully as during the present war.

"The patriotism of the German Social Democrats [Stalinists] began as a legitimate patriotism to their own party, the most powerful party of the Second International [Third Inter-

national]. On the basis of the highly developed German technology [collectivised economy] and the superior organizational qualities of the German people, the social democracy [Stalinists] prepared to build its "own" socialist society. If we leave aside the hardened bureaucrats, careerists or parliamentary sharpers, and political crooks in general, *the social patriotism of the rank and file social democrats (Stalinists) was derived precisely from the belief in building German socialism [Russian socialism]*. It is impossible to think that hundreds of rank and file social democrats (let alone the millions of rank and file workers) wanted to defend the Hohenzollerns or the bourgeoisie [Stalinist bureaucracy]. They wanted to protect German industry, the German railways and highways, German technology and culture, and especially the organizations of the German working class, as the 'necessary and sufficient' national prerequisites for socialism.

"A similar process also took place in France. Guesde, Vaillant and thousands of the best rank and file party members with them, and hundreds of thousands of ordinary workers, believed that precisely *France [Russia] with her revolutionary traditions* [October], her heroic proletariat, her highly cultured, flexible and talented people, was the promised land of socialism. Old Guesde and the Communard Vaillant, and with them hundreds of thousands of sincere workers did not fight to protect the bankers or the rentiers [Stalinist bureaucracy]. They sincerely believed that they were defending the soil and the creative power of the future socialist society. They proceeded entirely from the theory of socialism in one country, and in the name of this idea they sacrificed international solidarity, believing this sacrifice to be 'temporary.'"

H. ALLEN AND R. STONE.

[To Be Continued]

[In the third and final section of this article, we deal with the revival of the working class movement in Europe, after its betrayal by the social-patriots. The international labor movement begins to recover its militancy and solidarity slowly but surely as Lenin's call to struggle begins to be heard. The Russian Revolution approaches, demonstrating conclusively that the socialist solution is the only solution to the imperialist war.]

A Note on James T. Farrell

Those who read James T. Farrell's article, "Literature and Ideology," in the April issue of this magazine must have been impressed with the fact that Farrell is pretty much of a unique phenomenon on the American cultural scene: a creative artist of acknowledged talent and power who also possesses (and here is the rarity) the ability to seriously discuss the theoretical problems of literature and literary criticism in relation to the economic and political development of society, as well as that development itself. He is both the creative artist and the serious literary and political critic—that contemporary rarity genuinely deserving the title of intellectual.

The above is written not as a gratuitous compliment with which to amend a critical review, the conclusion of which will be that his book** is a failure. It is written rather because of the fact that a recognition of Farrell's unique stature is cen-

tral to an understanding of the reasons for the failure of this book.

Farrell's position as a novelist rests for the most part on the Lonigan trilogy. That, regardless of the merit of his subsequent volumes, is as it should be. For Studs Lonigan is such a genuinely revolutionary work of creative literature, so powerful in its synthesis of the naturalist and symbolist methods and their application to the American scene, that it has rightly dwarfed his subsequent writings.

The Literary Methods of Farrell

In Lonigan, Farrell writes by accumulating routine experiences and by piling up objective reportage, the power of which is greatly heightened by his remarkable facility for recording daily speech; he adds incident after incident—and then there is the flash of the symbol, the insight. All the while, the maximum objectivity is maintained, the author's personality or sympathies never intrude; and that is why he is able to evoke such sympathies for his characters.

This effective method, the above description of which is

*The Third International After Lenin, pp. 68 to 71. Emphasis ours.

**"\$1,000 a Week," by James T. Farrell. Vanguard Press, \$2.50.

both brief and rough, requires several extremely demanding creative powers: 1) the ability to hold the reader's interest through the long stretches of writing which the accumulation of his material demands; 2) complete objectivity in order to avoid the temptation of sentimentality, and in order to heighten the interest of his narrative and make more sharp and acute the flash of symbolic insight which illumines the lengthy stretches of the novel; and 3) extraordinary familiarity with the material and locale.

That Farrell does have the above in plenitude explains at least in part the success of *Lonigan*. But it is precisely in the difficulty of applying these powers to the short story form that we find a clue to the failure of the stories in *\$1,000 a Week*. It seems to me extremely doubtful if a successful short story can be written by the long range accumulative method which Farrell has so uniquely developed. And if it can be done, it is very rare. Certainly Farrell has not succeeded in this instance.

Farrell's method, while obviously most suitable for the lengthy novel, can also succeed perhaps when used for the writing of a sketch—written, I imagine, as if it were merely a section of a book. (Many of the stories appear to have been written with such an approach.) But a short story, in the sense of a complete exposition of an incident or a series of incidents involving a human relationship and a certain development of character, and resulting in an increase in the perspective sensibilities of the reader in the form of either an emotional or intellectual excitation—this appears to me a very difficult thing for Farrell to do with the method at his disposal.

How the Short Story Makes Out

This, I think, can be demonstrated by an examination of the stories in *\$1,000 a Week*. Many of them lack organic development, few of them have any compelling reason to begin and end where they do. They appear to be chunks of a larger work, if not in the sense of having so been planned, then in the sense that they have been created with such an approach. At times, it appears as if Farrell hardly realizes the need for a beginning and an end, for a complete, organic developmental line which dominates the story, for the creation of a whole product. It appears as if the distinction between a section of a novel and a short story is not clear in Farrell's mind, and if it is, he has failed to realize it in his work.

It is only in an occasional story that Farrell shows the ability to write within the framework of a brief, compressed story. The other pieces show the failure of attempting to transmit the leisurely method of accumulative detail to a literary form whose primary demand is economy and conciseness.

Some stories are chunks of a novel, incomplete and insufficient by themselves; others, such as *Sorel*, are really outlines for novels or very long stories; still others are sketches, minor in significance, partially because of the limitations of the sketch in general. Only one story stands out in the reviewer's mind as being genuinely successful, *Sport of Kings*.

Therein, I think, is the basic technical cause for the failure of these stories. But the two other creative attributes which were listed above are also often conspicuous by their absence. For instance, there is a noticeable and disturbing lack of objectivity in such stories as *Sorel* and *Getting Out the Vote for the Working Class*. The former is an attempt at ridicule and sarcasm without the sharpness and subtlety necessary for such an attempt; the latter story, one of the few instances in which Farrell runs away with his bitterness, is a vitriolic attack

against Stalinist intellectuals which often descends to the absurd and burlesque. It is precisely because of his abandonment of the method of objectivity in a story such as *Getting Out the Vote for the Working Class* and his inability to satisfactorily substitute another method, that Farrell cannot even obtain sympathy for his characters in this story. All that is left, then, is caricature, burlesque, diatribe.

