
October 1943

Fourth International

CLASS JUSTICE AT WORK

Appeals Court Decision in Minneapolis Trial

By The Editors

Post-War Preview *by John Adamson*

Soviet Life in Wartime *by John G. Wright*

An Apologist for Fascism *by Joseph Hansen*

“What to Do with Italy?” *A Review*

The Arsenal of Marxism

Letters on the Spanish Revolution

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Our contention that placing *Fourth International* on newsstands is one of the most effective methods of distribution is bolstered by the following letters from agents:

Local New York: "The F.I. sales in the last few months have been very gratifying. One newsstand on 42nd Street, near the N.Y. Public Library, sold 50 copies in one week . . . Our sales average for F.I.'s in the last year has gone up 50%."

St. Paul: "We're giving a newsstand on Wabasha the F.I. on a consignment basis and mailing out what he returns to us. Since he sold 5, we want to pass that 5 on to you. Will you increase our bundle order beginning with the September issue by 5? As he sells more later, we'll increase our bundle again."

Seattle: "We have rounded up 8 more newsstands for literature, so will you send us 30 additional copies of the September F.I.? This isn't a permanent increase, until we find out how their sales go."

* * *

Letters from our Seattle agent during the month show considerable other activity in addition to "rounding up 8 more newsstands":

"Trying to get some other ideas on subs and literature sales for both the F.I. and paper (*The Militant*), I finally decided to go through all the Manager's Columns of the back issues of F.I. for ideas gathered from other cities."

"Enclosed is a money order for \$15. Of this \$9 is for another set of the bound volumes of *New International* and *Fourth International*. The other \$6 is for subs. . . . We'll pay our bills at the middle and end of each month now; it's a wonderful feeling to finally get our debt brought up to date."

* * *

Letters from *Toledo* show that considerable work is being done by our agent there:

"Have received the September issue of the magazine and desire to have an additional 20 copies for contact work. Will you send these as soon as it is possible. Have read the magazine through and the articles are well worth reading, especially on 'The Italian Revolution' which should appeal strongly to some Italian people

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume IV October 1943 No. 10 (Whole No. 38)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: FELIX MORROW

	Page
Class Justice at Work.....	An Editorial 291
Soviet Life in Wartime.....	By John G. Wright 293
Post-War Preview.....	By John Adamson 297
A Shamefaced Apologist for Fascism	By Joseph Hansen 300
The Progress of Inflation.....	By William F. Warde 305
"What to Do with Italy" (A Review)	By John G. Wright 308
Spain: Monarchist and Republican	Maneuvers 311
From The Arsenal of Marxism:	
Letters on the Spanish Revolution	By Leon Trotsky 314



I want to get the magazine to. Could you send me 20 sub blanks. I want to send letters to prospective subscribers and include the blanks."

* * *

Letters received from the following countries show sincere appreciation:

Scotland: "I think that E. R. Frank's article on Lewis in the April F.I. is the best explanation of the role of the labor leaders that I have seen."

Australia: "I find your pub-

lications highly valuable and very useful."

Canada: "I am enclosing money for subs to *The Militant* and *Fourth International*, some copies of which I received recently. You may be sure they were appreciated. The healthy core in Britain of the Fourth International is most encouraging. The labor aristocracy in Britain is rotten, but there is strong ground on which the masses in Britain can hammer out a policy in defense of the

We still have in stock bound volumes of The **NEW INTERNATIONAL** and **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** for the following years:

1938	\$2.50
1939	2.50
1940-41	3.00

If you do not already have your bound volume, get it now.

Order from

Business Manager

Fourth International

116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

coming revolt in Germany. They are slow to move but once they start they will not let go."

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933 OF Fourth International published monthly at New York, N.Y., for October 1, 1943.

State of New York)
County of New York) ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Reba Aubrey, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the Fourth International and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Fourth International Publishing Assn., 116 University Place, New York City; Editor, Felix Morrow, 116 University Place, New York City; Managing Editors, James P. Cannon and Vincent R. Dunne, 116 University Place, N. Y. C.; Business Manager, Reba Aubrey, 116 University Place, New York City.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Fourth International Publishing Assn., 116 University Place, New York City; Felix Morrow, 116 University Place, New York City; James P. Cannon and Vincent R. Dunne, 116 University Place, New York City; Reba Aubrey, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

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

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

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is — (This information is required from daily publications only.)

REBA AUBREY,

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of September, 1943. IRVING SCHEER.
(Seal) My commission expires March 30, 1944.)

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME IV

OCTOBER 1943

NUMBER 10

Class Justice At Work

The Court of Appeals Decision in the Minneapolis Trial

By THE EDITORS

By upholding the convictions of the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis labor trial of 1941 the Eighth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals blasted another gaping hole in the pretensions that Washington is waging a "war for democracy." The central issue in the case concerned the right of free speech which is one of Roosevelt's "four freedoms."

Although this elementary right is unconditionally guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, the Circuit Court decided that under the Smith "Gag" Act the government was empowered to deprive leaders of a working class party and members of a trade union of their right of free expression and to jail them for exercising it.

The defendants were deprived of their democratic rights and sentenced to prison in the Federal Court at Minneapolis. What does the Circuit Court of Appeals say about this kangaroo proceeding? It declares that it was done in a correct legal manner. This decision, in defiance of the law, the Constitution, and of all principles and traditions of democracy, is the product of class prejudice and class justice. The judges gave unconditional endorsement to the prosecution, regardless of all evidence to the contrary. We are witnessing a repetition of the illegal procedures and frameups that President Wilson and his Attorney-General Palmer used against Debs, the I.W.W. and the revolutionists in the last war.

Class Roots of the Trial

The roots of the Minneapolis trial reach down into the war policy of the Roosevelt government. That government is bent on beating down all labor opposition to its course. Naturally, they singled out the most conscious representatives of the advance guard for the first attack. It was for this reason that the Trotskyists were indicted and brought to trial.

The Socialist Workers Party is pledged to an irreconcilable struggle for socialism. The indictment charged the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party with holding and propagating the view "that the Government of the United States is imperialistic, capitalistic and organized and constituted for the purpose of subjecting workers and laborers to various and sundry deprivations and for the purpose of denying to them an alleged right to own, control, and manage all property and industry in the United States," and that it was desirable and necessary that the workers and farmers bring about a revolutionary change in this system. This is the one point in the indictment that the defendants acknowledged as true.

As an integral part of its struggle for socialism, the Socialist Workers Party conducted, as it still conducts, an irreconcilable fight against Wall Street's war. Its members and sympathizers in the unions opposed, as they still oppose, the treacherous

policies of the trade union leadership which worked to shackle the unions to Roosevelt's war program. They foresaw that the submission of the labor movement to the Roosevelt regime would cripple the fighting powers of the workers, facilitate the employers' attacks upon their organizations and economic gains, and endanger union democracy and independence of action.

Continuation of Persecution

By its decision the Circuit Court of Appeals continues the assault launched by the political agents of Big Business and their servile agents in the trade union bureaucracy against the Trotskyist leaders and against the outstanding militants who led the powerful truckdrivers' movement in the Northwest under the inspiration and guidance of the Trotskyist program and party.

Both the Roosevelt administration, then preparing for war, and its labor flunkies were determined to smash and outlaw this political and union opposition. They seized the opportunity opened to them in the spring of 1941 when the leaders of Minneapolis Local 544 refused to obey Tobin's command to abandon their vigorous struggles to improve wages and working conditions and resisted his moves to set up a dictatorship over the local. After the local by majority vote transferred its affiliation from the AFL to the CIO, Tobin telegraphed to the White House for help.

"When I advised the President of Tobin's representations this morning," Roosevelt's secretary, Stephen Early, told the press, "he asked me to immediately have the Government departments and agencies interested in the matter notified." (*N. Y. Times*, June 14, 1941.) Raids upon Socialist Workers Party headquarters in the Twin Cities, arrests and indictments of the 29 members of the Socialist Workers Party and of Local 544-CIO, and their trial, followed.

The political motivation behind the prosecution was pointed out by the American Civil Liberties Union in its letter of protest to Attorney-General Biddle on Aug. 20, 1941: "It is reasonable to conclude that the government interjected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of the one side which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policy." Biddle himself confirmed that the Department of Justice had proceeded against the Socialist Workers Party because of its anti-war stand by stating that: "The principal basis for the prosecution is found in the Declaration of Principles adopted by the Socialist Workers Party in December 1938" and singling out the following sentence: "If in spite of the revolutionists and the militant workers, the U.S. Government enters a new war, the Socialist Workers Party will not under any circumstances support that war but will, on the contrary, fight against it." (*Minneapolis Tribune*, June 28, 1941.)

Although the defendants were charged with conspiracy, the real conspirators were all on the other side of the case. Tobin conspired against the 544-CIO leaders not only with the Minneapolis bosses, the Republican Governor Stassen and the Democratic President Roosevelt, but also with the FBI. Government testimony during the trial revealed that FBI men had been working for months with Tobin's agents in the local to incriminate and oust its elected leaders. Karl Skoglund, former 544 President and one of the 18 convicted, was approached and offered immunity from deportation if he would turn informer against the other 544 officials.

The Doctrine of Conspiracy

The doctrine of conspiracy has been used by the American ruling class as a legal weapon against the workers for over a century. It was first invoked against workers who tried to organize in order to better their conditions. During the second strike in the United States which took place at Philadelphia in 1806 boot and shoe makers were indicted for conspiracy for attempting to raise their wages. This was the first of many trials of this kind extending thereafter for over a period of 40 years until the workers through the most strenuous struggles had wrested the right to organize into trade unions. The criminal syndicalist laws which have led to the imprisonment of thousands of workers in the various states are based upon this same doctrine of conspiracy.

The charge that the Trotskyist movement is in any way a conspiracy is a brazen lie. Our movement founded upon Marxism employs democratic and popular means to reach and teach the masses. It advocates its views in the open and seeks the widest circulation for the party's revolutionary principles and program.

During the trial, both Albert Goldman, defense attorney and defendant, and James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, explained at length and in detail the true nature of Marxist political opposition to imperialist wars and the genuinely popular and democratic essence of the revolutionary working class struggle for socialism. The expositions of Trotskyist views in Cannon's testimony and Goldman's speeches have been republished in pamphlets which have circulated in tens of thousands of copies in this country and abroad.

These expositions served the double purpose of defending revolutionary Marxist ideas against capitalist caricature, perversion and frameups, and of using the trial as a medium for the propagation of our ideas and the promotion of our program among broader circles of the working class. By means of this prosecution the Roosevelt administration sought not only to deal a demonstrative blow against union militancy but to impose a ban upon all socialist literature. Well known works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky were presented as evidence against the defendants, including the 95-year-old classic, the "Communist Manifesto." The administration hoped also to illegalize or at least behead the Trotskyist movement.

Recognizing these aims, the defendants determined to fight them to the limit. The guiding lines of our party's policy in the struggle have been to defend our revolutionary principles together with our legal rights. These aspects of the case are discussed in the pamphlet: "Defense Policy In The Minneapolis Trial."

The firm stand of our comrades at the trial met with acclaim from the advanced workers everywhere. The publications emanating from the trial—the speech of Goldman and the trial

testimony of Cannon—have been the most popular pamphlets ever issued by our movement. Since the trial new members have been recruited into our party faster than ever before in the fifteen years' history of American Trotskyism. All this shows that the defendants turned the trial into a political offensive against the class enemy. In this they were true to the best traditions of international Marxism.

Congress declared war on December 8, 1941. On the same day the court sentenced the defendants to prison. How could the political significance of the trial be better symbolized?

The Minneapolis case was the first instance in which the Smith "Omnibus Gag" Law, passed in 1940, was invoked. For the first time since the infamous Alien & Sedition Acts of 1798 this statute made the mere advocacy of ideas a federal crime. "It is enough to make Thomas Jefferson turn over in his grave," said Representative Martin of Colorado during the debates in Congress. "It is without precedent in the history of labor legislation. It is an invention of intolerance contrary to every principle of democracy."

The Meaning of the Minneapolis Trial

The sponsor of this ultra-reactionary law was the same poll-tax Representative Howard W. Smith, who is the leader of the anti-labor bloc in Congress and co-author of the vicious Smith-Connally anti-strike law. Smith and the Big Business gang he represents regarded this law as an indispensable weapon in the campaign they were preparing to unleash against the labor movement. A *CIO News* editorial said at that time: "Labor knows that criminal syndicalism laws and the like have been repeatedly used against union organizers rather than for the purpose for which they were supposedly passed." For this reason both the CIO and AFL opposed the bill.

After the Democratic-Republican coalition passed the bill, the American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations pleaded with President Roosevelt to veto it on the ground that it "would become an instrument of oppression against unpopular minorities and organized labor." Roosevelt nevertheless signed it over these protests.

Now it can be seen that the Smith "Gag" law was the forerunner of the flood of anti-labor legislation which has since poured from Capitol Hill and the state legislatures. The struggle around its passage was a rehearsal for the struggle around the Smith-Connally Bill three years later. Roosevelt personally signed the first Smith Act. He publicly endorsed the essential features of the second Smith Act (Smith-Connally anti-strike law), withholding his signature only because of minor technicalities. He has not hesitated to use both of these acts against his political opponents and against incorruptible fighters for labor's rights.

It is no less clear that the prosecution of the Trotskyists was but the first in a series of similar judicial attacks upon the labor movement by the Roosevelt regime. The militant miners who were recently found guilty of violating the Smith-Connally Act by a Federal Court in Pennsylvania are victims of the same administration and employer-inspired campaign as the Minneapolis defendants.

Nor have the Minneapolis indictments been the last of the administration's attacks upon the Trotskyists. Roosevelt's Postmaster General has taken away the second-class mailing rights of "The Militant." Just as the Trotskyist movement was the first to be hit by the Smith Act, so its organ has been the first working class paper to suffer a reactionary attack upon the freedom of the press.

Events have demonstrated that the Trotskyists are first in the line of fire because they are the spearhead of militant resistance to the developing reaction. The strategy of the agents of Big Business, entrenched in Washington, is to pick off those who stand at the extreme left-wing of the labor movement. If these initial attempts prove successful, they can then proceed to move forward in frontal assault against the rest of the labor movement. Step by step they intend to rob the workers of all their democratic rights.

If the leaders of Local 544-CIO can be jailed under the Smith "Gag" Act, this law can and will be used against other union leaders. If the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party can be imprisoned because of their revolutionary ideas and criticism of administration policies, then the leaders of other political

groups, including prospective Labor Party leaders, can be similarly persecuted for the expression of critical opinions.