What the Stories Lack

It is much the same with regard to material. Those stories in which Farrell departs from his usual type—the lower middle class—leave a feeling of dissatisfaction. To read Farrell on the expatriates in Paris and the rise of a French fascist leaves one with a feeling that he is borrowing material that is not native to him. To read him on the psychological tortures of a paralytic cripple returning to America from a frustrated life in Europe leaves one with the feeling that he is borrowing a method for which he is not, at least as yet, prepared. When he writes, however, of the life of the urban petty bourgeoisie—the domestic difficulties of a young couple (*King of Sports*) or the overwhelmingly ironic and pitiful joy ride of two couples attempting to escape their boredom (*Whoopie for the New Deal*)—he is far more successful. These stories sharpen the sensibilities of the reader and succeed in merging the specific experience with the general concept.

Thus far it might appear from this review that Farrell's difficulties are mainly technical—the problems of methodology. But a moment's though will show that also involved is a social and, to some degree, a political problem. That I am certain Farrell would agree to—even if he thought every other line in this review were nonsense. And it is here that I wish to return to my opening paragraph. For from the understanding that Farrell is both a creative artist and an acutely perceptive literary critic—as well as a serious student of politics—comes the conclusion that he is both conscious of and concerned with the problems of his own literary development.

Certainly, for instance, he must be aware of the problem involved in his inability to successfully move out of the milieu of his first work. Certainly he must be aware of the problem involved in his failure to write of the Roosevelt and pre-war periods. The petty bourgeoisie in the twenties and then in the depression—that is Farrell's essential milieu. No one has even approached him on that score, but certainly if he is to continue his growth as a creative artist he must attempt to find new fields of experience, new classes and class strata to dissect. His ability to grasp new materials and integrate them into his creative product has not, I think, kept pace with his stylistic and technical growth. There is no widening horizon of subject matter corresponding to his increasing technical refinement.

The War and the Writer

Farrell's work bears the marks of reminiscence—reminiscence of his earlier life, his experiences up until, let us say, his late twenties, and since then he has merely exploited this material to such an extent that it is running dry. The reader will gain the impression, I think, that Farrell requires a reinvigoration, a renewal of contact with new and important strata of our national life.

This, let it be admitted, is no easy task. Especially at present, when a writer of Farrell's integrity will face the need of clashing, more than ever, with the powers-that-be and their sycophantic apologists. As an instance, let me cite the fact

that thus far Farrell has not attempted to write about the war and its social effects. Certainly he is one of the few writers in this country who has either the competence or the elementary honesty and integrity to do so.

There are even more difficulties. Farrell is obviously not a wealthy writer. Quite the contrary. It is likely that one of the motives that impels him to write year after year so fecundly out of the same general source of experience must undoubtedly be the continued need to earn bread and butter. The leisure and time required to gain those new experiences and new contacts I have tried to indicate, would probably be very difficult for Farrell to acquire.

These, then, are some of the problems of the serious writer in the present period. Of course, if Farrell were a "Hollywood" Steinbeck... But, fortunately, he is not.

This book must be considered a failure. But the reader of this review should not be misled. The failures of a Farrell are far more important, more valuable and more interesting than the successes of other writers. If only because of his rugged integrity, he towers over the rest head and shoulders. I am certain that the readers of *The New International* will want to read his book and will find it a valuable experience. The adverse critical judgment—and the reason I have tried to indicate for that judgment—should not deflect any reader from the fact that Farrell remains a precious jewel of competence, seriousness, integrity and promise in an utterly corrupted and decadent literary world, and that anything he writes therefore merits attention and respect.

R. FANGSTON.

ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION Documents Relating to the History and Doctrine of Revolutionary Marxism

On the "Fallen Women" of Liberalism

The Reichstag elections of 1912 were viewed by the German liberal bourgeoisie as an important test of strength against the Kaiser and his landowner-militarist support. Though not able to control the executive branch of the government, the Reichstag had authority to legislate on questions of such first-rate importance to the bourgeoisie as the budget, taxes and tariffs. With the help of the Social Democracy, the bourgeois Liberals hoped to establish their control over the financial affairs of the Reich.

The leaders of the Social Democratic Party were only too willing to coöperate in such a "People's Front" against reaction. They entered into electoral agreements whereby they pledged mutual support wherever either of them was confronted by a reactionary candidate in the run-offs.

Rosa Luxemburg subjected this attempt to blur class lines to a revealing analysis. In the following article she sums up the lessons of the "People's Front" bloc.

For almost two years now, the life of the Social Democracy has been tuned for the Reichstag elections. That great event is now passed and we can make a survey of the general situation. Has an entirely new situation been created by the elections, which promises new political prospects and perhaps even demands a change in the tactics hitherto pursued by the party? One would almost believe this from a reading of the Liberal sheets. A triumphant jubilation and intoxicated joy runs through the Liberal press: the Black and Blue bloc* has been defeated, an oppositional majority of the Left has been created against the Junker-Clerical reaction in the Reichstag, and all this—a result of the presentation of a firm front of the liberal bourgeoisie against the Right! The mutual electoral support of the Liberals and the Social Democrats, so they put it, has brought about this sudden fundamental change in the political situation.

Germany's political heavens would really resound with the music of the liberal violins if only the alliance of the workers' party and the bourgeoisie in the Reichstag would ever become a lasting one. These melodies may not sound bad, particularly to the ears of that handful of peculiar enthusiasts in our own ranks who have for some time hoped for a decisive change in the German political scene as a result of

a "great bloc from Basserman** to Bebel," and have prophesied the happy resurrection of a liberalism now generally believed to be dead. The present resurrection, proclaimed with self-intoxication, is also, alas, nothing but a big humbug. This happy belief, which even impressed many a social democrat with its braggadocio, could only arise in the first intoxication of victory.

"Facts and figures, facts and figures!" as Mr. Bounderby in Dickens' *Hard Times* would put it. What does the legend of the manly virtues of liberalism look like in the light of figures and facts? In the general election the right wing of liberalism won only four seats while the left wing won none. With this, the situation of 1903 returned to normal again and the first established fact is this: liberalism, as an independent party standing on its own strength, no longer exists. The proud champion with whom Social-Democracy is to ride into battle arm in arm can continue to live only by the grace of either the Social-Democracy or of the reactionaries. Then came the run-off elections and now the real heroic deeds of liberalism began. Only in Bavaria and in the Reich provinces do the liberal voters generally follow the slogan, "the front against the Right" in the first two run-off elections. What, however, was their position throughout the rest of the country? In the first run-off election, the Peoples Party delivered sixteen districts to the reactionaries. The National Liberals did the same in two districts. In the second run-off, the Peoples Party handed over two districts to the anti-Semites. With the exception of Cologne and Heilbronn, the liberal voters divided in such a way that a small part voted for the Social-Democracy and the greater number went over to reaction and stabbed the Social-Democracy in the back. The fact that we still won such a large number of seats in the second run-off election was possible because we still had reserves to bring to the polls and particularly because we already had taken such a lead in the first elections as to prevent the liberal traitors from causing us a worse disaster. And exactly the same, yes, worse, occurred in the third run-off; in every district where we won, the "progressives," just like the National Liberals,

*Bloc of right wing parties, representing the monarchists, militarists, church hierarchy, etc.

**Leader of right wing bourgeois Liberals.

went over in their majorities to the camp of reaction. For example, of 11,000 Progressive votes in Potsdam-Osthavelland, 1,200 went to the Social-Democracy and 6,200 to the Reichs Party! Our victory would also have been impossible on this election day had not the general election given us such a strong preponderance. Only a very few districts did the liberal votes which we received counter-balance that given to the reactionaries.

The difference in the results of the last two run-off elections in comparison to the first is not due to the liberals taking, after many a stumble, to the difficult path of virtue and decisively marching forward. It explains itself as being due to a much simpler circumstance. The clever strategy of the government sent those districts in which the Social-Democracy was weakest to the firing line first, while on the last two election days the Social-Democracy stood in the lead as the strongest party from the outset. The legend of the great rescuing electoral help of the Liberals for Social-Democracy can therefore only be peddled by the Progressives, who have every reason in the world to bamboozle everybody, themselves included. Not thanks to the help of the Liberals, but despite their betrayals did we win so many seats. It was with our own strength that we won where the Progressives and National Liberals opposed us and it is generally due to our own strength where we won over reaction. Our own 4,250,000 voters, the Social-Democratic masses, carried our banners victoriously from the first attack to the last run-off against the opposition of the reactionaries and the treachery of the liberals.

It is well understood that it may be in the interests of the Liberal politicians to conceal these facts. Were the Social-Democracy, however, to support the Liberal legend it would be guilty of the gravest error of a political strategist—the underestimation of your own strength. The Social-Democracy has gained its greatest victory with its own strength, a strength created by the proletarian class struggle, more self-reliant than ever, and in opposition to all the bourgeois parties. And it would be an injustice to the enthusiastic masses of proletarians who streamed to us in the millions, were we to belittle this victory, their victory, by giving it an insane interpretation in the sense that the liberals do. It is true that on our part we apparently momentarily blurred the clear lines of the main struggle and helped to puff up the legend of a brotherhood in arms with the liberals and of their heroic deeds. This resulted in the first place, from a too active solicitation of Liberal support on the part of our central organ, then, during the whole run-off campaign, in which our leading bodies advanced in unison with the Liberals, a little too vociferously the slogan “against the Black and Blue bloc.”

Now, however, a cool examination of the facts shows that we fought and conquered, from beginning to end, with our own strength and that the help from the Liberals was, on the whole, an illusion. It reveals itself in the end to have been an entirely negative virtue in that every last Liberal vote was not cast for the reaction and against us. Granted that a victory would have been impossible in some of the closely fought districts if the Liberals would have gone over to reaction in their entirety. But is that a merit to be marked to their credit and made the basis of a reliable alliance when one examines the relationship of forces from party to party? The loose, undisciplined troop of Liberal voters, the majority of whom will go over to reaction every time, are no army with which reaction can be defeated. “Out of pap I cannot bake a sword,” sings Siegfried. And as the Liberals, the Progressives included,

despite the official election slogans of their parties, rendered throughout in their majorities, reinforcements to reaction, the latter, in turn, gave them powerful support. Regardless of what fables the bards of the newest heroic epic of liberalism may originate, the fact remains: The Conservatives and anti-Semites helped the Progressives to victory over us in a dozen districts and the National Liberals in another dozen. In still other districts their assistance was defeated by the overwhelming power of the Social-Democracy.

Thus has liberalism completely confirmed its inherent wretchedness and its homogeneity with reaction in this election as before. And so about the only real result of the glorious alliance of Liberalism and Social-Democracy that remains is by all means the undoubted fact that the masses of Social-Democratic voters saved for the Reichstag some dozen deputies of the Liberal brand who would otherwise have been swept away in the flood.

And it would be a wonder if all of this had turned out differently. Parliamentary checker-board moves and election strategy cannot alter historical facts, banish class interests, or bridge class contradictions. The development of Germany on the basis of monopoly capitalism which has progressed in recent years with great force and at a dizzying pace, and the imperialist epoch of world politics, which has recently been ushered in with a beating of drums, cannot be gotten rid of through parliamentary tricks. Its iron logic leads to an ever deeper division of bourgeois society, and its iron step stamps out mercilessly the remains of what calls itself bourgeois progress and bourgeois Liberalism. A resurrection of Liberalism in Germany for common action with the Social-Democracy against reaction—entirely excluded now in the era of growing capitalism can, therefore, only be the dream of a fool or a piece of outright fakery. These wooden nickels can only be passed off as *genuine* coins by those who are interested in confusing the class consciousness of the proletariat.

Liberal organs of the type of the *Berliner Tageblatt* and politicians like Herr Hausmann may perform joyous somersaults on the ruins of the Black and Blue bloc and triumphantly hoist the flag of the “United Left”—that Left which is to encompass in its majority the same National Liberal Party which the *Berliner Tageblatt* only yesterday, in an enlightened moment, called “a fallen woman.” The Social-Democracy cannot build its hopes and plans of battle on the “fallen women” of bourgeois Liberalism. On the contrary, it must say to itself with sober understanding: *The parties of the Black and Blue bloc are defeated, but the politics of the Black and Blue Bloc continue to rule.* The next military bill will show that the Social-Democracy is still the only foe of reaction, as before. Who, however, is for militarism and imperialism is also for the indirect taxes and tariffs that are as much a part of it as B follows A. The unanimous majority of the bourgeois parties on the military and colonial question will, at most, be shaken on the tariff and tax questions by a family quarrel over the larger and smaller fig-leaf of the inheritance tax that is supposed to hide the plunder of the toiling masses. The questions of militarism and imperialism are at the central axis of political life today. In them, and not in the question of a responsible ministry, lies the key to the political situation. And from this viewpoint, the result of the great electoral battle for us is the understanding that the political situation remains the same, it has only ripened. We cannot expect a decline of capitalism, but, rather, a mighty upswing, and with it, a growing sharpening of the class contradictions. And flowing from this, we have as the situation

in the Reichstag, not the opposition of the "Right" to the "Left," but, now as before, the old opposition of the bourgeois parties as a whole to the Social-Democracy. To bring this to the consciousness of the masses as sharply as possible, in opposition to the Liberal falsifiers of history, that is the first pressing task of our party.

A new and important factor and, in this sense, a new situation, has, to be sure, been created by the last election. This is the unexampled increase in the Social-Democracy as a result of the sharp class developments and as a bearer of the revolutionary class struggle. Such an increase of strength lays duties upon our party. Not to utilize the great increase in the number of our supporters to gain new conquests for the class-conscious proletariat, to further advance the cause of socialism, would make us unworthy of the victory.