For these reasons the Minneapolis case is of the utmost concern to the entire labor movement. The legal battle against the Smith "Gag" Act and the convictions of the 18 will now be carried by the Civil Rights Defense Committee and the American Civil Liberties Union to the U.S. Supreme Court. The more vigorously organized labor speaks out against the railroading of the 18 and rallies to their defense, the greater grows the possibility that the Supreme Court will be compelled to declare the Smith Act unconstitutional and reverse the convictions. A victory in this important case could become a starting point for the reversal of the anti-labor offensive which now menaces the hard-won rights and gains of the American working class.

Soviet Life In Wartime

What the Moscow Press Reveals

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The colossal power unleashed by the Soviet masses in their 28 months of life-and-death struggle against German imperialism have found their most spectacular expression in the unprecedented military feats of the Red Army. Crucial as they are, the achievements on the military arena represent only one aspect of the total war effort.

Leon Trotsky pointed out that "the so-called military 'potential' depends primarily upon the economic strength of the state. . . . In times of peace, the measuring of the economic might between the two hostile social systems can be postponed—for a long time, although by no means forever—with the help of political devices, above all the monopoly of foreign trade. During a war the test is made directly upon the field of battle."

Because of Stalin's policies the economic strength of the Soviet Union has been submitted to this gravest test under the most adverse conditions. The first workers' state in history created in one of the most backward countries of Europe with only 15 years of planned economy behind it—and, moreover, with these three Five-Year Plans carried out under the degenerate, wasteful and rapacious Stalinist bureaucracy—was pitted in single combat against Germany, the most advanced capitalist country in Europe, backed by the entire resources of a conquered continent.

These are overwhelming odds. Stalin, who long ago betrayed Bolshevism, staked everything on his alliance with London and Washington. What aid has this actually brought to the embattled Soviet masses? The Kremlin promised the Soviet soldiers, workers and peasants that they would get vital military assistance—a "second front." More than two years have gone by, and despite the persistent pleas and whining of Stalin and his Browders, there has been no "second front." Whatever London and Washington may decide to do in this connection in the next period—in order to serve their own interests and policies—cannot alter the fact that even from a purely military standpoint, Stalin's foreign policy has brought the Soviet Union exactly zero.

But what about lend-lease? Let us hear what one of the most serious publications of the American bourgeoisie has to say on

this subject. Leland Stowe in an article in the October issue of the quarterly *Foreign Affairs* writes:

"The American lend-lease and British supplies did not reach Soviet Russia in sufficient proportions to become a major factor in the crucial defensive fighting along the Don, in the northern Caucasus and at Stalingrad during the summer and early autumn of 1942. This flow became really important only about the time that the Russians had already demonstrated their bulldog grip on Stalingrad."

Mr. Stowe is compelled to admit that the Red Army's military record represents an "exclusively Soviet achievement." In public the capitalist press of course loudly denies this. But among themselves these gentlemen prefer the truth.

Soviet industry and agriculture, that is, Soviet workers and peasants, have borne the full brunt of the struggle. Despite all the terrible handicaps, the Soviet Union, even under Stalin, has already demonstrated on the military arena the superiority of nationalized economy, over decaying capitalism just as it had previously demonstrated the superiority of socialist methods in times of peace by the unprecedented economic achievements under the three Five-Year Plans. Every thinking worker will ask himself: If the conquests of the socialist revolution can lead to such attainments in a backward country, then what heights can the workers of advanced countries in Europe and the United States reach?

Side by side with their remarkable record of achievement must be placed the terrible price that the Soviet masses have had to pay for the Stalinist leadership and policies. The official Moscow press is beginning to divulge the full impact of the war on the Soviet Union.

Civilian and military casualties number between 15 and 20 millions. Soviet economy is feeling the pinch of manpower despite its vast human reserves. Youth and women comprise the bulk of the industrial personnel.

Here is a typical editorial comment in *Pravda* that discloses the true picture:

"Our economy has proved capable of preparing in a short period of time labor cadres to replace those called to the front. Some 1,400,000 new workers from the trade schools and the

FZO (factory and shop schools) alone have streamed into industry and transport during the war period. In addition, women by the hundreds of thousands—the wives and sisters of front line fighters—have entered the factories.” (*Pravda*, July 8.)

The New Cadres in Industry

The FZO and the “trade schools” supply Soviet industry with girls and boys from ten to seventeen years of age, and even younger. It should be recalled that child labor was introduced by the Kremlin in October 1940, that is, eight months prior to Hitler’s invasion; and in this brief period almost a million youngsters were already integrated in industry. The number of children and adolescents now employed, according to Stalin’s own figures, must be in the neighborhood of three million.

The proportion of women in industry is a jealously guarded secret. But it is possible to arrive at an estimate.

Pravda constantly refers to new hundreds of thousands of women workers. Special drives are conducted to speed the influx of women into industry. The press regularly features the achievements of women workers. The International Women’s Day is one of the few traditional socialist holidays still celebrated with great pomp. During the celebrations this year, *Pravda* stated editorially:

“The women back of the lines have shown themselves to be self-sacrificing patriots. All the strength of our womanhood, their abilities, their knowledge, their experience and time are wholly at the disposal of their native state. The working woman and peasant woman accept the government’s assignments as an iron law. But they strive to raise the productivity of labor and to work more efficiently. They take upon themselves additional obligations.” (*Pravda*, March 6.)

Seven years ago, in 1936, there were almost 3,500,000 women in heavy industry, metal and machine plants, construction and mines; and another million in light industry. It may be assumed that there is at least double that number now.

The New Cadres in Agriculture

The dominant role of women and children is even more marked in agriculture.

Pravda flatly states:

“The youth has truly become the decisive force in the collective farm production. Youths and girls, adolescents are now working as tillers and tractor operators; they tend cattle, raise grain, vegetables and technical crops. An important section of the youth is in charge of special squads, brigades and cattle breeding farms.” (*Pravda*, January 20.)

One of the major activities of the bureaucracy this year has been to reconstitute the *Komsomol* (Russian Young Communist League) in the villages in order to give the necessary direction to agriculture. The *Komsomol* organization, reorganized so many times in the past, must be rebuilt from scratch. Here is a picture of its present condition:

“In the Rokhatinsk district of the Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic there are 52 primary *Komsomol* organizations, but more than half of them exist only on paper. Meetings of the *Komsomol* take place only sporadically. In 10 collective farm organizations there were no meetings at all last year. Many members of the *Komsomol* have lost all touch with the organization.” (*Pravda*, January 20.)

For the first time in years local and district-wide meetings activists of the *Komsomol* are being held. They are attended by prominent functionaries. Kalinin, the President of the Soviet Union, was assigned to speak at a meeting of the Moscow *Komsomol*. (*Pravda*, February 14.)

Benediktov, the People’s Commissar of Agriculture, made a tour of individual collective farms, addressing the meetings of the *Komsomol*. At one of these meetings in the Tambov region he said:

“The major part of the field work is being done today, in the time of war, by the young boy and girl collective farmers.” (*Pravda*, July 8.)

The report of the attendance at this meeting gives a cross-section of the forces now available in agriculture.

“To the meeting of the *Komsomol* of the ‘Svetly Put’ *kolkhoz* in the Tambov district there came the boys and girls of the entire village; there came *kolkhoz* women and the aged folk.” (*Idem.*)

The Tambov district is one of the rich farming areas, back of the front lines. It goes without saying that a model collective farm was selected for a meeting with such a high dignitary as the People’s Commissar of Agriculture. The local bureaucrats, it is no less obvious, must have done their utmost to get the largest possible attendance. Yet the only adults present were women and the aged. By and large, this attendance faithfully reproduces the war-time population of this particular village, and of the other villages throughout the country.

Conditions in Agriculture

Of all the sectors of Soviet economic life, agriculture has suffered the most and is under the gravest strain. Hundreds of thousands of square miles of the richest agricultural areas have been turned into wasteland. *Pravda* speaks of the reoccupied territories as “desert land.”

The functioning *kolkhozi* (collective farms) and the *sovkhhozi* (state farms) suffer from acute labor shortage, scarcity of machinery, replacement parts and fuel. The lack of horses has compelled the utilization of cows for field work and transportation.

To the needs of the civilian population and the army is now added the terrible plight of the population in the vast territory recaptured from the Germans. Since last winter the Red Army has recaptured an area four times as great as Germany. Tens of millions of civilians still remain in this “desert land.”

Among the emergency measures initially adopted by the Kremlin were voluntary donations of cattle, pigs, poultry, grain, etc., by collective farms in the rear to those in the devastated areas. For many months the Kremlin conducted a nation-wide campaign to spread this movement, ostensibly launched by the collectives themselves but actually initiated from the top.

This campaign touted by *Pravda* in June as embracing “millions of male and female collective farmers” proved a failure. The results were pitifully inadequate. The original plan of the Kremlin doubtless envisaged contributions of cattle, seed, etc., from the private possessions of the peasants. The press laid stress on personal “donations.” But the bulk of the actual stock obtained under administrative pressure came from the property of the collectives and state farms, and thus tended to weaken them still further.

Sharper measures were then applied. Amidst great fanfare the Kremlin suddenly announced on August 22 a “state plan for reconstruction of the Nazi-occupied areas as fast as they are liberated.” Every paper in Moscow featured it to the exclusion of all other news. The full text is not yet available, but the cables make the salient features of the plan quite clear. Restoration of agriculture is the burning problem. By October 15, “200,000 cattle, 350,000 sheep and goats, and 55,000 horses” will be supplied to the liberated areas in the north and the south. (*New York Times*, August 23.)

In the decree these herds are referred to as "evacuated cattle" which are being returned to their original collective farms. The assignment of quotas to various districts, however, clearly indicates that this is another administrative measure. The quotas cannot be fulfilled without levies on the private stocks of the peasants. And this may lead to dangerous consequences.

The individualistic tendencies within the collectives have been enormously speeded up by the war. The food scarcity and the currency inflation have resulted in a hot-house growth of "millionaire" peasants side by side with the "millionaire" *kolkhozi*. The huge sums donated and invested in loan drives by individual peasants in all parts of the country are eloquent proof of the resurgence of the "kulak" on the Soviet scene. A clash between the regime and these individualistic tendencies is unavoidable. Signs of it are already discernible.

The Kulak Danger

Editorial after editorial in *Pravda* warns against individual collective farmers who are "not averse to shirk," who "evade their obligations" to the collectives, etc. In other words, there are peasants who spend most of their time on their own private strips, who sell on the free market, and hoard grain.

Deliveries of grain to the state are permitted to lag, and often are not fulfilled. Benediktov, the People's Commissar of Agriculture, warned that the "fighting task" of the *Komsomol* is to create "militant brigades for the shipment of state grain deliveries." (*Pravda*, July 8.)

In a single district, chairmen of 111 collectives were removed; in another, 30. (*Pravda*, June 28.)

In the reports of plenary sessions of party district and county committees throughout the USSR, there is a constant harping on the failure of this or that region to fulfill its sowing program, or the harvest, or repairs of tractors and combines.

At the Plenum of the Ryazan County Committee, "the work of the leaders of party organizations in Novo Derevensk, Sapozhkovsk, Ukhlovsk, Pronsk, Trubechinsk and a number of other regions was severely criticized" for failures in the sowing program. At the Plenum of the Kirov County Committee, "the leaders of Molovsk, Urzhumsk, Sovetsk and Lebyazhsk regions" were criticized for similar failures. (*Pravda*, June 28.) In a period of a single week in June *Pravda* listed more than 50 badly lagging areas.

Pravda of course omits to mention that involved here is more than the customary inefficiency and failure of the leadership. The leaders of the various districts are none other than the "millionaire" *kolkhozniki*.

The most recent moves of the Kremlin—especially the attempt to lean on the youth and the administrative measures to solve the crisis in agriculture—are unmistakable signs of the sharpening of the class struggle in the village. They are grave signals of a growing internal danger.

Soviet Workers in Wartime

One great advantage over the past lies in the fact that the Soviet youth in the village has rallied *en masse* to the defense of the remaining conquests of the October revolution.

The Soviet workers, especially the youth, are performing miracles of industrial production. The Red Army is kept supplied with all the necessary technical equipment despite the grave losses of industrial plants and raw materials suffered in 1941 and 1942.

For the mass of the workers the food rations are at bare

subsistence levels. Housing conditions, very bad before the war, have not improved. Production of civilian goods is almost at a standstill. The little that is produced comes primarily from handicrafts.

Conditions are worst in places like Leningrad and other cities where the needs of the population can be supplied only from local sources. But the Stalinist bureaucracy is now boasting that in July the entire city of Leningrad was served by "346 sewing shops, shoe shops, locksmith and other enterprises" which play "a big role in supplying the inhabitants of Leningrad with mass consumption goods." (*Izvestiya*, July 2.)

The greatest "successes" have been attained in the production of children's wear. "In five months of this year there have been already produced (in Leningrad) 11,400 pairs of children's shoes, 10,800 overcoats, 7,900 dresses and more than 5,000 warm sweaters." It is impossible to purchase even second-hand articles of necessity. "All sales involve barter: for example, for three pairs of old shoes a new (repaired) pair is issued, and so on." (*Izvestiya*, July 2.) Although greatly reduced by the casualties during the siege, the population of Leningrad is now about a million and a half souls.

Such are the conditions under which the Soviet workers have maintained their morale. They are evincing more and more initiative. Their self-confidence has been greatly raised by their own unprecedented achievements and the successes of the Red Army. There are signs that they are exerting an increasing pressure on the bureaucracy. Reflecting this pressure, *Izvestiya* writes:

"Is it after all necessary to cite proof that the Soviet people, working in the rear, are consumed with a desire to give all their strength and all their knowledge in order to increase the aid to the front lines? They are concerned by the fate of their native enterprises, they constantly think and worry about them. To listen to their voices, to their opinions, and capably to utilize their fountains of initiative—that is the direct duty of every director in every enterprise." (*Izvestiya*, July 4.)

Not so very long ago, Stalin's press used to blame the workers for any drop in production. Now the blame is placed on the local bureaucrats.