ROSA LUXEMBURG.

(Translation by E. Lund.)

BOOKS IN REVIEW

A Liberal and the War

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR,
by Lewis L. Lorwin, Random House, New York. 510 pages.

The title of Dr. Lorwin's book is somewhat misleading. This volume is far more than an attempt to chart the probable economic consequences of the present war. It is rather an attempt to analyze the whole history and nature of Nazism and of democratic capitalism, and to sketch a program of action for the latter during and after the war.

Dr. Lorwin is well known as a writer of books on economic and social questions, and especially on the labor movement. His books of French Syndicalism, the Ladies Garment Workers Union and the American Federation of Labor have become more or less standard works in their field. All his works, and the present one is by no means an exception, are characterized by a meticulous collection of data, a scholarly, pedestrian style, and an unbending determination to offend as few people as possible. This last trait is not simply an expression of good manners, but is integrally connected with the whole nature of Dr. Lorwin's thought. He is, above all things, a moderate, a believer in partial programs, in the combining of all kinds of "trends," both social and ideological, into a pattern of social progress. He is a New Dealer of the old school—in short, the kind of man whose fighting symbol and emblem is the half loaf.

Economic Consequences of the Second World War is an important book for two reasons. Firstly, it contains as good a review of Nazi ideology and socio-economic practice as is now available. Part One, on "The Nazi Background," is a description not only of what the Nazis think and intend, but of what they have actually been doing in Germany. Part Three, "Consequences of a Nazi Victory," is an attempt to construct a picture of what the world would look like should the Nazis win a full victory, basing itself primarily on what they have actually been doing throughout their conquered territories. These parts of the book are well documented, and though there are some gaps, the exposition is, on the whole, as complete and instructive as any which has come to our attention.

When it comes to putting a label on the Nazi economy,

Lorwin rejects both the idea that it is a socialized economy and that it is simply an extension of classical monopoly capitalism. He believes that the term "National State-Directed Capitalism" is most descriptive of what is going on in Germany as "The essential feature of this system is that the state uses the institutions of private ownership to carry out politically determined policies of national expansion. It is the economic system of expanding imperialism under modern technological and economic conditions." Up till now, Lorwin believes, the conflicting elements inherent in such a system have been held in check by the fact that during its whole history Nazi economy has been an armament and then war economy.

LORWIN'S ANALYSIS OF CAPITALISM

The second reason for the importance of this book is that it attempts to analyze the background of capitalist democracy and to offer a program for the post-war world in the event of a victory by the United Nations. If Lorwin were merely presenting another ready-made scheme after the pattern of Clarence Streit's *Union Now* or the other tens of liberals and assorted crackpots whose Utopias have burst into print of late, he would not deserve the valuable space given to this review. But he is one of the best informed and equipped (both by experience and mental capacity) representatives which the most advanced section of the American bourgeoisie has at its disposal. If capitalist democracy is indeed able to solve the major problems confronting the world, it is men like Lorwin who should be able to tell us how. This is the problem which Lorwin has set himself, and his failure to solve it indicts not so much himself as the whole system of institutions and ideas which he represents.

In Part Two, "The Democratic Background," Lorwin shows the connection between political democracy and early *laissez faire* capitalism. He points to the increasing challenge to the whole liberal-democratic system of ideas represented by the economic shift to monopoly capitalism which took place in the latter part of the nineteenth century and which still prevails. He points out that democratic progress was possible as long as capitalism was expanding on a world scale—though the impression of progress portrayed is enhanced by confining the field of vision to the advanced, exploiting nations, and ignoring the vast exploited colonial areas. But then came the "Great Depression and the Crisis of Democracy." The depression shattered traditional confidence in the capitalist system in the minds of millions. In some countries this resulted in popular demand for government intervention in the economic process, *à la* New Deal; but in others it resulted in the rise of militant, expansionist fascism. To a great degree Lorwin ascribes the latter phenomenon to the inability of social democrats either to adjust their thinking to the introduction of widescale reforms in capitalism, or to really take the path of revolution. Their "do nothing and wait till the system collapses" policy gave the militant Nazis their chance, and they took it.

TENDENCIES AND REALITY

Now none of this is very new or very striking. Its importance lies in the fact that it shows that Lorwin really has a grasp of some of the main historical factors which have gone into the making of democratic capitalism—something very rare among men of his kind. But the conclusion drawn from it all is to see in the programs of the New Deal, the theories of Keynes and the "Stockholm School" the road to the future.

The "new tendencies" which Lorwin describes as characteristic of the present era are, summarized in his own words:

"...the industrialization of new countries, the demand for higher living standards and the growth of social protectionism, the decline of the business man and the rise of the managerial state, the increasing influence of management and labor in the national economy, the effort toward the fuller utilization of the world's resources and the extension of economic planning, the stimulation of national capital accumulation and the building up of new centers of economic power, the revolt against vested privilege at home and against corporate power exercised from abroad, the efforts toward greater economic security and more equitable division of national income..." (page 472).

Now the significant thing about this list of "tendencies" is that, along with some items which are, in fact, what has been going on, there are so many which are only "demands for," "efforts toward," and "revolts against." This list, if viewed in the light of the concrete historical realities rather than from the point of view of liberal wish-dreams, is really a remarkable compilation of some of the most crucial contradictions of the world capitalist system.

1) The industrialization of new countries as a result of the export of capital from the old capitalist lands, or of the "stimulation of national capital accumulation" achieved by means of ruthless internal exploitation, is one of the chief factors in the contraction of the world market for the older industrial nations. Under capitalism, this trend, instead of holding out hope for the industrial development of the backward areas and a concomitant rise in the standard of living of their populations, has led to the devastation of whole industrial areas in the older countries on the one hand (eg., British textile industry) and to the present Nazi "solution" of forcibly de-industrializing great areas.

2) True, there has been for a long time a "demand for higher living standards," but capitalism has been able to meet this demand only by doles and inadequate WPA's for the millions of unemployed except in those periods when it was "solving" the problem by exterminating them on its battlefields. "Social protectionism" is the parlor phrase for all those measures taken to reduce the prevailing misery to such proportions as will prevent violent social outbreaks.

3) As to the "effort toward the fuller utilization of the world's resources and the extension of economic planning" ... the only efforts along these lines of which we are aware are the brilliantly conceived and executed plans for plowing under wheat and cotton, limiting petroleum production by quota systems, dumping coffee and oranges into the sea, and international cartel agreements for the limitation of rubber and tin production, etc.

4) The "revolt against vested privilege at home and against corporate power exercised from abroad" are officially limited to Thurman Arnold's abortive attempts to do something about some of the more ruthless monopolies. Of course, both Hitler and Roosevelt have proclaimed that no millionaires are going to come out of this war, which makes this "trend" universal. Unfortunately for Dr. Lorwin, the capitalists don't seem to pay very close attention to these gentlemen's holiday speeches.

5) "The efforts toward greater economic security and more equitable division of national income." Yes, efforts there have been. When workingmen organize and make demands on their employers it is exactly for greater economic security and a more equitable division of national income for which they fight. But the whole trend of capitalism has been toward less security and toward a less equitable division of income. Surely Dr. Lorwin has not failed to read the National Resources

Planning Board report on the distribution of income in the United States?

ONCE AGAIN, LIBERAL SOLUTIONS

Finally, there is his mention of trends toward managerial government, increased influence of managers and labor, etc. In a certain sense these trends cannot be denied. But the real significance of these trends has not been to increase economic security and welfare for the masses, but to coordinate and centralize *capitalist* economic controls in the hands of the state. In fact, this is what Lorwin does not want to see in *all* the factors and trends described above. All of them express either the centripetal forces at work within capitalism, or, on the other hand, the growing realization among wide sections of the population of the inadequacies of the whole system. This realization, he hopes, is leading and will lead to a gradual, peaceful, piecemeal change in the system. That this hope fails to be borne out by the whole experience of the New Deal in this country as well as of similar programs abroad, that it is, in fact, extremely unhistorical in general, are considerations which Dr. Lorwin banishes from his mind by stating that the only alternative is revolution, and revolution, as a social process, is too expensive. If history would only develop according to the latest cost-accounting methods!

The post-war measures which Lorwin advocates are feasible only if the trends analyzed above are in fact what he says they are. He proposes the establishment of such agencies as an "International Relief and Social Assistance Commission," a "World Economic Development Organization," an "International Colonial Administration," a "Permanent Peace Conference," a "World Educational and Recreational Center," etc. All these mechanisms are to work toward greater international planning of the exploitation of national resources and for the general welfare. That none of these palliatives even touches any of the fundamental contradictions of the world capitalist system seems to be a fact which even Dr. Lorwin vaguely realizes.

On page 483 he states that:

"...the trend toward economic order could be harnessed in the service both of human welfare and of individual self-realization. The precondition is the willingness of individuals and of organized groups to subordinate their personal gain and power to public welfare, to replace conflict by discussion and agreement, and to accept the need for orderly change toward social-economic democracy."

Everything in Lorwin's scheme, then, depends neither on the reality of the "trends" which he sketches, nor on the effectiveness of the institutions which he proposes, but rather on the hope that after the war the world will be run by men of good will. For those who seek a solution to the world's problems along these lines we can recommend a much better book than that written by Dr. Lorwin. It is the New Testament.

LAWRENCE O'CONNOR.

Moscow Correspondent

MOSCOW WAR DIARY, by Alexander Werth.
Alfred A. Knopf, New York, N. Y., 1942.

Alexander Werth, for many years correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian*, went to Moscow as a reporter for Reuters Agency and was there from June to October, 1941. The first part of the book is in the form of a diary and deals with the months of July, August and September, the decisive period of the great German offensive and the relatively rapid advances of the German army. The second

part of the book gives a number of impressions of the front, naturally of that part of the front to which Werth was admitted. In conclusion, Werth develops his general point of view on the question of the war and the question of the future peace.

Werth is of Baltic German descent. His parents went to St. Petersburg from the Baltic region and there became fully Russianized. Werth does not mention this German origin, but since his name is German and his origin the Baltic region, one is fully justified in assuming his German descent. This is of interest only because Werth speaks of the Germans solely as Huns and develops a general "philosophy" on the hopelessly depraved character of the German people. He adheres to the expression Hun so persistently throughout the whole book that he even translates the Russian word "Njemtz" as Hun. This is a direct falsification, since "Njemtz" is the Russian word for German.

Werth's family belongs to the cadet wing of the Russian bourgeoisie. His father was a factory director in the Don Basin and in the Urals. The family went to England at the outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution. Werth reads and writes Russian and has maintained certain childhood memories of pre-Bolshevik Russia, even though these memories are vague and of a very limited character. This Russian origin and knowledge of the Russian language are in themselves great aids for an objective report. Most of the reporters who write on contemporary Russia do not understand a word of Russian. But Werth's book demonstrates that one can understand the Russian language without in any way being less blind in traveling through Russia than those who do not understand a word of the language.

SOME "OBJECTIVE" OBSERVATIONS

The diary attempts to give "objective" observations made during the first three months of the war on the character of the Russian people and Russian "heroism." It is surprising to note how Werth does not in any manner succeed in coming in contact with the Russian people or in achieving an insight into Russian life and thought. Werth's life in Moscow in those decisive three months are entirely empty and meaningless. He reports extensively on almost every meal he ate, on the drinks, on the weather, on the conversations with his chauffeur and with his cook. His greatest source of information was Losovsky's press conference, where the latter rebuffs questions with answers like "You are too curious, Mr. Werth," or "We cannot answer that yet." (Example: the question of the number of Poles interned in Russia.) During these months Werth visited the theater or the opera almost daily. He did this to kill time and to picture normal life in besieged Moscow. One reads many extensive reports and analyses of the theater and opera bills, and also the movies which Werth visited.

During his visit to the front, in the Vyasma sector, Werth, of course, saw the destruction wrought by the German advances. Here, too, his contact with the army limited itself to a number of empty conversations with officers. The reservation and taciturnity of Russians toward foreigners is so great and so systematic that Werth complains at length that Stalinism (he never uses the word but calls it the "new régime") has created a uniformity of expression which has completely strangled the old powerful and picturesque language of the people. Despite these extraordinarily limited impressions, Werth comes to absolutely positive conclusions in reference to Russia, the Russian people, the Russian régime, the Russian army and the Russian war potential, etc.

Werth estimates the military and economic possibilities of Russia very favorably. He is completely convinced that the Russian government, under the leadership of Stalin, without anything further, will succeed in decisively defeating the Germans and with only one prerequisite, not too difficult to fulfill, that Russia receive enough weapons and munitions from England and America.

He notes all manifestations of Russian nationalism very carefully and voices with outspoken emphasis his complete agreement. The war must be won by Russia, by Stalin's Russia, by the "new régime," which is far removed from every kind of "socialism" and where the danger of a return to socialist ideas is fortunately no longer present.

Werth belongs to that widely prevalent species of liberal "anti-fascist" intellectuals who were opposed to the Russian Revolution when it had a proletarian and socialist character and who were won for the contemporary Russian régime as a result of Stalin's counter-revolutionary politics.