Pravda Changes Its Tune

If the production of the Kalinin coal mine in the Molotovsk district has dropped from a peacetime level of 3,000 tons a day to 2,000 tons in 1941 and to 1,574 tons in June 1943, it is the leadership that is wholly to blame. (*Pravda*, June 28.) But why has this leadership been permitted to undermine production for the entire period of the war? On that score there is silence. The bureaucrats continue their arbitrary rule, immune from the control of the rank and file. The sole remedy remains the lash from the top.

The mines in the Kuzbas, the largest available source of supply, have been lagging badly in coke production, and have thereby disrupted the output of iron and steel.

"The Plenum of the (Kemerovo) County Committee of the party has found unsatisfactory the functioning of the trusts and combines of the Kuzbas in the first six months of the current year. The Plenum has underscored that the City Committees of Prokplev, Anzhero-Sudzhensk, Leninsk-Kuznetsk, Ossinikov, Stalinsk and Kisselev have failed to assure the elimination of those inadequacies which were pointed out in the motion of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. concerning the work of the party organizations in the Kuzbas." (*Pravda*, July 8.)

Moscow papers of late have resumed featuring articles against bureaucrats and bureaucratic practices. The same gentlemen who have just assumed the prerogatives of a military

caste, with all its trappings, gold braid uniforms, special officers' clubs, orderlies, etc., are now pointing an accusing finger at "directors-aristocrats."

Party functionaries are under fire for having isolated themselves from the masses. Even in distant Bashkiria, plenums of the highest party bodies pass resolutions condemning long-standing bureaucratic practices.

"Certain party organizations ignore such important forms of education as the calling of meetings of party activists . . . The reporter (Secretary Ignatiev of the Bashkir County Committee) called attention to the extremely rare appearances of and political reports from the secretaries of county, regional and city committees of the party, the chairmen of executive committees and of regional Soviets and the leaders of industry. Many Soviet, trade union and cooperative activists have stopped making reports to their respective electorates." (*Pravda*, June 28.)

The Kremlin is resuming the old game of unloading its own crimes on its underlings. In the very midst of the greatest victories, the need of scapegoats suddenly becomes acute!

Stalin's New "Turn"

Above all, Stalin now needs scapegoats on whom to unload the entire responsibility for the working and living conditions of the Soviet masses. A major campaign against the lower-ranking civilian bureaucrats has been in progress for months.

In a leading editorial "War and the Care of the Toilers' Living Needs," *Pravda* hypocritically laments:

"Unfortunately not all local leaders everywhere have become imbued with the consciousness of the fact that it is their daily duty to be concerned about the living needs of the toilers in the rear."

And then it is stated:

"The government and the party demand a genuine, broad and decisive turn by the local organizations to provide all-sided services with regard to the living needs of the workers in the rear." (*Pravda*, June 18.)

Why was it necessary to wait almost two years before demanding this "turn"? How is it possible for the local organizations to disregard with impunity the elementary needs of the masses? By its belated and hysterical demands, the Kremlin gives the clearest possible expression to the irreconcilable contradiction between its regime and the living needs of the whole country.

Special meetings of the party membership in Moscow are now being held regularly. At one of them a resolution was passed "binding the leadership to give day-to-day care to the living conditions and needs of the toilers." (*Pravda*, June 4.)

The Twelfth Session of the Moscow City Soviet—another suddenly revived institution—sent a letter to Stalin, informing him that:

"You personally Comrade Stalin are worrying tirelessly about Moscow and your concern and attention inspire all Muscovites to new labor feats. Your constant concern about the needs of the Soviet people obliges us to improve manyfold all our work in satisfying the living needs of the population." (*Pravda*, June 26.) Not only the government and the party but Marshal Stalin himself is demanding a "genuine turn."

Shocking cases of negligence are being publicly aired.

In the city of Kirov "communal living quarters of the textile workers are without lights, the rooms are dirty and uncomfortable. . . . The apartment houses attached to the factory have empty rooms; one half of the living area is occupied by individuals not connected with the industry. Meanwhile a portion of the workers lives in barracks unequipped for human habitation. . . . The factory is not fulfilling the plan." (*Pravda*, June 7.)

In Chelyabinsk 700 workers are quartered in a former

schoolhouse with no facilities for cooking or heating water. "Many cots are without mattresses. Only half of the rooms are supplied with sheets and pillow cases, and these, too, are black with dirt." (*Pravda*, June 18.)

Again,

"The city baths work irregularly. There used to be cold water but no hot water; now there is hot water but for the last few days no cold water."

Pravda is indignant that street cars fail to operate regularly and then the workers are blamed for coming late. (*Pravda*, June 18.)

All this is from an article entitled, "Damning Facts." Among the facts cited is the following:

"Let us walk into the dining room of a leather factory. Here the workers are compelled to stand in line 30 to 40 minutes. The dining room is supposed to serve 400, but only 6 plates and 2 teaspoons are provided. The dining room has all-told 8 small tables. The kitchen does not contain a single undamaged utensil; food is prepared in pots full of holes which are plugged up with rags. . . . The director of the factory, Andreyev, remains calm and imperturbable. He and the secretary of the party organization are not at all upset by these abominations."

The article concludes as follows:

"The adduced facts show that among certain local organizations there is no sign of a genuine Bolshevik concern for the needs of the masses."

The campaign is nation-wide. The editors of *Magnitogorsk Metal* in the distant Urals evinced exemplary initiative. They organized "a raid of worker correspondents to check on the functioning of factory dining rooms. Not a few facts of poor service rendered to the workers were disclosed; many valuable suggestions for improving community food-service were made." But the factory organizations paid no attention. *Pravda* commended the Magnitogorsk editors for their "raid" and warned the factory administration to correct its attitude toward "the signals in the press." (*Pravda*, June 27.)

But just what steps are actually taken to remedy the situation? Let us see what the approved procedure is.

Stalinist Remedies

On May 30 *Pravda* carried a criticism of "party and trade union leaders and managers of N— factory for a bureaucratic attitude toward cultural-living conditions of working men and women. This enterprise fails systematically to fulfill the plan."

On June 28 *Pravda* was able proudly to report that the bureau of the city committee having jurisdiction over N— factory took up all these criticisms and found them to be correct.

"The Bureau of the City Committee took note that the party bureau of the factory and its secretary, Comrade Berezin, failed to organize properly the party political work at the factory and did not fully utilize the party's rights of control over the functioning of the administration. The factory trade union committee and its chairman, Comrade Semeikin, took a formal-bureaucratic attitude toward such a native cause as the satisfaction of the cultural and living requirements of workers and employes."

All the individuals and organizations involved got a censure. Only Semeikin, chairman of the trade union committee and the lowest ranking bureaucrat, was removed from his post.

Not a word was mentioned about any improvement in the conditions at the factory, or of steps contemplated to that end. One scapegoat was apparently enough in the way of showing a correct attitude toward "signals in the press."

More than a month after the Moscow membership meeting

that passed a resolution on the need of "caring for the workers," the highest Moscow party committees met in a plenary session. A great deal of criticism was voiced. Especially reprehensible was found to be the work of the housing committees in preparing for the coming winter. "Especially poor is the work of repairing roofs and providing central heating for buildings." The gathering solemnly affirmed that "individual industrial, party, Soviet and trade union organizations have not taken all the necessary measures for improving the living conditions of the toilers and have failed to evince enough initiative in mobilizing local resources as a result of which biggest inadequacies

obtain in rendering service to the living needs of the population." (*Pravda*, July 14.) This apparently likewise suffices at the present time as a proper response to "signals in the press." The groundwork for future scapegoats has in any case been prepared.

The bureaucracy continues to operate in time of war just as it did in the period of peace. Will this satisfy the Soviet workers? *Pravda* itself hardly thinks so. Recurring more and more frequently in its columns is the old admonition: "There is an increasing need for raising our political vigilance." In the past this has always served as a signal for wholesale purges.

Post-War Preview

By JOHN ADAMSON

The Second World War has unquestionably gone far beyond its predecessor of twenty-five years ago in its ferocity, its destructiveness and its all-inclusiveness. The war has swept into its whirlpool the peoples of virtually the whole globe, the colonies as well as the metropolitan centers. Even the neutral countries have not escaped its all-embracing effects. In this war the dividing line is beginning to disappear between civilians and soldiers.

The war poses all the questions of the class struggle point blank. It subjects all peoples, ideas, organizations, institutions and systems to an inexorable test. It abhors all ambiguity. The war rejects all half measures. It exposes all that is rotten and decaying.

This war is bringing to a close that historic period of capitalism where politics was characterized by unlimited compromises, by huckstering between the different political factions and cliques, by political stockjobbery of all kinds. The politics of pre-war Europe is vanishing before our very eyes.

The day is past when the politics of reformism—the elaboration of empty, high-sounding "compromise" schemes which threw a sop to the masses, while leaving the domination of the monopolies and banks untouched, and all the essential problems of the masses unsolved—were adjudged as the highest political wisdom. The foundation has been withdrawn from this kind of politics. Capitalism in its death agony cannot offer the people even the smallest reforms, even the most insignificant improvements. It cannot even offer them the miserable standard of living of pre-war Europe. Capitalism in the period of its terrible decay and decline, can offer the masses of Europe only a new serfdom, political reaction, starvation, disease and self-destructive wars.

The contradictions of this epoch are too profoundly acute, the catastrophic downward plunge of capitalism is too headlong, the needs of humanity too unpostponable, to provide much leeway for the middle-of-the-road politicians whose stock in trade consists of parliamentary trickery and jugglery.

New "democratic" capitalist governments, on the model of the Weimar Republic of 1918 or the British Labor government of Ramsay MacDonald, may still be formed. The emergence of such governments remains a distinct possibility, however, only because the European working class is badly disorganized. The organization of such "democratic" capitalist governments will not signify that Europe is about to repeat the experience of the last war and go through a prolonged period of "demo-

cratic" capitalism. It only means that the capitalist rulers will be forced to push forward "democratic" capitalist governments in a desperate attempt to halt the radicalization of the masses and their struggle for a new socialist society. Such governments will be of an extremely unstable nature and of very short duration. They will represent not a new equilibrium, but merely a short-lived stage ending either in the victory of the workers' revolution which will establish a socialist republic or the definitive victory of the counter-revolution, which will establish a stark-reactionary military dictatorship.

The only revolutionary forces in Europe today are the working class in alliance with the city and country poor. The only revolution which the working class can and will lead is the socialist revolution. The only alternative to the present rule of the industrialists and the banks is the rule of the workers', soldiers' and peasants' soviets.

Two World Programs

Roosevelt and Churchill both represent "democratic" capitalist governments. But the trend even in the United States and Great Britain is toward totalitarianism, toward dictatorship. Strikes are outlawed in the both countries. The democratic rights of the people are systematically being trampled upon and destroyed. Both the U.S. and Britain possess numerically powerful labor movements; the Anglo-American capitalists are thus forced to proceed with a certain caution in their home countries. In Europe, however, they feel no such restraint, in the pursuit of their openly counter-revolutionary aims.

Roosevelt and Churchill understand that it is not in the cards to establish stable "democratic" capitalist governments in Europe today. Given free scope, given their democratic rights, the European working class will not require overly much time to organize its revolutionary party, and to overthrow all of its capitalist oppressors. The choice, from the Roosevelt-Churchill point of view, is a Franco-type government or the spectre of the socialist revolution. (Roosevelt and Churchill prefer to call it "anarchy.")

The war is bringing the fact home that there exist only two fundamental world programs today—the stark-reactionary, imperialist program of the ruling classes, representing the monopolists, the cartel owners, the banks, and the world program of the socialist revolution, that is, the program of the Fourth International. All the programs, or lack of programs, of all the intermediate groups, the Stalinists, the laborites, the social-

democrats, the liberals, the centrists, the pacifists, etc., etc., all reduce themselves in the last analysis to eclectic hodge-podge concoctions in the service of big Capital. They represent the pathetic waverings of the middle class between the big capitalists and the working class. The petty bourgeois groupings, tossed about like a feather in a gale storm, capitulating to the imperialists at every critical juncture, demonstrate again the profound Marxist truth that the middle class can have no basic program of its own today but must espouse the program of one or the other of the two fundamental classes of present-day society.

The example of Stafford Cripps is highly instructive in this regard. In pre-war Europe, Sir Stafford might have spoken his empty banalities for many years and have established a reputation for being a great social thinker, a great "left-winger", a do-gooder, a friend of the common man and of suffering humanity. Today major political questions cannot be so easily evaded. Almost overnight, history, in the guise of Winston Churchill, grabbed up by the collar this estimable, middle-class muddlehead and converted him into an open agent of British imperialism which at that very moment was engaged in the attempt to strangle the Indian revolution. The historic period when the heroes of the golden mean can bask in the sunshine of middle-class public opinion is rapidly drawing to a close.

Both the programs of Marxism and of world capitalism base themselves upon the reality of the present-day world. They have this much in common—they both seek to analyze and evaluate the actual facts of the class struggle. That being the case, it is important to establish exactly what is the perspective of the big bourgeoisie? How do they evaluate the present situation in Europe, the outcome of the war?

Of course, it is not so simple a matter to discover these facts, as one might imagine. In spite of the thousands of books published each year, in spite of the hundreds of speeches delivered over the air waves, it takes considerable effort to ascertain the true opinions and plans of the leaders and spokesmen of Big Business. The capitalist statesmen of England and the U.S., no less than those of the fascist countries, rule to a great extent by deceit. Hypocrisy lying, trickery and double talk have been developed by these capitalist statesmen into a veritable art. Mastery of this art is an indispensable prerequisite for any individual who aspires to become a bourgeois statesman. Capitalist writing and oratory require the ability to weave high sounding, sonorous phrases that mean nothing and commit one to nothing, but are intended to lull and soothe the people, to quiet their fears, arouse their hopes and retain their confidence.

When you are trying to glean the policy of a Roosevelt or a Churchill from one of their speeches, you have to go about studying the material at hand in the manner of a detective studying clues in a crime case. You have to read the speech "between the lines." A recent article entitled "British Policy—A Conservative Forecast" by Quintin Hogg in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs*, is very illuminating for an understanding of Churchill's declarations and provides a key for a more profound understanding of the policies and aims of Anglo-American capitalism. Quintin Hogg is an important member of the influential group of young Disraelian Tories, and is a member of the British House of Commons from Oxford.

The British *Tribune*, organ of Stafford Cripps-Aneurin Bevan, characterizes this group in the following manner:

"The British traditionalists are still desperately in need of the active support of the organized Socialist movement of Great Britain, for the task which they now have to achieve is

infinitely more delicate than the one which faced them when Germany was loaded with military menace. *What they now need is the cooperation of British labor in the murder of the infant European revolution.* That is why reaction in Britain must still wear the mask of progressivism without at any moment yielding a single bulwark of privilege. That is why the young Disraelian Tories, like Lord Hutchingbroke, Quintin Hogg and Hugh Molson, continue to mouth the phrases of reformism anent the social services of Britain while, at the same time, they become almost incoherent with rage if our policy toward Europe is questioned."

Candid Avowals

Quintin Hogg, as we see, is an authoritative spokesman and member of the British ruling class. His article, printed in a magazine read by government officials, diplomats, professors etc., but not widely read by the general public, gives a less guarded and far more complete picture of where the imperialists are heading than the speeches of Churchill or Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, the discerning reader quickly grasps the fact that the policy outlined in this article dove-tails with the policy enunciated by Roosevelt, Churchill, Eden and Hull. As a rule their policy has to be reconstructed from hints and phrases, it has to be read between the lines in the declarations of these capitalist statesmen. The same policy is stated more thoroughly, completely and frankly in this article.

"The first principle of the conservative statesman," writes Hogg, "is to try and think himself ahead into the concrete situation with which he is likely to be faced . . . But what is the situation likely to be?" Hogg gives the picture as the British Tories see it: "This war is not going to end like the last. To appropriate a line from T. S. Eliot, it will end 'not with a bang but a whimper.' There will not be an Armistice. There will be no last shots fired at 11:05 A.M. There will not be a certain moment at which we are at war and a subsequent moment at which we are at peace and free to reconstruct the world. There will be a confused period in which the problems of peace and the problems of war are inextricably intertwined—the only peace of reconstruction' we are likely to get. After that it will be too late to reconstruct."

He continues, "The two immediate factors of the situation in Europe after the defeat of Hitler will be the necessity of military occupation and European relief. We—and I mean the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the British Commonwealth—will not be driven to these acts by vindictiveness or sentimentality but by the sheer logic of events. Some will not like the policy they entail. All will have to accept it.

"I think that this was what Mr. Churchill had in mind in his somewhat guarded reference . . .

"The first purpose will involve the maintenance of a large military force in Germany. The Nazi regime has destroyed every organization that might conceivably have formed the basis for an opposition . . . When the Nazis fall there will be a void. Pockets of isolated Nazi fanatics will hold out, will be suppressed and from time to time will break out again in fits of hysterical resistance. Drove of expropriated workers will roam far and wide without the means of livelihood. Towns will have been battered. Food supplies will have been disorganized. Epidemic disease will probably appear on an enormous scale.

"All Europe, as well as Germany, will be in confusion. Peoples will rise against the remnants of the Nazi occupying power but will not thereby achieve unity. The Giraud-de Gaulle controversy is only a foretaste of factional disputes to come. Some of the Quislings will rat. Others will continue their treachery in varying degrees. Always there will be an insistent cry for food. Homeless people will demand houses.

War prisoners and foreign workers from German factories will ask care and lodging on their way home in places which cannot accommodate them. Factories will be closed. Chaos will reign everywhere. The one unifying force will be the armies of the United Nations. The one sure source of food will be the United Nations Relief Organization. The one instrument of political security will be the authority of the victorious Powers.

"It is idle to pretend that this period of chaos will prove short. Houses are not built in a day. It will take time to repatriate Hitler's slave labor and years to reorganize industrial production. The agriculture of Europe is not going to recover for fifteen years or more. The cattle have been slaughtered. The fields are partly unfertilized. The farmers and their laborers have been scattered. And in Germany itself the disease of Nazism will take at least a generation to eradicate.

"Europe as we knew it has disappeared. Possibly it has ceased forever to be the economic or political center of the world . . ."

In the light of this harsh and cruel picture of post-war Europe, how hollow, how empty, how pathetic is the chatter of the liberals and laborites about post-war reconstruction, about the century of the common man, about the brave new world "we all seek to build." Like religion, these slogans are intended as opium for the people.

The British ruling class knows the real facts and their only program is, in partnership with the United States, to preserve and ensure their power and privileges by converting the peoples of Europe into serfs, under the rule of Anglo-American bayonets and threats of starvation. That is the cold-blooded, barbaric program which the Anglo-American capitalists offer as their "solution" to the European problem. As Hogg puts it: "Some will not like the policy . . . All will have to accept it."

The Real Plans

From all sides comes confirmation that Hogg's is no individual opinion. On the contrary, this represents the deliberate, calculated, predetermined and authoritative policy of Wall and Lombard Streets. Two important pronouncements verify this fact. The September 24 *N.Y. Times* reports that U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull declared to newspaper reporters that "food and order" will be the two-fold key for Wall Street's plans to subjugate Europe. The *Times* states: "In emphasizing the importance of the project (United Nations Relief), the Secretary of State recalled how four nations slipped into anarchy after the last war and warned that as many as fourteen nations would follow that course after the present war, unless someone fed them."

This statement should be studied in connection with the speech delivered in England the same week by Sir Samuel Hoare, British Ambassador to Spain. Sir Samuel Hoare declared that Britain has become the "leading military power in Europe." "Having achieved this power," he asserted, "Britain does not intend to abandon it and tomorrow it may be the safeguard of European stability' . . ."

"Sir Samuel placed 'food and order' as the first needs of Europe," the *New York Times* correspondent reports. "We are prepared in full cooperation with our great Allies to prevent famine by insuring the effective distribution of food supplies and to forestall anarchy by Allied garrisons at key points on the continent."

These are the plans, these are the intentions of British imperialism. But there is a great gap between desire and accomplishment. Hogg of course recognizes that Britain has lost her world preeminence. . . . Our industrial ascendancy has dis-

appeared. Financially and economically the U.S. is incomparably the greatest Power in the world." He hopes, however, and this is the hope of the British Tories, that Britain will be indispensable, even though in a junior capacity, in Wall Street's drive for world hegemony. "Can American trade function in Africa and Asia without British political assistance?" he demands. Hogg thinks it cannot.

The War With Japan

But even if Britain is able to establish itself as the junior partner of the firm of Anglo-American capitalism and even if the war with Hitler is successfully concluded, there still remain the war with Japan and the necessity of reestablishing Anglo-American hegemony in the Far East.

"The result," writes Hogg, "will be a period of peace and war. Part of our industry will be switching to the reconstruction of Europe and Great Britain. Part will still be supplying the armed forces. Part of the armed forces will be transferred to the Far East; part to the European Army of Occupation. But some will return to industry . . ." He forecasts that:

"This will raise intricate problems within the armed forces. Who is going back first to get civilian jobs? Veterans of Tunis and Burma will strain to come back to England, only to be told that they are wanted in the European Army of Occupation, or to fight the Japanese. Boys will be sent out from this country to take the places of demobilized men just as they come to think the war is over. Demobilization will become a thorny political problem.

"The end of the war with Germany will set up a new series of shortages. It is estimated that bombing, lack of repairs and shifts in population, added to existing slums and overcrowding, will give Britain a shortage of 4,000,000 dwelling houses in 1944—more than ten years' output at maximum prewar rates. Our clothes are wearing out. Everything is getting shabby and out of repair. We shall be short of timber, short of ships, short of food, short of oil and, above all, short of men.

"Certain political conclusions follow from this. Mr. Churchill is one of the few men who have had the courage to draw them. If government is not to break down it will have to be strong government. The mere demand for demobilization from within the services will ensure the continuance of conscription to replace those who are demobilized. There will still be rationing, because there will still be shortages; a system of priorities will still govern new production. Some requisitioning of housing accommodation is probable. Rent restriction is certain to continue so long as there is a shortage of houses; and there may be a continuation of billeting and of compulsory labor service . . ."

Such is the future that the British ruling class holds out for the British people. Regardless of military victory, nay, on the assumption of military victory, the war economy plus the organization and maintenance of huge armies and military establishments will continue for a very long time to come. How long? The only authoritative statement given out on this score thus far has come from Knox, U.S. Secretary of the Navy. He blurted out in an unguarded moment that the U.S. and Britain will have to police the world for the next hundred years. By then Knox and his friends feel that it will be safe. Or maybe they will demand an additional extension.

Hogg understands too well that such a program cannot survive even the ordinary rigors of British parliamentary contest. "Will these become party issues?" he apprehensively inquires. "No government," Hogg is convinced, "can withstand grievances on the scale which will exist, if they are given organized expression by a powerful Parliamentary opposition." He then quotes Churchill's plea for a continuation of the present coalition after

the war. "Anybody who opposes Mr. Churchill's plea for national unity after victory, will, I believe, be simply swept off the map," he melodramatically warns the weak-kneed Labor Party leadership.

This perspicacious, class-conscious Tory unwittingly gives testimony on behalf of our contention that the treacherous labor bureaucracy of the Bevin-Morrison type, as of the Murray-Green variety, constitutes today an indispensable cog in the maintenance of the stability of the capitalist regimes both in Britain and the United States. Apparently the stability of the mightiest capitalisms rests on none too firm a foundation.

The Lies of the Past

In the temporary stabilization that capitalism achieved in Europe after 1923, the middle-of-the-road politicians of the yellow Second International told the workers that their methods of peaceful and gradual evolution were safer, demanded less sacrifice and bloodshed than the aggressive, sanguinary methods of the Russian Revolution. They assured the working class that the reformist policies of the British Labor Party or the German Social-Democratic Party, the methods of peaceful election contests, the routine organization of trade unions, and the winning of modest reforms etc., guaranteed the gradual, peaceful and painless transition to the new socialist society. This argument had a certain appeal and exercised considerable influence on sections of the working class of Europe. Of course, the yellow

"socialists" did not bring socialism to the European workers. Neither were the workers in Italy, Germany and Spain spared the rigors and violence of civil war. Nor were the European workers spared the horrors of the Second World War.

Europe Today

Under Czarism, with its tyrannical, barbaric and murderous rule, the Russian working class quickly shed its reformist illusions and learned the lesson of revolutionary Internationalism. The Russian working class was the first to build a powerful Bolshevik party and the first to make a successful socialist revolution.

In similar fashion, the Europe of today provides little soil for reformism to take root and flourish. The Europe of today leaves little room for philistine illusions. Gradualism will be thought of in the next period as a bizarre, totally unrealistic philosophy. The war is pounding home the grim lesson that the workers' revolution is the only way to end the imperialist slaughter, that the Socialist United States of Europe is the only alternative to the present madhouse of capitalist Europe.

The European workers can be depended on to rebuild their revolutionary socialist International, the Fourth International, on lines that correspond to the requirements and needs of the present epoch. The present epoch will be recorded as one not only of imperialist wars but also of liberating revolutions.

A Shamefaced Apologist For Fascism

By JOSEPH HANSEN

I

Immediately preceding the outbreak of World War II, the Allied bourgeoisie, preparing ideologically for the impending conflict with the Axis powers and possibly the Soviet Union, opened up their heavy guns of propaganda in favor of the values and ideals of capitalist democracy. This barrage reached peak intensity upon the Red Army's invasion of Finland.

The petty-bourgeois radicals, responding characteristically, turned their slingshots on Marxism.

We were inflicted with a series of probings into "ends and means," dissections of "Bolshevik amorality," and confessions of faith in the "democratic process" as opposed to the "Machiavellianism" of Lenin and Trotsky.

The Dynamics of Doubt

The war has now reached the stage where the program for "peace" begins to assume preponderance over all other questions. The blueprints of the Allied bourgeoisie, however, delineate not world democracy but a world police system. Their propaganda, accordingly, has been revised somewhat. The statesmen, columnists and anonymous editorial hacks now lay emphasis upon "hard-boiled," "tough," "realistic" power politics.

Among the petty-bourgeois radicals this shift in emphasis is having its effect. Niebuhr, for instance, reviewing Burnham's book, *The Machiavellians*,* in the May 1 *Nation*, while

deploring the danger of falling into the "abyss of cynicism," nevertheless believes "our whole bourgeois era . . . has been so filled with political sentimentality that a realistic reaction was inevitable." A new "discussion" magazine, *Enquiry*, supported by such a political weathervane as Lillian Symes, dwells on the "mythology of socialism" and the need of "taking into account the facts of social life."

New Probings

Burnham's latest polemic probably foreshadows a new series of probings into the "myth" of industrial democracy, dissections of the "dream" of peace on earth and confessions of faith in the rise of a new ruling class as opposed to the "religion" that the workers can organize a classless society to free the world from capitalism in its death agony.

Burnham began with a rejection of materialist dialectics. His rejection of the Marxist method then led him include the class character of the Soviet Union. Was it really a degenerated workers' state? The signing of the German-Soviet pact crystallized this doubt into conviction. A new class, he argued, had seized power in the USSR.

This theory Burnham developed to its next logical stage in his book of 1941, *The Managerial Revolution*. The "managers," as distinct from the owners, are even now, he claimed, displacing the capitalist class. Their basis, he argued, is functional—the division of labor requires a highly skilled stratum to direct the complex industrial machine. Out of this stratum, in its "inevitable" drive for power, will develop, he predicted, the new rulers. Socialism, Fascism, Nazism, even the New Deal, he maintained, are basically identical, constituting but variant

*THE MACHIAVELLIANS: Defenders of Freedom. James Burnham. John Day Co., 1943. \$2.50.

means by which the "managers" achieve state power.

Burnham's own political position towards this "inevitable" new ruling class and its "inevitable" managerial revolution was only implicit. Now he has carried his theory further along the path of its logic. Burnham, we learn from his latest book, stands in the camp of what he terms the "Machiavellians," that section of the budding ruling class most skilled in the science of unprincipled politics and public deception.

The Vertical Approach

The key to understanding Burnham's degeneration is his concept of what constitutes a class in society. The Marxist view, that classes can be determined in the final analysis—if we are to follow a scientific method—only by their relation to the economic system, he rejects as pure "myth." For instance, on the law of surplus value, worked out by Marx in tracing down the economic source spring of the capitalist class, Burnham quotes Pareto approvingly: ". . . to know whether Marx's theory of 'surplus value' is false or true is about as important as knowing whether and how baptism eradicates sin. . . ."

Burnham regards society as if it were a cabbage. It is composed, he says, of "social forces." By way of illustration he pulls the following leaves off his cabbage: war, religion, land, labor, money, education, science, "technological skill," art, literature, commerce, industry, army, agriculture, finance, "liquid wealth," the church, "industrial management," "the state machine," "the political bureaucracy." This conglomeration constitutes "social forces" in our professor's mental image of society. And he swears by Science!