THE AUTHOR'S ANALYSIS OF THE WAR

Werth carefully notes that one speaks of the "Second Fatherland" World War. But he is disturbed and dissatisfied when Voroshilov appeals to the workers of Leningrad for the defense of the city. "Why to the workers?" he asks, displeased, and not to all Russians. But he consoles himself, with justification, that it was probably only an accidental deviation in agitation. He is happy to find accusations against the Germans in the periodical, *The Godless*, on the grounds of their persecution of the Catholic and Protestant clergy. He makes careful comparisons between the 1931 edition of the Encyclopedia and the second purified edition of 1938, and reproachfully remarks that in the first edition *The History of Moscow* was essentially concerned with the history of the revolutionary events and only a half page given to the real history, i.e., the pre-revolutionary period. He reads and studies the "new *History of the USSR*," which in contrast to Pokrowsky's historical writings is obviously traditional, banal, and nationalistic. It respectfully appreciates the Czars, portrays the traitorous Dimitri as a Polish spy, etc.

Next to the Huns, Werth's greatest enemy is "Trotskyism." He underscores in various places the wise politics of Stalin in liquidating the Opposition. But Werth must have, somewhere are somehow, sensed the existence of oppositional currents or else a pious ejaculation like the following could not be explained:

"What would be fatal for the future peace of Europe would be any sort of return by Russia to international Trotskyism and any attempt to Trotskyize Germany. It would be a boomerang. In a few years Germany would go Nazi again and start another war. But I think the Russians are becoming increasingly aware of the real nature of the German problem."

From this and other instances one becomes aware that the currents of discontent with the Stalin régime even make their way into the glass house in which Mr. Werth lived. He does not, nor does he dare to, give a report on these tendencies. In order to report them he introduces as his medium an obscure personality, a Portuguese or South American journalist who appears as the personification of the fifth column and tells his disruptive anecdotes. Thus this anonymous Portuguese tells among other things that great sections in the army and in the population are dissatisfied with Stalin and that there exists "much disappointment because the Germans had managed to invade Russian territory at all."

A EUROPE WITHOUT AMERICA

Werth clings to the conviction of a Russian victory. He wants a Europe ruled by England and Russia. A Europe without Germany and with the exclusion of *America*. This anti-American, pro-European position is an interesting symptom of a definite and assuredly *significant* tendency in England. Werth clearly sums up his beliefs in his conclusion:

Russia, at the end of this war, will be a tired, devastated country. She will, more than ever, be concerned with rebuilding her towns and industries and creating real prosperity for the Russian people. It may take her twenty-five or thirty years before such prosperity is attained—prosperity greater than anything she has yet achieved. She will not be interested in world revolution; she hasn't been for years. But she will want security...

In the West, there can be another security block based on England and resurrected France and closely coöperating with the Eastern block. After a long period of mental convalescence, perhaps Germany also will become a possible member of the European community...and no one must be guided by the externals of Germany's régime—whatever régime she may adopt. The Nazi poison lies so deep in the German soul that no "fall of Hitler" can be taken at its face value. It might be nothing more than a subterfuge, engineered by the equally more criminal German army leaders, and with full Nazi approval. Even the sudden establishment of a "Soviet Germany" or a "Democratic Germany" would be no reason for abandoning caution. It might only be a shrine for a subsequent revival of Hitlerism and a trick for avoiding retribution. The German communists can no more be trusted than the Weimar Republic to clean the German soul of cruelty and militarist greed... *Giving up flying* is a small penalty which the German people must pay for the unparalleled catastrophe their criminal and adored leaders have brought on millions of fellow Europeans. With the rapprochement between Russia and Britain, Russia will, I am convinced, become *increasingly democratic and European*. In England we are steadily moving, in almost all directions, toward socialism in the wider sense of the word.

Mr. Morrison, Mr. Bevin, and Mr. Eden...have given us a foretaste of the post-war Britain.

As for America, it is too early to assess her part in this war. It depends on the extent to which the Roosevelt spirit spreads, and lasts. If, after the war, America coöperates with Europe in every way then the next hundreds years may become the golden age of civilization, of the human race...if not...*then Europe*—that is, the bloc comprising the Western and Eastern federations of independent states—*will have to carry on alone*. But with Britain and Russia as the pillars of this new Europe, it can be done.

Werth's book is a symptom of a crisis in the ranks of the English intellectuals. It is not a document on contemporary Russia, but rather a document of the prevalent confusing lie-propaganda which attempts to falsely portray Stalin as a liberal bourgeois nationalistic democrat and seeks to prepare with its anti-German line the future European counter-revolution. At the same time, however, it unconsciously reveals the internal weakness of the Stalin régime.

MARY CASTING.

Bourgeois New Worlds

POST-WAR WORLDS, by P. E. Corbett.
Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. 208 pp., \$2.00.

Marxian socialists were not and are not now alone in their endeavor to chart a new world free of nationalism. But they are alone in knowing what to do about it. The contradictions of capitalist society as a world profit economy resting on a system of national states is all too apparent even to the theoreticians of the bourgeois order. Special pleading on the cause of the war notwithstanding, they all realize that war, particularly total war, is an enormous degenerating influence upon society and humanity.

At the turn of the century, in the period of expanding

economy and the rise of imperialism as the main policy of the powerful and rich national states, many writers sought a justification for imperialism and war in the fact that this related phenomenon was unavoidable and necessary because it resulted in a higher development of society and a general improvement in the world standard of living. This, too, was special pleading, for such views were based on national interests and failed to take into account the fundamental basis for imperialist policy, the inevitable decline of world capitalism, and the fact that an improvement in the world standard of living was for only a section of society and that was based on exploitation of the national populations and the colonial peoples.

Since World War I, at least, the danger of a complete degeneration of capitalist society and its replacement by socialism, has become a source of discomfort to the bourgeoisie and its ideological defenders. The war of 1914-18 was a portent of the future. New weapons of destruction, the signing of a peace which guaranteed the outbreak of a new war, the narrowing bases of world capitalism, pointed the way to a new breakdown of the profit system.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS EXPERIMENT

The post-war period witnessed a feverish movement in all the warring countries to prevent a repetition of that devastating conflict by the creation of instruments for solving national conflicts and to provide the means for a peaceful solution of the "differences" between the countries (or alliances) of the world. What was really sought was a guarantee of the power of one group of capitalist states against another—the maintenance of the *status quo* in world relationships. As a result, we had the formation of the League of Nations and the World Court.

The years following the formation of these two bodies were not promising in the fulfillment of the aims of those who prevailed in the establishment of these utopian organizations. What stands out in the intervening years between the birth of the League of Nations and the outbreak of World War II is the sharp conflicts on the Continent and in the colonial areas between the powers which engaged in the First World War for "peace and democracy." War, in one form or another, has existed since 1918. These preliminary "skirmishes" merely foreshadowed the present holocaust.

This is the singular fact which disturbs men like Professor Corbett, who are ardent advocates of world bodies to outlaw war and "internationalize" bourgeois society.

In *Post-War Worlds* we have the classic bourgeois approach to this problem. Corbett's analysis of the First World War is unusual only in the fact that he does not, after twenty-five years, understand the fundamental cause of that war. Perhaps it is more correct to say that his understanding of the war is confused, for he declares that the root causes of the old conflict, and the new, are "political, economic, social and psychological in character" (page 3). What he understands by this is difficult to assay, since the ideas which follow this statement are devoted to the Axis program of the "master race" and their innate desire for "conquest." The conclusion drawn by the professor is that the present war "may therefore be accurately described as one between democracy and totalitarianism" (page 5).

IDEAS FOR WORLD REORGANIZATION

He is not really sure of this because he observes that on

the democratic side are such countries as Poland, Greece and the Soviet Union. "Nevertheless," he writes, "there is an element of truth in the description" (page 4). Having assured himself that his doubts on the character of the war are groundless, the professor warms up to his theme.

A good part of the book is devoted to the experiences of the League of Nations and its ultimate downfall. While the author readily admits that the League was doomed in advance, his theory is that this need not have happened. One of the main reasons attributed to its downfall was the failure of the United States to become a member of the body to enforce its influence (finance and arms) upon any country which sought to violate the covenants. Another, that France and England fell out over policy, the former seeking the enforcement of sharp measures against Germany, the latter aiming to reduce the strength of France on the Continent and maintain a balance of power in favor of England. From then on, the professor concedes, the conduct of the League was totally uninspiring.

Hardly a person would have disagreed. Almost from the very inception of the League new plans for world organization were announced. In the so-called "disarmament" period of post-war capitalism, "world plans for peace" were abundant. They flourished until the present war. But what is highly indicative of the utter futility of this war is that such plans have been pushed precisely in the midst of the present conflict when the warring governments avoid any discussion of specific war aims.

There are literally hundreds of books devoted to this problem of the establishment of permanent peace by international organizations under capitalism. Professor Corbett's book has this value: it discusses all the plans proffered by the ideological representatives of bourgeois life and thus presents a compendium of futility. For anyone interested in the burning problems of social reorganization, of socialism, this is a valuable handbook, summarizing the best thinking of the existing social order!

THE FEDERAL IDEA AND INTERNATIONALISM

In the opinion of the reviewer, the important chapter of the book is the one entitled "Ascendancy of the Federal Idea" (page 42). Here we find summarized the most important projects for bourgeois world reorganization. (At this point it is important to bear in mind that *federalism* is not *internationalization*; the plans fostered by bourgeois theorists are, in truth, opposed to true internationalism.) In their order, Corbett outlines the main ideas of Briand's plan for a United States of Europe; *Civitas Dei*, by Lionel Curtis; *Union Now*, by Clarence Striet; *New World Order*, by H. G. Wells; *A Federation for Western Europe*, by Ivor Jennings, and similar plans based on identical thought.

All the gentry mentioned, with the exception of H. G. Wells, think only in the terms of the continued existence of capitalism and their plans are based, not on a thoroughly internationalist concept, but on the national interests of whichever country they happen to represent. Thus the plans are regional or sectional, and their realization is based on the "power principle," the right of domination by one power or set of powers over the rest of the world. For the socialist point of view, Corbett turns to the muddle-headed thinking of utopia-crazed Wells.

These plans, as already indicated, are predicated on the idea that union must be initiated by the Western democracies, which should employ arms to enforce peace! Or, interna-

tional organization must begin on the European continent; or, it must be organized and led by the United States and Great Britain against the rest of the world!

Corbett proceeds to outline the concrete form of world organization through economic reorganization based on capitalist production, the formation of supranational police, supranational courts, supranational legislation and supranational administration. All of this is to be based on the maintenance of the fundamental structure of the system of national states and private capitalism, howsoever amended.

HOW THEY REGARD THE COLONIAL WORLD

The reactionary thinking of the sponsors of "post-war worlds" is nowhere so graphically revealed as in their common attitude toward the colonial world (page 177). Here again they prove the contentions of Marxian thought which charges that bourgeois society cannot act beyond its national and profit interests. The gentlemen referred to realize that the colonial problem is of the deepest significance, and by his devotion to the question, Professor Corbett reveals that, at least in so far as he is concerned, it is in many respects decisive.

And the solution? You can guess it immediately. It is not freedom and equality for the colonies. Quite the contrary, a new form of the exploitation is projected for the vast majority of the people of the earth. The new exploitation should be conducted in common by the "white world." Thus, Corbett writes: "To share out the colonies as a step preliminary to federation or reconstituted and reformed league would involve dislocations as disastrous as they would be absurd. The alternative appears to be their assignment to the federation or league for administration" (page 178). Who will determine the share of each country in the wealth and exploitation of the colonial world? Naturally, the strongest of adherents to the new world organizations!

The key to understanding these men is the fact that in the entire book there is no discussion of the *economic* problems of imperialist capitalism and the *class* problems of this social order. It is not really funny that Professor Corbett chooses the writings of H. G. Wells as representative of socialist thought—a man whom not even the milkiest of socialists regard as an authority. All that Corbett has to say about the socialist solution to the problems of modern society is: "A spontaneous world revolution aiming not only at the abolition of privilege, class, monopoly, but at the suppression of political boundaries and the fusion of all peoples into one society is as inconceivable as the immediate perfection of civilization in every corner of the globe" (page 193). And why not? Perhaps the reason why the professor leaves a discussion of the socialist answer to the very last two pages of his book is because it enables him to avoid answering the question.

Immediately following the above, we are treated with a genuine piece of bourgeois thinking: "Even if it be admitted that socialism is a condition of peace, it does not follow that it is the sole condition" (page 194). It is, for our money, especially after reading *Post-War Worlds*.

ALBERT GATES.

Opportunism Down Under

INTRODUCING AUSTRALIA, by C. Hartley Grattan.
The John Day Company, New York. vxi-331 pages.

C. Hartley Grattan is one of those journalists whose mentality is obsessed by such matters as "scholarly research," "constitutions and federalism," "states'

rights," etc. He is a legalist and a formalist in the worst sense of the word. Although he has one good book to his credit, dealing with America's entry into the last war, his other works are marked by a stodgy approach and superficiality.

His book on Australia is particularly bad in this respect. It is little more than a collection of abstract facts about this almost unknown territory. If one wishes to learn the low-down about Australia—its size and population, climate, its various industries, Australian slang, culture, etc.—then this book performs a very useful purpose. But if you are seeking something that lies a little deeper—say, for instance what is the basis for Australian labor reformism and opportunism, what is the social character of Australian economy, etc.—then it must be stated that such a book is not yet written.