This approach to society is not new. It was used by Masaryk, who in 1898 repudiated Marx's theory of surplus value—the touchstone for determining the structure of society divided into classes—and adopted the political slogan of the "crisis in Marxism." Sorel, one of Burnham's "Machiavellians," began with mild doubts: Wasn't Marx's theory "leading to fatalism"? and wound up as the prophet of Masaryk's "crisis in Marxism"—all this long before the 1905 revolution.

Almost a half century ago Labriola called the doctrine of social factors "that old bore" and pointed out that Marx's theory of surplus value, "the typical premise without which all the rest of the work is unthinkable," is but the "perfection of an elaboration made by economic science for a century and a half"; whereas the typical premise of Sorel and Co. that society is a conglomeration of "social factors" (or "forces" as Burnham following Mosca terms this moldy stew) is the vaguest and most unreal of abstractions. The questions still remain: Why does one "social force" of a particular kind arise at a given period in history? Why does a "social force" like the "state machine" dominate, say, the social forces of "art" and "literature" at a particular stage of development?

Burnham's collection of withered cabbage leaves was long ago tossed by the Marxists into the garbage can of history.

Here is an example of Burnham's "vertical" approach in action:

"Social and political events of the very greatest scope and order," he declares in contrasting his concept of society with that of Marxism, "—the collapse of the Roman Empire, the rise of Christianity, the advance of Islam—have occurred without any important correlated change in the mode of economic production; consequently, the mode of production cannot be the sole cause of social change."

Burnham again repeats the old banalities. As a matter of fact, Marxism maintains that development of the mode of production is the "cause of social change" only in the final

analysis. Secondly, one of the classics of Marxism, Kautsky's *The Foundations of Christianity*, demonstrates with scientific exactitude that it is impossible to understand precisely the period cited by Burnham without understanding the profound "correlated" changes in the mode of production.

Kautsky's work, written before his betrayal of Marxism, has long been available in an English translation.

Burnham, however, has a horizontal approach to society as well. There are at the bottom the masses—dumb driven cattle unfit to enter the pages of history—their fate "to submit to the dominion of a small minority" and to "be content to constitute the pedestal of an oligarchy." In the strata above the herd are the "elite," the clever ones expert in the use of "force and fraud," predestined to enjoy the "advantages that power brings." It is only the "elite," Burnham maintains, who make history.

The Horizontal Approach

"Faith in the Historical Process," declares Burnham, "does duty for faith in the God of our Fathers." (p. 175) This severe judgment, however, does not prevent our scientific Machiavellian from promulgating his own religious faith in a Historical Process. Progress is a "myth," he holds. An "elite" arises, seizes power, degenerates, is replaced by a new "elite." Under the manipulations of a cynical, sometimes "scientific" priesthood, society whirls around in an eternal "cycle."

As ground for his contention, Burnham points to 2,500 years of written history. During this period, he insists, despite all revolutions, there has always been an "elite," in its narrower sense, a ruling class. *Therefore*, there will *always* be a ruling class.

In deriding this kind of argumentation Hegel once remarked, "He must be a poor creature, who cannot advance a good ground for everything, even for what is worst and most depraved." We suspect there were Burnhams in Hegel's day.

The existence of the class struggle does not prove the existence of an absolute and eternal cycle. The class struggle itself develops, achieves new levels, nurtures the seeds of its own destruction, following the dialectical pattern of all processes in nature, society and the mind rather than the formal pattern of abstract identity which Burnham carries to absurdity.

Burnham falls into this characteristic fallacy because his method of analysis hobbles him to the drag-chain of isolated, raw facts.

Even Burnham's petty-bourgeois colleagues are able to detect the fundamental weakness in his reasoning. Horace S. Fries of the University of Wisconsin, reviewing *The Machiavellians* in the *Public Administration Review*, Vol. III, No. 3, concludes: "One way of stating the shortcoming in the Machiavellian idea of science is to point out that it commits the fallacy of crude empiricism." Trotsky, of course, called attention to Burnham's false ideas about scientific method as early as 1939.

Marx and Engels observed in a pamphlet in 1848: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." And they never claimed credit as the first to note this fact as Burnham suggests they did in his book. Their great contribution was to demonstrate that we are living in the epoch when society will finally emerge from this long development in the chrysalis of the class struggle, no longer divided internally but united on the basis of new production methods and an unprecedented expansion of the world's production forces.

The absurdity of Burnham's concept of a class can be demonstrated from an illustration taken from his own book.

"Members of a ruling minority regularly have some attribute, real or apparent, which is highly esteemed and very influential

in the society in which they live.' To mention simple examples: in a society which lives primarily by fishing, the expert fisherman has an advantage . . . Considered as keys to rule, such qualities as these are variable; if the conditions of life change, they change, . . . when fishing changes to agriculture, the fisherman naturally drops in the social scale."

Presumably as a Machiavellian of the "fox" type, the fisherman baits his hooks for the suckers, seizes village power, and devotes his leisure to making history.

Since our profound savant finds it necessary to discover an "elite" even in a primitive fishing society, we can gather how imperative it was for the preservation of his theory to convert the Stalinist bureaucracy into a ruling class. We also gain fresh insight into the theoretical underpinnings of erstwhile Burnhamite Shachtman's theory about a new class in the workers' state, "hitherto unknown and unforeseen in history."

Burnham has another argument which he presents as ground for his faith in the rise of a new class: that the very structure of modern industrial society *requires* an "elite" to run it. In face of the fact that Marxism has proved theoretically (and partially in practice in the Soviet Union) that world economy, freed from the fetters of capitalism, will develop such prodigious productivity as to finally liquidate the age-old scarcity which has given rise to class divisions, what basis is there to believe that those who "manage" will be *required* to become a new oppressing class rather than what Engels defines as an administration over things? "Scientific" Machiavellianism has a ready answer.

Because, says Burnham, looking at his own navel, it's "human nature." It's human nature to "seek power and privilege"; it's human nature to form "elites" and new ruling classes. And as every spokesman of the capitalist class knows, "human nature" is an abstraction that neither god nor devil nor a planned economy of plenty can change.

Far from constituting the unique view peculiar to a limited and exclusive "elite," Burnham's theory boils down to the argument advanced by that run of the mill Machiavellian who heckles at socialist street meetings: "Why divide everything up? The smart guys would just get it back again. You can't change human nature!"

Such are the profound depths of Burnham's theory.

II

To whom is Burnham's book addressed? He himself excludes the masses, recognizing quite correctly, we must admit, that it is "ludicrous for the authors of books like this one . . . to pretend to speak to the people." The total circulation, Burnham expects, will reach—and here he strikes the only note of optimism in the entire volume—maybe 2,000 of the "elite." Certainly its argumentation is not directed to the Marxists whose ranks he deserted. For whom then is intended the camouflage in the title that Machiavellians are "defenders of freedom"? For whom is this Machiavellian hogwash that he believes it possible to gain an amount of "democracy" in the "managerial" society through a chart of checks and balances?

Is it too far-fetched to conclude that Burnham is speaking to possible cadres among the "elite" who might constitute the initial corps of a political party "hitherto unknown" in the United States?

If Burnham has not yet reached the stage where he is ready to draw the practical organizational conclusions now implicit in his views, it is possible nevertheless to determine with precision the *direction* in which he is moving.

For some obscure Machiavellian reason our cautious author does not mention that his fellow thinkers, Sorel, Michels, Mosca,

Pareto, whose views he presents through liberal quotation, are widely considered as among the chief godfathers of *fascist* theory. Burnham no doubt holds this fact to be irrelevant, since truth in his eyes plays an indifferent role in the class struggle and he believes Machiavellianism far mightier than the truth.

But the point is, Burnham's theory of society has evolved to the stage where it clearly merges with the main stream of pre-fascist ideology. This is what makes it necessary to still consider Burnham's writings at all.

Burnham's Grand Order of "Neutral" Machiavellians

Let us emphasize, lest Burnham indignantly accuse us of Machiavellian skullduggery, that we are not accusing Burnham of being a conscious American fascist. We are simply stating that his thought belongs to that school of petty-bourgeois ideology which Germany in particular witnessed during the rise of Hitler.

In Germany in the face of the sharpening struggle between the two major classes, the petty bourgeoisie steadily disintegrated. Small-time government bureaucrats, jobless army officers, doctors, lawyers and dentists unable to meet the rent, snobbish professors smarting under curtailed budgets, all those with relatively fixed incomes who, filled with dreams of "success," i.e., becoming Big Business men, felt the screws of inflation and unemployment steadily tightening, sought escape in day dreaming about themselves as supermen above the vulgar rabble, in visualizing themselves as a new class that, going against history, would seize power. They found their philosopher in socialist-hating Nietzsche, they found their political theories in the writings of soul-sick pedants of Burnham's type. A whole literature grew up that reeked of blood and iron and "realism." A frustrated petty bourgeois demands stern illusions when he takes vengeance even in day dreams upon Big Business for its baseness and upon the working class for its historic destiny denied the petty bourgeoisie.

In Germany when the demagogue came he found his path prepared by this Machiavellian literature. Large sections of the petty bourgeoisie were so morally corroded and decayed that it was not difficult to sweep them off their feet through adroit manipulation of the logical pattern to which they had become conditioned. They stampeded into the slaughter house like sheep behind a judas goat. They provided us with a classic pattern of the petty bourgeoisie driven to frenzy in the period of the death agony of capitalism.

In the United States, since the war started, the petty bourgeoisie have been going down like ripe wheat under the blade. The process is scarcely started but already a deep mood of pessimism has seized a section of them. It is in such a mood that they respond to books like Burnham's.

A simple test will determine at least what class Burnham is actually addressing; that test is his description of the fate of the petty bourgeoisie in his coming "managerial" revolution. Here a surprise is in store for us. Although this exacting Machiavellian claims to be a scientist engaged in dissecting society and determining its course, he manages not once to mention the existence of a class called the petty bourgeoisie. What happened to the petty bourgeoisie? Aren't they part of capitalism which Burnham admits is doomed? Can it be that Burnham's fancy name "managers" is really another synonym for the petty bourgeoisie? Is it the petty bourgeoisie who are going to rule the coming "managerial" society? Or is Burnham perhaps

proving Trotsky wrong in calling him a petty-bourgeois politician by simply striking this class out of existence with a stroke of the pen?

The petty-bourgeois hacks who reviewed Burnham's book did not fail to maintain the illusion. Not one of them noticed Burnham's omission of the petty bourgeoisie in his "unorthodox" and "controversial" analysis. Like the audience of "elite" to whom he appeals, Burnham cannot bear to look at the reality revealed in his mirror. In order to be able to face himself, Sherwood Anderson's character, John Webster, in *Many Marriages* puts a silver crown on his head, and thus crowns himself a man; Burnham apparently needs the crown of "manager."

And this is the type that dares speak of the "irrationality" of the masses, of their corpse-like obedience and the ease with which they can be manipulated by foxy Machiavellians!

Burnham may not know where he is headed, but this only brings into prominent relief some of the darker sides of his present politics. Consider his attitude on war in the period of bourgeois decay:

"If our aim is peace, this does not entitle us, from the point of view of science, to falsify human nature and the facts of social life in order to pretend to prove that 'all men naturally desire peace,' which history so clearly tells us, they plainly do not." Again, "wars are a natural phase of the historical process."

Our eminent crystal-gazer has discovered the ultimate cause of wars to lie in "human nature" and the disdained "historical process." What is this but a brazen attempt to support the war on the ground that opposition is "meaningless"?

Here is another significant indication: He rejects the politics of Marxism. In its place he accepts the politics of whom? First, Machiavelli, characterized by Labriola as "the first great political writer of the capitalist epoch . . . who did not invent Machiavellism, but who was its secretary and faithful and diligent editor." Perhaps the politics of the bourgeois class in its rise has a magnetic attraction for Burnham as well as a theoretical interest. But he accepts the politics of the bourgeoisie not only in its rise but in its *decline*—the politics of Mussolini's Pareto, *et al.* Burnham draws a straight line from the 16th century to the 20th in presenting his predilections, and this line traces the rise and decline of bourgeois politics.

Still another consideration: Thousands of times in the last decades Marxists have demonstrated that all society faces a crucial alternative: Fascism or Communism. This alternative faces not only the classes as a whole but each individual to the degree of his political consciousness. Burnham rejects communism as a "myth." With what is he left?

Burnham of course argues that he is neutral. Just as truth in his eyes abstains from the class struggle so he seems to believe he can abstain from taking a position toward his "managerial" revolution.

But this too is fallacious. It is a typical petty-bourgeois view—instead of recognizing that they are being ground between the millstones of the capitalist class and the working class, they project themselves into a never-never world above the classes. At best they are taking a short reprieve before coming to a decision, at worst they are in a stage of transition toward the camp of blackest reaction.

The grave words of Engels, recalling Machiavelli's epoch, aptly characterize Burnham's delusion of neutrality: "In our stirring times, as in the 16th century, mere theorizers on public affairs are found only on the side of the reactionaries."

One reviewer, Roucek of Hofstra College writing in the July issue of *The Annals* of the American Academy of Political and

Social Science, seems a bit uneasy. After remarking that Burnham dishes out a "quite unimpressive display of esoteric philosophical verbiage," he concludes: "Burnham always seems to be shadowboxing but not delivering the full punch." One wonders, as Roucek intends naturally, what might be the politics of this gymnastic Machiavellian if he uncorked his "full punch."

The May 19, 1941, issue of *Time* magazine likewise served up a bit of food for thought when it reviewed Burnham's second contribution to science, *The Managerial Revolution*: "Readers . . . may wonder whether author Burnham does not carry neutrality too far—not once in his brilliant exposition does he make a slip, write the word fascist instead of manager."

A third reviewer is still more incisive. Huse of the University of North Carolina, analyzing Burnham's latest book in *The Southern Economic Journal*, July 1943, writes the following as his final paragraph: "One reproach that might be made against Mr. Burnham is his omission of Lawrence Dennis, a Machiavellian if there ever was one, to whose *Dynamics of War and Revolution* Mr. Burnham himself seems peculiarly indebted."

A Deadly Parallel

Who is Lawrence Dennis?—a newcomer to politics might ask. Dennis is an avowed fascist, who advocates fascism for America and who is widely considered as the leading theoretician of self-acknowledged fascism in the United States.

The charge of Mr. Huse is, therefore, a very serious one. Is Huse perhaps committing a Machiavellian slander? Perhaps we can clear up Burnham's "neutrality" if we go to the trouble of comparing his views with those of Dennis.

Dennis has written three books, *Is Capitalism Doomed*, *The Coming American Fascism*, and *The Dynamics of War and Revolution*. All of them appeared before Burnham's writings. All of them were written from the viewpoint of a man anxious to set up a fascist dictatorship in the United States.

In his first book (1932) Dennis reached the conclusion that capitalism is doomed. He maintained, however, like Burnham that he was not seeking to make "converts to a new economic faith or plan." Dennis was interested only in measures to make the "old age" of capitalism "long and pleasant." His "only dogma" like Burnham's "is that people must think realistically . . . about the problems of the world depression."

In his second book (1936) Dennis gave up hope of measures to preserve democratic capitalism and predicted the inevitable triumph of either communism or fascism, of which he chose the latter. Burnham during this same period chose communism only later to reject it.

On Marxism, Dennis declares: "I am inclined to find in his (Marx's) explanation of the existing system and its inevitable course to collapse many flaws in logic and science. (Isn't this Burnham's position?—J. H.) I find the idea of a classless, governmentless society of workers enjoying social order and material abundance fantastic and unattainable. (Burnham reached this view later than fascist Dennis—J. H.) It appears unattainable for the reason that social order requires government and administration by a ruling class or power-exercising class which must always be an aristocracy of management, however selected, operating through some set of mechanism of social control, economic as well as political." (*The Coming American Fascism*, by Lawrence Dennis, p. 7.)

Some years after Dennis's succinct conclusion, Burnham wrote a whole book to explain this same point of fascist theory. "Incidentally, it is to be remarked and even stressed that Communist Russia, no less than the fascist countries, the billion-

dollar capitalist corporation, or the efficient army in the field, meets with extreme thoroughness and rigor these universal imperatives of social order and administrative efficiency." (*Idem*, p. 7.) These "universal imperatives" have a familiar ring, especially in connection with the question of the class character of the Soviet Union.

Dennis, too, believes society is like a cabbage—only he uses the old-fashioned term "social factors" instead of the modern Machiavellian "forces."

And here is our old friend human nature in his birthday clothes: According to Dennis, "Human nature has not changed materially under liberal capitalism. The masses have not the intelligence or the humanity, nor the winners the magnanimity, which liberal assumptions have postulated." (*Idem*, p. 100.) Where did Burnham go to school?

Fascist Dennis entitles one of his chapters, "The Inevitability of the Leadership of the Elite." Here are some sample excerpts from this chapter: "Fascism says that the elite, or a small minority, call its members by any term you will, always rule under any system." Seven years later, Burnham was to write this down as the claim of "Machiavellianism."

The ground Dennis selects for his view is brutally frank—more frank than Burnham's ground: "The central point is that it is useful to think of government and management as being the function of a minority, and that it is not useful to any good social purpose to proceed on the theory that the people or the majority rule." (*Idem*, pp. 234-5.) This view is "useful" of course for the establishment of fascism which Dennis advocates. Unlike Burnham, Dennis has a clear goal. For the means to this goal, it is clear he has made a close study of what was efficacious in Italy and Germany.

Dennis even presents Burnham's arguments—in advance of the clever Burnham—as to why there will always be a ruling class. First argument: "Civilizations come and go, but the elite go on forever" because of the "limitations and inequalities inherent in human personalities." (*Idem*, p. 236.) Second argument: "The sheer mechanics of administration and management of large numbers of people and the complex instruments of modern civilization" require a ruling class. But in place of "Machiavellianism," Dennis uses these arguments to advocate *fascism*.

If the reviewers of Burnham's book would like a better insight into some of Burnham's contentions about the Machiavellians as defenders of freedom let them check fascist Dennis. "The elite do rule" but this does not mean that the "elite are subject to no control by the people." The majority may be organized by an "out-elite" and "replace one set of the elite in power by another." "The problem of order and welfare, in the light of the . . . inevitability of the leadership of the elite or a minority, appears to be largely one of getting the right elite or minority in power . . ." (*Idem*, pp. 242-3.) Almost word for word this appears seven years later in Burnham's book. We don't believe Burnham consciously plagiarized from Dennis although at times the similarity is so striking as to require an effort of will to keep from becoming a convert to Burnham's theory about the depravity of human nature.

Dennis continues: "It is one of the merits of fascism, and a part of its appeal, that its leaders do not dissimulate their rule or try to place responsibility for their rule on a phantom of definition and assumption—such as, the majority or the proletariat." Burnham claims this to be the distinctive merit of "Machiavellianism."

Dennis ends his book on the problem of the fascist party,

its organization and its method of action. He believes the time not yet ripe (1936) and calls only for "preparatory thinking and discussion."

It is only in this final chapter that we find the main difference between Dennis and Burnham. All other differences are at bottom differences of terminology.

Fascist Forecasts

In 1940, Lawrence Dennis published his third book. All his volumes thus precede Burnham's and if credit is to be given for development of theory it is customary in the world of science to recognize the first in time. Let us see, therefore, what is rightfully Burnham's and what Dennis's—all the while keeping an eye out for any fascist or Machiavellian trickery.

Dennis starts out on a pessimistic note: "This book is addressed not to the masses but to the elite or to the ruling groups, actual and potential . . . it will never be read by the masses . . . it is too rational to appeal to the masses." We rub our eyes and proceed.

Now we are in for a shock. Dennis, like Burnham, predicts a new system to replace capitalism. "I am prepared to record definitely and stand on the prediction that capitalism is doomed and socialism will triumph." But what does Mr. Dennis mean by "socialism"?

"The terms communism (referring to the revolution in Russia), Fascism (referring to the revolution in Italy), Nazism (referring to the revolution in Germany) and the New Deal (referring to the revolution in America) now appear clearly to be each just a local *ism*. Looking at the entire world situation, one may now say that there is just one revolution and just one significant *ism*: socialism." Dennis's "socialism" turns out to be identical with Burnham's "managerial society." Did Burnham expound this very same thesis with greater brilliance when he called it the "managerial revolution"?

Dennis even has in a nutshell Burnham's description of the differences in the course followed by the "managerial revolution": "Fascism and Nazism, differ from communism mainly in the manner of coming into operation. A vital element of the Fascist and Nazi way of coming to power was the taking of the big business men and middle classes into the socialist camp without resistance and, even with enthusiasm . . ."

Dennis speaking in the light of the German and Italian experiences explains a lot of things. "The main purpose of a realistic approach to current problems must be to prepare the minds of the elite minority capable of leadership when the time comes for such leadership. The time is not yet ripe . . ." Thank God for that favor. But "The real leaders of the new American revolution will at some stage of the collapse have to sell themselves to a considerable number of people."

What Next?

Dennis even anticipated books of Burnham's type. "As the world swaps revolutions and imperialisms" Americans will "take new bearings." He recommends that they reject Karl Marx and turn to Machiavelli. Again, "The present ins in the democracies are neither organized nor class conscious. The changed mechanics, after we go to war, will at once work for a clarification of thinking about power by the outs or marginal ins among the elite."

Burnham began by rejecting the materialist dialectics. In the end he rejected Marxism completely and took a number of the more nervous rabbits along with him in his flight, penning

them up in the Workers Party. But Burnham was in such a hurry to get some place that this Workers Party became irksome baggage. He discarded it the way a soldier of fortune discards a trophy of war when it stands in the way of richer loot. He has written feverishly—in his spare time producing two books

within two years, one of them creating quite a ripple among the "elite" of the petty bourgeoisie. The theories developed in these two books, while not plagiarized, we trust, from the works of the fascist Lawrence Dennis, at least provide a remarkable demonstration of how great minds run in similar channels.

The Progress Of Inflation

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

On the first anniversary of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942 Roosevelt's Director of Economic Stabilization Vinson solicited congratulations by boasting that prices during the first 19 months of this war advanced only 12 per cent as compared with a 29.5 per cent increase in the last war. These government figures may be regarded with justifiable mistrust. As AFL and CIO statisticians have pointed out and as every buyer is daily reminded, they far from disclose the actual rise in retail prices. Statistics, too, have been conscripted for government service in this war. Meanwhile the inflationary process continues.

The OPA has had no success in reaching its proclaimed objective of rolling back the cost of living to September 1942 levels. Although Washington has been in ecstasy over Labor Bureau indices showing a slight decline in food prices of 1.9 per cent from May to August, any optimism that this will be sustained is premature and unfounded.

This little pause in the upward movement of some retail commodity prices is restricted and transitory. The multiple reciprocating factors pushing up the price levels do not exert equal pressure at all stages in the inflationary process. The present dip is immediately caused by a seasonal decline in the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables. These prices are considerably higher than a year ago.

But stabilization even at the present elevated levels cannot be counted upon. Once the influx of farm products abates, food prices will resume their upward climb. For the fundamental forces generating inflation, far from being weakened or removed in the past period, have been enormously strengthened and cannot fail to assert themselves with redoubled energy.

Analogous phases are to be encountered in many other spheres. For example, heat-treated steel gradually expands up to about 1,350 degrees Fahrenheit. Upon reaching this critical point and while passing through it, the steel shrinks somewhat. After exceeding the critical point, however, steel continues to expand at a more rapid rate. It appears that retail prices are passing through a similar critical phase in their process of expansion.

The consuming masses encounter inflation most directly in the form of soaring prices. But this unbridled increase in the cost of living is produced by an interlacing series of economic factors.

Among these is the relationship between the annual national income and the quantity of consumer goods on the open market. In its September 30th "boxscore on inflation," the OWI reported that this "excess purchasing power" has now soared to a record \$51,400,000,000. This represents an increase of about 20 billions over last year.

Obviously, government efforts to drain off these loose billions through bond sales, taxes, curtailment of consumer credit, etc., have proved ineffective. This is further confirmed by the results of the recently concluded Third War Bond Campaign. Although almost 18 billions were raised, from the standpoint of

absorbing excess purchasing power, "it is a failure," writes S. F. Porter, *New York Post*, Oct. 1, 1943. "The money has come from insurance companies, corporations, other institutions and wealthy individuals. . . . We're only now creeping toward the \$5,000,000,000 set for individual subscriptions."

Administration economists concentrate public attention upon the imperative necessity for closing up this "inflationary gap." That gap, instead of diminishing, has been constantly widening. A brief review of the relevant figures on the financial side alone will demonstrate how swift is the pace.

Money in circulation now amounts to about 19 billion dollars. During the last war, and even during the banking crisis of 1933 when demands for cash were heaviest, the United States got along with an average of about 5 billions. Money in circulation at the start of 1942 was about 11 billions. The total amount of currency in circulation by the end of 1943 will probably be four times greater than during the First World War and almost twice as much as two years ago!

However in highly developed capitalist countries like the United States and Great Britain the main vehicle of monetary inflation is not, as in most European and colonial nations, the amount of currency in circulation but the total bank deposits. This so-called "deposit currency" which constitutes the principal medium of circulation provides a highly significant index to the extent of inflation. In 1942 total bank deposits in the United States passed the 100 billion mark for the first time in American history. This amounts to almost five times the value of the Treasury's gold which, incidentally, represents more than 70 per cent of the world's monetary gold.

New money is being created by the billions every month. This signifies progressive inflation of the national currency.

The principal cause of the enormous expansion in the money supply is of course the government's war expenditures. For the first quarter of the 1944 fiscal year, government expenses will total over 22 billions—a third higher than for the corresponding period the year before. Only about 45 per cent is covered by federal revenue. The remainder has to be obtained by borrowing from the banks. By the end of this year the national debt will top 200 billions which is approximately \$1,500 for every man, woman and child in the country.

Bank holdings of government obligations for the week ending September 18 are over 35 billions compared with 20 billions for the previous year. The banks are buying these bonds not with their capital or excess reserves but with credit extended them by the Federal Reserve System. Their excess reserves keep dwindling; they amount to \$2,050,000,000, as compared to \$3,039,000,000 a year ago; and are replenished only through infusions from the Federal Reserve System. These methods tend to undermine the solvency and stability of the entire banking system.

As E. J. Condon points out in the *New York Times*, September 26, 1943:

"The old rule-of-thumb that a bank should have total capital funds equal to at least 10 per cent of its total deposits is a wartime casualty. . . . The ratios of bank capital to deposits are declining steadily. . . . Just two years ago the ratio for all member banks of the Federal System averaged approximately 10 per cent. The figure now is about 7.5 per cent."

These facts and figures are impressive evidence of the greatly strengthened inflationary trends in the United States, notwithstanding any slight momentary drop in a few retail food prices. The growing disparity between available consumer goods and purchasing power, the progressive multiplication of the monetary supply, the government's war expenditures and bank borrowings, the abolition of restrictions upon the banks' creation of credit are all bound to manifest themselves in mounting prices.

The people know from personal experience what the high cost of necessities means in terms of reduced standards of living. But all the agencies of capitalism work in unison in order to prevent them from grasping the connection between the high cost of living and the financial policies of the government. When new money is issued without any corresponding backing, the gold value of all the money in circulation is decreased. This means that each unit of the currency, each dollar, can buy less goods. But since the dollar *appears* to remain what it was, people have the illusion that the value of the dollar is the same while the value of the commodities has risen. They do not say: We have been deprived of half our income by this monetary manipulation. They say: The cost of living has gone up.

In other words, they feel and notice the effect without really understanding the cause of price rises. This enables the government to mask its fleecing of the people by camouflaging its operations behind the high cost of living. If the administration told the workers: "We're going to cut your wages by issuing more money," the workers would react very vigorously to such an attack upon their income.

Instead the government slashes into the real income of the workers by its monetary measures and policies while the reactionary press tells the workers that they are creating the high cost of living by demanding wage increases or spending too much money.

A gauge of the extent of depreciation in the value of the dollar is provided by the price of gold in dollars in Bombay, India, one of the free gold markets. There gold recently sold at the equivalent of \$74.80 an ounce compared with the American fixed price of \$35. This means that in Bombay the dollar is rated at less than 50 per cent of its nominal value.

What is happening in the United States today is only part of an economic process as global as the war from which it emanates.

The world sweep of inflation strikingly demonstrates the interdependence of the nations under capitalism. Every one of the factors of inflation noted in the United States operates with greater or lesser force in all other countries. Even the neutral nations have been unable to escape the plague; Turkey has been among the hardest hit.