For, on these matters, Grattan is a complete blank. In one sentence (to the effect that Australia is the country where a miner can become a cabinet minister) Zinoviev, in his essay, *The Social Roots of Opportunism*, had more to say than all of Grattan's 300-odd pages. There is no effort to explain the specific features of Australia: (1) The backwardness and distorted character of its economy, which is a pastoral one; (2) The ability of the Australian Labor Party to achieve a successful (until recently) reformist growth; (3) The effects of the supremely chauvinistic policy of racial exclusion and tariff protection; (4) The real reasons for the minute Australian population; (5) The relation between British capital and Australian industry; (6) The "seizure" of Australia by America, etc.

Above all, Grattan avoids any discussion on the "White Dominion" policy and the special backwardness of the Australian labor movement insofar as socialist and revolutionary ideology are concerned. But how can one even begin to understand Australia's present crisis without answering these questions? Of what use is it to know the bare "facts" when the Australian people are fighting for survival against Japanese invasion? Must one not know *the* fact that the Australian reformist Labor Party is politically bankrupt and that it is precisely the policy of its leadership in collaboration with the rulers which has prevented the economic and material growth of this vast continent and brought it to its present precarious position?

The best part of this book is, in our opinion, a bit of Australian verse which we take the liberty of quoting. A working class as tough as all that can yet learn Marxism and get rid of its capitalists!

"A REAL AUSTRA-BLOODY-LAISE"

By C. J. Dennis

Fellers of Australier,
Blokes an' coves an' coots,
Shift yer bloody caracases,
Move yer bloody boots.
Gird yer bloody loins up,
Get yer bloody gun,
An' watch the bugger run.

Fellers of Australier,
Cobbers, chaps an' mates,
Hear the bloody enemy
Kickin' at the gates!
Blow the bloody bugle,
Upper-cut and out the cow
To kingdom bloody come!"

HENRY JUDD.

And What Company

Simon & Schuster, Inc., New York. i-ix, 304 pp.
"THE COMPANY SHE KEEPS, by Mary McCarthy.

Hollywood motion pictures solemnly assure us in their introductory footnotes that "all the characters portrayed are fictitious. . . ." Usually this guarantee is pure redundancy, since they rarely bear any resemblance to reality, anyway.

The trouble with Mary McCarthy (who apparently identifies herself with the heroine of the book, Miss Sargent) is that she is the Eternal Sophomore, the Never-Grow-Up, the Universal Debunker. Miss Sargent, who prides herself in "not believing in anything" (including the peculiar brand of "Trotskyism" which she vehemently upholds at one period), reminds us of those young college sophomores discussing the problem of "*petitio principii*" (begging the question) in their elementary classes on formal logic. Like these students who cannot grasp the scientific ideas of hypotheses and projection and therefore insist that all science argues in a circle (begs the question), Miss Sargent believes that everything (including believing) is circulatory and must fall back upon itself. This, of course, results in an advanced form of neurotic cynicism—of which our author has more than her just share. An intellectual snob of an extreme type, Miss Sargent is a most unpleasant character to contemplate. Her fetish of sneering and jeering at *everything* extends even to the poor psychoanalyst who attempts to aid her. Her intellectually sadistic pleasure of foreseeing and shutting off every remark of every individual she ever associated with certainly did not make her company much of a delight!

One reviewer remarked on the method by which this "novel" unfolds. He compared it to the process by which an onion is peeled off, layer after layer, with each layer revealing a different facet of the heroine. The analogy is good, provided the reader realizes that (unlike with Gypsy Rose Lee) nothing remains or is revealed after all the layers are peeled off. Nothing, that is, except the nebulous Miss Sargent—half proud, half regretful of the fact that she never had a real experience—emotional, sexual or political—in her entire life. As the portrait of an American petty bourgeois intellectual Oblomov, *The Company She Keeps* is a success, if you care for this sort morbid, self-objective sort of writing. As a novel, it is misnamed, since it bears greater resemblance to an elaborate case history study by some clever, literary psychoanalyst.

The "political" aspects of the book—although containing a devastating portrait of "The Yale Intellectual"—are filled with an ignorance that become appalling. We do not mean so much the description of Shachtman as "a dark little lawyer," but rather the constantly implied insult that "Trotskyism" and Marxism have something to do with the absurd and neurotic creatures whose company Miss Sargent found interesting, at any rate, until she progressed to her next "layer in life" by marrying a wealthy professional.

This is an abuse of literary license and elementary honesty worthy of those frauds who pillory an opponent by distortion and caricature. Mary McCarthy knows nothing of politics and should recognize this. If she persists in utilizing her undoubted talents in creating artificial, unhealthy and synthetic literary products like this book, that is her affair. Hollywood, reported to be short on subject matter and script, may be interested. But literature and art are not consonant with caricature and debunking. The moment Mary McCarthy catches up with the realization that her energies are wasted

she will cease to write and will probably rationalize this bankruptcy by turning upon her own work.

H. J.

Karl Marx on India

The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindus themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether. At all events, we may safely expect to see, at a more or less remote period, the regeneration of that great and interesting country, whose gentle natives are, to use the expression of Prince Stalykov, even in the most inferior classes, "*plus fins et plus adroits que les Italiens*," whose submission even is counterbalanced by a certain calm nobility, who, notwithstanding their natural languor, have astonished the British officers by their bravery, whose country has been the source of our languages, our religions, and who represent the type of the ancient German in the *Jat* and the type of the ancient Greek in the Brahmin. I cannot part with the subject of India without some concluding remarks.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked. They are the defenders of property, but did any revolutionary party ever originate agrarian revolutions like those in Bengal, in Madras, and in Bombay? Did they not in India, to borrow an expression of that great robber, Lord Clive, himself, resort to atrocious extortion, when simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity? While they prate in Europe about the inviolable sanctity of the national debt, did they not confiscate in India the dividends of the rajahs, who had invested their private savings in the Company's own funds. While they combated the French Revolution under the pretext of defending "our holy religion," did they not at the same time forbid Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples of Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut? These are the men of "Property, Order, Family and Religion."

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe and containing 150 millions of acres, are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. That centralization of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power. The destructive influence of that centralization upon the markets of the world but reveal, in the most gigantic dimensions, the inherent organic laws of political economy now at work in every civilized town. The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand, the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the re-

sults of the bourgeois epoch, the markets of the world and the modern powers of production and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

FOR THE RECORD!

*The Bound Volume Bargain
of the Century!*

NOW AVAILABLE!

LABOR ACTION

(Covering 1940 and 1941—All Copies)

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

(Also Covering 1940 and 1941)

Both Together for \$4.00

(Including Mailing)

or \$2.50 for each Volume separately

Send Orders to: **LABOR ACTION**
114 West 14th St.
New York, N. Y.

Printed Index For

NEW INTERNATIONAL

VOLUMES VI AND VII



APRIL 1940—DECEMBER 1941

ARRANGED BY AUTHOR, COUNTRY AND SUBJECT



Price Ten Cents . . . Order Now!

Limited Supply