These facts are now frankly admitted in bourgeois financial circles. Here, for example, is how the Bulletin of Rockefeller's National City Bank for June 1943 discusses "The Trend Towards World Inflation":

"Always great wars have brought about inflationary price increases. For war means, on the one hand, great expansion of purchasing power in the form of bank deposits and currency created by war financing, and, on the other, tremendous

dislocations of production and distribution caused by the mobilization of huge armies and their insatiable demands for equipment and supplies of all kinds.

"That the Second World War is proving no exception to past experience is amply revealed by the following charts and tables, showing wartime movements of commodity prices, note circulation and bank deposits in different countries. . . . The rise of commodity prices has been pretty much a world-wide phenomenon, but with great variation in the degree and timing of the advances, depending upon the particular circumstances of each country—the extent of self-sufficiency, the inflationary pressures, the efficiency of controls, etc.

"The greatest price disturbance has been in the Axis-exploited countries of Continental Europe, in certain of the Latin American countries, and in countries like Turkey, India and China. . . . At the outset of the war, the impetus to rising prices came mainly from the disruptions of normal channels of trade, currency depreciations—as in the case of sterling, the French franc and the Canadian dollar—and greatly increased transportation costs, particularly shipping. Later, as the war continued, spread and intensified, new forces appeared, more powerful than those earlier. One of them, the increased purchasing power put in circulation, stems from the enormous war expenditures. *Loss of confidence in currencies, flight into commodities, and hoarding have become more manifest in many areas.*"

These general features of inflation can be observed in all countries, regardless of their political regime, economic development, and relation to the war. Let us make a rapid survey of the world economic conditions, beginning with the Axis countries and their satellites, going through the colonial and semi-colonial lands, and ending with the United Nations.

World Inflation

Germany has spent over 100 billion dollars for military purposes since Hitler came to power. The national debt rose from 34 billions in June 1939 to over 167 billions of Reichsmarks last August. Reichsmarks in circulation have increased 196 per cent from 1938 to 1942, according to official statistics. Commercial bank deposits increased two and a half times from 1938 to 1941. Despite the loot from conquered and despoiled Europe, Germany is being terribly impoverished. As long ago as last Christmas there was "an unparalleled superfluity of cash awaiting spending, but nothing on which to spend it because of the famine of holiday goods of every variety. . . . Out of the impoverished Christmas markets there has sprung up a system of barter. . . . Family heirlooms, plate, rugs, electric utensils, sewing machines, cutlery and old clothing are indiscriminately offered in exchange for more seasonable goods, chiefly toys." (*New York Times*, December 24, 1942.) Since then things have worsened considerably.

Inflation had progressed so far in France a year ago that the French are collecting antiques, pictures, furs, silverware, canes at prices often 500 per cent higher than the year before. Rare postage stamps which are so compact that they can be carried in a matchbox are selling at fabulous prices. Boys go in for collecting bottles, because even an empty medicine bottle is worth five francs at any drug store.

Italy has been utterly bankrupted by the fascist regime and the war. Before Mussolini was overthrown, inflation had mounted to such heights that 39 per cent of all revenue was needed merely for payment of interest on the public debt. It remains to be seen what value, if any, the Italian lire still possesses.

According to the *New York Times* correspondent, "The Finns are fighting inflation even harder than they are the Russians . . . but whereas they seem to think that somehow they

can eventually get the best of the Russians, they have already begun to despair about inflation." The Bank of Finland has little foreign credit while its note circulation has jumped eight-fold. Shoes retail for 1,000 marks a pair instead of 150 marks as formerly. Meanwhile Finns are wearing shoes made of wood and cardboard. Such are the fruits of Mannerheim's war.

The Balkan states are in a similar financial condition. In Rumania the prices of vital commodities rose between 125 to 740 per cent between 1939 and 1942. During 1942 alone the increase was 50 per cent! The Norwegian price index was up 79 per cent in March this year; that of Portugal was up 90 per cent last October. In Franco's Spain real living costs as reflected in the black market are estimated to be three hundred per cent higher than in 1940. Everybody from the poorest beggar to the richest aristocrat and highest government official deals in some way or another with the black market. Almost everything—from bars of gold to food culled from city garbage pails—is bought or sold through illegal channels. In many countries the black market operations rival those on the public market. Punishments and executions have failed to stop its growth anywhere. Economic necessity and greed override the law and its enforcers

The Orient

In Japan, *Nichi-Nichi*, leading organ of the military clique, writes: "The lowering of the people's standards and increased savings are of vital importance. Taking the people of Japan as a whole, each one must live on one-third of his monthly income, allocating the remaining two-thirds for taxes, savings and other important fields."

Why? Because the new war program calls for a total expenditure of 30 billion yen in a year. This is two and a half times as large as Japan's whole national income in 1930 and is still larger than her already inflated income in 1940. Only 11 billion yen out of a total national income of 42 billion for 1942 are left for living expenses; this represents a decrease of 12 per cent compared to the previous year. It amounts to only 100 yen per person a year. This is about \$40 in American money.

How much currency the Japanese have issued at home in the occupied countries nobody knows. But Finance Minister Kaya this year announced to the Diet that Japanese currency had been divorced from gold and the President of the Bank of Japan warned that "Public confidence in Japanese currency is a vital question of the future."

Nichi-Nichi also warns the Japanese people not "to entertain optimistic views as to our future. The people must endure more hardships in their daily lives." These words portend the typhoon of runaway inflation. If such is the state of affairs in a conquering power, what must it be like in the conquered countries?

China, said Mrs. Wellington Koo, wife of the Chinese Ambassador to Great Britain, is near economic collapse. "The relentless pressure of war . . . makes itself felt in hunger and cold and worthless money, the grinding burden of increasing scarcity and rising prices." The Chinese, she said, do not worry much about rationing because there is little or nothing to ration. In the last year prices have gone up from five to fifty times.

"My stepdaughter is in the interior of China, working for the Red Cross. She gets a salary of \$50 a month, which is above that of most salaried workers. However, a meal costs her \$3, a yard of cloth \$10. A one-room hut, made of mud and straw, costs \$3,500. People cannot afford to buy coal which cost 1,000 Chinese dollars a ton."

If such is the economic situation of the favored upper classes, what must be the lot of the Chinese masses?

Ruin, poverty, famine, disease rage throughout the Orient. The fatal trio of food scarcity, monetary inflation and ever-mounting prices are at work in India. The wholesale price indices which had been increasing at a rate of 3 or 4 per cent monthly up to January of this year have since been jumping at an accelerated rate. The Bank of India's statement shows a continuous and heavy increase in note circulation. It is now three times as great as when the war started and is increasing faster than the rate of production. "The suffering of the masses," remarks the *New York Times* reporter, "is genuine and great."

Recently in Iran a three-year-old Buick sold in Teheran for \$18,000. Eggs are five for a dollar in an agricultural country. A rebuilt Russian typewriter costs \$1,400. And good Persian rugs sell for more in Persia than in New York.

Neutral Turkey, which has to maintain an army at the cost of more than a million lire a day, shows "all the characteristic indications of a classical inflation." Its Treasury's paper money in circulation is seven times greater than the pre-war circulation of about 100 million lire. The flight from the lire into goods, real estate or gold is proceeding rapidly. In nearby Palestine the cost of living has tripled since 1939.

On September 16 the Bank of England reported a record high of £981,089,000 of notes in circulation. Bank deposits stand at £209 billions as against £179 billions in 1941. Food prices show a 75 per cent rise since 1939, if one can credit the official statistics.

Across the Atlantic in the Caribbean Islands, in Mexico and Latin America the same story can be told. In Chile wholesale prices have gone up over 200 per cent since 1939. While production in the past 14 years has increased only 21 per cent, the note issue has jumped 340 per cent. The demonstrations of Mexican workers against the high cost of living have been duplicated throughout Latin America.

These are the economic consequences of the costliest war in history. Military expenditures of all the belligerents will exceed half a trillion dollars by the end of 1943, the Department of Commerce estimates. This sum is nearly three times the total monetary cost of the four years of the First World War. The *New York Times*, February 6, asserted:

"It amounts to \$231 for every living person. It could buy an automobile for every family, including those of Darkest Africa. It could provide humanity with 100,000,000 homes costing \$5,000 each."

These enormous expenditures are driving one country after another into bankruptcy via the road to inflation. The financial editor of the *New York World Telegram* nonchalantly confessed on June 15, 1943:

"It is rather obvious that most of the countries engaged in the war already are bankrupt, the cost of the conflict having increased their debts to points where they exceed their wealths. They can become solvent again only by raising the values of their assets in terms of their own currencies. The only alternative is to default on part of their debt payments. . . . Their currencies will have to be devalued to a point where other nations will be willing to accept them at their face values."

"Most of the countries engaged in the war already are bankrupt!" Meanwhile the war goes on. Its full effects are yet to be felt in the economic life of the peoples of the world. The rapidly developing inflation within the United States indicates that this disease will assume more and more malignant forms and lead to disastrous consequences in the strongest sector of world capitalism as well as in its weaker parts.

“What To Do With Italy?”

WHAT TO DO WITH ITALY, by Gaetano Salvemini and George LaPiana. 1943. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York. \$3.50
* * *

It has been the lot of liberals, literally from their very first appearance on the historical scene, to find the search for truth to be the most embarrassing of all human pursuits. The glaring discrepancy between their views and reality has bared itself constantly, especially in times of great social stress. If during periods of relative stability they found it necessary to apologize at regular intervals for themselves and the world, then in our generation, this has become almost a daily ordeal.

Liberals, above all liberal academicians, have solved this contradiction by enlisting as the most ignoble servants of reaction, and becoming the most vicious practitioners of the lie. Salvemini and LaPiana, however, have remained loyal to the old doctrine of liberalism. These two noted Italian scholars, refugees from Mussolini's thugs and now teachers of history at Harvard University, are among the few living academicians who still retain a modicum of respect for truth; and in dealing with events do not by and large hesitate to set down the actual facts alongside of their opinions and interpretations.

With the futile and outworn equipment of nineteenth century liberalism, they, in their latest book, still try to oppose the onrush of reaction and to solve the burning and unpostponable problems of our day, among which they correctly put the problem of “what to do with Italy.”

Let us see how the logic of events squares with the logic of liberalism.

Italy: 1918-1921

Italy entered the last war as a democracy and emerged from it, in the camp of the victors, still a democracy. In 1914-1918 capitalism in Italy and throughout the world had behind it not the years of economic stagnation and crisis that mark the interval between the two world wars, but several decades of relatively uninterrupted growth and prosperity. Capitalist democracy had therefore far more favorable conditions for demonstrating its viability in Italy after World War I than is the case today when, after 21 years of fascism, the country turns up a captive of the rival imperialist camp. But Salvemini and LaPiana argue to the contrary. They see a great future for a “democratic revolution” in Italy.

They have learned nothing from the events of 1918-1921 when the Italian democracy proved itself incapable of solving a single major problem during the post-war crisis that gripped the country. The Italian masses were then compelled to seek their own solution, just as is the case today. They rallied to the program of socialism.

The Italian Socialist Party which had 47,000 members in 1914 grew to more than 250,000 by 1920. The number of organized workers under the party's influence and direction leaped from 300,000 in 1914 to more than 2,000,000 in 1920. Even these significant figures and tempos of growth do not reflect quite fully the mighty surge of the Italian masses toward the socialist solution. In 1920 the workers seized the factories; the peasants were dividing the landlord's estates. Demoralization and panic prevailed among the ruling class. All the conditions obtained for an easy victory for the revolution, except one: a genuine revolutionary leadership.

It is precisely at this point, however, that our authors, in summing up these events, substitute a liberal fiction for historical reality. They maintain:

“The social revolution which had been feared did not take place only because the rank and file of the Italian people did not want it . . . The failure to carry on a revolution *when it would have met with little or no resistance* was in itself evidence of the common sense of the mass of the Italian people.” (Page 59. Our emphasis.)

The “people who did not want it” were actually engaged in making the social revolution. The ruling classes who most certainly did not want the revolution were powerless to prevent it. “It would have met with little or no resistance.” Why then was it not carried through? Was it because the revolution was left leaderless at the height of the crisis? Was it because the treachery of the social democratic leaders had caught the masses off-guard, paralyzed their self-action, and permitted passivity, disorganization and demoralization to set in? According to Salvemini and LaPiana, to answer these questions in the affirmative is to deny “common sense” to the Italian people.

The Fascist Counter-Revolution

What happened in Italy after the betrayal of the revolution by the Social Democratic leaders?

Our authors now return from the domain of liberal mythology to that of historical facts. They write:

“. . . The capitalists thought that the time had come to make the masses pay for the scare they had suffered and played ball with the Fascist hoodlums; the Nationalists, a noisy crowd of pseudo-intellectuals who had regarded the Fascists with contempt, now shook hands with them and joined in the fray; and, last but not least, the politicians who were in the government cast a benevolent eye upon these paladins of reaction and let the military chiefs, the police, and the courts more or less openly assist the Fascists in their criminal exploits.” (Page 60.)

This is the truth. The monarchy, the army, the courts, the police, all the government politicians “played ball with the Fascist hoodlums.” The entire state apparatus was placed at the disposal of fascism, in so far as this was possible at each stage. The finances were provided by Italian Big Business.

Salvemini and LaPiana write:

“. . . We may say that the entire large class reactionaries and conservatives, big business men, bankers, great landowners, the upper clergy, aristocrats of wealth and title, and a large section of the upper bourgeoisie were from the beginning or became afterwards, with few exceptions, firm supporters of the Fascist regime. It is enough to glance over the list of Fascist officialdom, especially of the *podesta*, or administrators of cities and towns; there, side by side with those of the Fascist parvenus, we find most of the names registered in the heraldry of Italy.” (Pages 166-167.)

Again,

“What Italy went through in that period from the fall of 1920 to the fall of 1926 was really a civil war in which the Italian people were betrayed: by the wealthy class which created the new Fascism; by the army generals and officers who supplied Fascist bands with weapons, ammunition and trucks; by the Giolitti government (and the ministers who followed him—J.G.W.) which allowed the Fascists to carry on their so-called punitive expeditions under the disguised protection of the police and with impunity from the courts; and finally, by the Monarchy which in the end abandoned

the country to the Fascists as a conquered territory." (Pages 58-59.)

Further,

"The fact is that it took Fascism six years of unequal struggle between a power which had at its disposal all the resources of the government, the police, the militia, and the Monarchy on the one hand, and, on the other, a reluctant people whose labor organizations had been wiped out, whose leaders had either betrayed them by going over to the enemy, or had been murdered, forced to flee, or merely rendered helpless by sweep of events." (Page 61.)

"The fact is . . ." Yes, these are the facts. They have been recorded, as our authors point out, "again and again in many languages by reliable historians," among them by Salvemini himself in this and three other books: *The Fascist Dictatorship in Italy*; *Under the Axe of Fascism*; *Italian Fascism*.

The Mind of a Liberal

The complicity of capitalist democracy in bringing fascism to power in Italy is impossible to deny. How then can anyone retain faith in so rotten a system? Very simply: by using the old subterfuge of explaining facts away *psychologically* when it is too embarrassing to explain them *politically*.

Years ago, fascism used to be explained away by such banalities as "war psychosis," "post-war neuroses," and similar pseudo-scientific verbiage. Salvemini and LaPiana now serve up a hardly superior current variety:

"A strange combination of muddy thinking and cheap Machiavellianism got hold of various groups . . ." Or, "they all cherished the illusion . . ." Or, "mistakes and blunders" were committed. "Strange mystery . . ." "Unfathomable mystery . . ." The latter expressions are reserved for those emergencies when events descend with crushing force and nothing remains for our scholars except to throw up their hands in perplexity, horror and despair.

Strange combinations, muddy thoughts, cheap Machiavellianism, blunders, mysteries, illusions and lamentations dance through their pages. These are gloomy companions of a disturbed imagination at odds with reality.

What staggers the Italian liberals the most is that so many seemingly splendid people "play ball with Fascism," and condone any and all deals with reaction.

If fascism won in Italy thanks to the treachery of the social democracy and the aid of the "democratic" state at home, then Mussolini's regime was able to sustain itself only thanks to the aid of the "democracies" abroad.

This, too, the book affirms:

"Six years of struggle (1920-1926) which would have ended in the victory of the people, if Fascism, besides having the support of such groups and classes in Italy as we have here described had not been protected and aided also by powerful forces outside Italy." (Page 61.)

What were these forces?

"It seems that the two countries in which Mussolini and his Fascism achieved the greatest success in publicity and popularity were England and the United States." (Page 61.)

In England and the United States, statesmen and bankers, diplomats and corporation heads, professors and corporation lawyers, politicians and journalists, judges and intellectuals, Catholic priests and Protestant laymen, in short the entire galaxy of "democracy," sang the "praises of Mussolini and Fascism on all occasions."

Profoundly symbolic of the class connection between Big Business, "democracy" and fascism is the fact that Myron Taylor, former head of United States Steel Corporation, had

hanging in his office side by side the inscribed photographs of Franklin D. Roosevelt and—Benito Mussolini.

Salvemini and LaPiana select from hundreds of other instances. For example, in 1923 Otto H. Kahn, head of the Wall Street banking house of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., hailed Mussolini as a "great man, beloved and revered in his country, a self-made man . . . no enemy of liberty . . . no dictator in the generally understood sense of the word . . ."

"I feel certain," Kahn added, "that American capital invested in Italy will find safety, encouragement, opportunity and reward."

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University and one-time winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace, gratefully accepted Mussolini's friendship and decorations. He paid homage to fascism as a "form of government of the very first order of excellence"; and found it "safe to predict that just as Cromwell made modern England, so Mussolini would make modern Italy."

English statesmen never failed the Duce.

"In the chain of events which permitted Mussolini to strengthen his dictatorship, England played a conspicuous part. Prime Minister Baldwin and Foreign Minister Curzon helped Mussolini, in 1923, to save his face after his criminal attack on Corfu. At the time of the crisis brought about by the Matteotti murder, while Italy was seething with indignation and Fascism was on the verge of ruin, the English foreign minister, Sir Austen Chamberlain in December 1924, made the move of paying an official visit to the Duce. It was the first time that such a dignitary of the English government had ever condescended to pay such a compliment to Italy. The English minister rushed ostentatiously to shake the hand of the Duce which was at that moment, in the opinion of the Italians, wet with Matteotti's blood." (Page 71.)

Churchill and Mussolini

Churchill's eloquence soared on many occasions in paeans to the man he now so righteously contemns. In January 1927, Churchill said in an interview, "If I were an Italian I would don the Fascist Black Shirt." In 1931 he acclaimed the "monumental work of Mussolini." In September 1938 he discovered that Mussolini towered above Washington and Cromwell; and in passing praised the Italian king for his acumen in accepting fascism. In 1940, with England already at war, he told the Italian people that the Duce was "a great man."

Let us add that Mussolini was the recipient not only of plaudits, diplomatic favors, etc., but also of hard cash. For instance, when the fascist regime was caught in 1925 in the vice of a desperate financial crisis, a consortium of American bankers headed by J. P. Morgan floated, on behalf of the Italian government, a loan of \$100,000,000. Mussolini was enabled to stabilize both the lira and his regime.

All this barely scrapes the surface of the "democratic" record vis a vis Italian fascism. The book infers as much.

Still another powerful international force protected and aided Mussolini. This was the Vatican.

Salvemini and LaPiana devote more than one-fourth of their volume to the analysis of the Holy See's role and devious policy in support of Mussolini. They say correctly:

"No historian, whether of the present or of the future, will be able to understand and explain fully the many Fascist successes in international affairs without taking into account the friendly relations between the Vatican and the Fascist dictatorship." (Page 81.)

Inside Italy, the Vatican moved cautiously at first. Mussolini received his initial favors from the Catholic Church in this

country. Citing official sources, the authors prove this to the hilt. On page 68, they write:

"In 1924, Cardinal O'Connell of Boston, while the civil war was going on in Italy, stated that

'Italy was in process of undergoing a marvelous transformation since Benito Mussolini had seized the reigns of government . . . I have never in my life witnessed a change so impressing. I see perfect order, cleanliness, work, industrial development (*Progresso Italo-Americano*, January 3, 1924).'

"In 1926, Cardinal O'Connell accepted a high Fascist decoration and, in his address of thanks to Mussolini's representative, he stated:

'Mussolini is a genius in the field of government, given to Italy by God . . .' (*Il Carroccio* XXXIV, p. 553.)"

The Vatican and Mussolini

In 1925, Cardinal Mundelein, the Archbishop of Chicago, stated in an interview that "Mussolini is a great big man, the man of the time." In October 1926, Cardinal Dougherty, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, referred to the "admirable work of the Duce and the Fascist government." Cardinal Hayes of New York accepted four high decorations from the Duce and each time expressed high praise to the donor.

These statements and actions are typical of innumerable others made by the highest dignitaries of the Catholic hierarchy, not to mention mere archbishops, bishops, or priests, friars, monks and nuns, or the editors of hundreds of Catholic diocesan bulletins, newspapers and periodicals.

This flood of support and adulation turned into a tidal wave after Pope Pius XI stated on December 20, 1926 that Mussolini had been sent by Divine Providence.

It would take us too far afield, even to summarize succinctly the wealth of material gathered by the authors concerning the relations between the Holy See and fascism and contained in the best chapter of this book. (See Chapter IV. The Vatican.) Nor would such a summary do justice to the scholarship and courage of the authors in following the Vatican step by step through the years of fascist rule. But one additional fact is worth noting.

On June 13 of this year, the Pope delivered, in person, an address to 25,000 Italian workers "gathered in Rome from various parts of the country, especially from Northern Italy." Salvemini and LaPiana point out that all the assembled workers who "heard the papal address could not fail to understand that the whole papal sermon was delivered for the purpose of telling them that they should not revolt against the Fascist regime and should refrain from 'civil disobedience.'" The Vatican supported fascism to the bitter end.

If these were the forces that sustained reaction in the past, by what logic could they be depended upon to oppose it today and in the future? Only by the logic of liberalism, which inhabits a world of its own, feeding on past memories.

The lessons of Italy were repeated in all their essential features in Germany in 1933. The authors themselves do not fail to point out that the "big industrial firms, banks, shipping, and insurance companies, in Italy no less than in Germany, were, together with the army, responsible for the creation of the dictatorship." In the Spanish Civil War, the "democracies" played essentially the same role as in the case of Italy and Germany; while the Pope reserved his highest praise of Mussolini for the occasion of the latter's entry—jointly with Hitler—into the Spanish "crusade." Franco, the butcher, had and still has the full support of the Vatican.

To know all this, to say it, and to prove it, as the authors

do, is to demonstrate that the Allies are counter-revolutionary, that they tend not toward "democracy" but to blackest reaction and dictatorship. But Salvemini and LaPiana conclude just the opposite. They see the hope of mankind in Churchill and Roosevelt, their "high principles" and their war aims.

Allied Policy

Yet the ideas of liberalism enter into sharpest conflict with reality precisely when it comes to the actual and not pretended policies and war aims of Washington and London. The course of the war has already demonstrated with crushing force that the "democracies"—not to mention the Vatican—have not altered their peacetime conduct in any significant way.

Salvemini and LaPiana do not hide their genuine alarm in citing the Darlan-Giraud deal and the advances to Otto Hapsburg, the Austrian pretender. They analyze in detail the negotiations and close collaboration between the Allies and the Vatican; they warn about the implications of the campaign to whitewash the Italian monarchy, etc., etc.

In their book, which was completed before the downfall of Mussolini, the authors say:

"As far as the American public can judge from what has leaked out about the plans being secretly and discreetly concocted in high circles, our diplomats in Washington are determined to supplant Mussolini with an Italian Darlan or Petain . . . If such a plan is carried out, the Savoy monarchy will remain as a guarantee against any radical revolution. A coalition of former leaders, the big business men and clericals supported by the Vatican, would take up the government of the country under the protection of the American and English armies of occupation. Some of the extreme fascist laws would be abolished, some concessions would be made to save the face of the democracies, and the new regime would, to all appearances, be hailed as a fulfillment of the terms of the Atlantic Charter . . ."

Ironically enough, the publishers released the book the same week that the Badoglio government surrendered to the Allies. Since that time, events have completely verified the above-cited analysis of the authors, much to their own dismay no doubt.

Nevertheless, Salvemini and LaPiana remain staunch supporters of the Allies and their war. The most rational explanation they have to offer for the conduct of Roosevelt and Churchill reads as follows:

"The lot of gangsters has become a comfortable one throughout the world, thanks to the fear of revolution which blinds the leaders of the liberty-loving peoples." (Page 15.)

Unable to face reality, Salvemini and LaPiana who suffer from a self-inflicted blindness impute their own affliction to Churchill and Roosevelt who proceed with open eyes from the knowledge that it is impossible really to stabilize capitalism in Europe and to avert the socialist revolution on the old "democratic" basis.

Salvemini and LaPiana fumble in the dark because they hold on to the ideas of liberalism which life itself has long ago discarded; and which can and do serve nowadays only as the most convenient cover for reaction. Old Labriola, one of their greatest countrymen, taught a lesson which they have never bothered to learn: "Ideas do not fall from heaven."

No one has sucked the ideas of liberalism out of his thumb. Nor are they something good for all times and under all conditions. These ideas arose in the course of the class struggle. They have their class roots in the bourgeoisie. They played a great and progressive role in the struggle of the rising bourgeoisie against feudalism. When capitalism was young and vigorous the "logical form of bourgeois domination was the

democratic republic." (Engels.) But capitalism has long since passed this heyday when democracy could and did serve as sheet-anchor for the whole bourgeois and even feudal regime; when everything which used to be reactionary could behave as democratic.

But there is another "logical form" just as inherent in capitalism: that of dictatorship. This form manifested itself progressively in the case of England (Cromwell) and France (Napoleon Bonaparte). As capitalism developed the trend to dictatorship tended more and more to manifest itself in a reactionary way. France relearned the lesson that the logical form of bourgeois domination is also the dictatorship under Napoleon the Little while Germany learned it under Bismarck. So long as capitalism remained in its ascendancy democracy and dictatorship could alternate and combine in many peculiar and transitional ways. But with the entry of capitalism into its highest and final stage the logical form of bourgeois domination is and can be only the dictatorship (Italy, 1921; Germany, 1933; Spain, 1938). This same historical process found still another expression in the rise of a new and higher democracy with its class roots in the proletariat. This democracy was established by the Russian Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky in October 1917, in Russia. The regression of proletarian democracy into Stalinist totalitarianism is purely *episodic*; the regression of outlived capitalist democracy is *chronic*.

In May 1929, Leon Trotsky explained this historical process, as follows:

"We cannot measure our epoch with the yardstick of the nineteenth century, which was *par excellence* the century of the extension of democracy. In many respects the twentieth century will be more differentiated from the nineteenth than the whole of modern history differs from that of the Middle Ages. . . . After the installation of revolutionary power in Russia and the check to revolutionary movements in a succession of other countries, we witnessed the establishment of fascist dic-

tatorship in the whole of southern and eastern Europe. How are we to explain this dousing of the fires on the altars of democracy?

"It is sometimes said that in these cases it is a question of backward nations, or of those lacking maturity. This explanation happens to be just good enough in the case of Italy. But even in cases where the explanation is appropriate, it is not enlightening. In the nineteenth century it was considered a law that backward nations were climbing the steps of democracy. Then why does the twentieth century push them along **the road of dictatorship**? I think that the explanation emerges from the facts themselves. Democratic institutions show that they cannot support the pressure of contemporary conflicts which are at one time international, and at another domestic, and on the other occasions both international and domestic at one and the same time. Is this a good thing or an evil? At all events, it is a fact.

"By analogy with electro-technology, democracy may be defined as a system of interrupters and insulators against the too powerful currents of the national or social struggle. There is no epoch in human history so saturated with antagonisms as ours. A hypertension of the current makes itself more and more felt along various points of the European system. Under a too high tension, the 'fuses' of democracy—class and international animosities—'blow out.' Hence the short circuits of dictatorship. Naturally the weakest 'interrupters' are the first to give way. But the force of domestic and world conflicts does not weaken; it grows. It is doubtful that it is destined to calm down, given that the process has so far taken hold only of the periphery of the capitalist world. Gout begins in the little finger of a hand or in the big toe, but once on the way it goes right to the heart."

When history herself has rendered the ideas of liberalism impotent and illogical, the spokesmen of liberalism have no choice but to follow suit.

Reviewed by *John G. Wright*

Spain: Monarchist and Republican Maneuvers

Resolution of the Spain Group in Mexico, Fourth International

EDITOR'S NOTE: The following document presents the views of the Spanish comrades now residing in Mexico. On a number of points—notably its support of the slogan of a provisional government and its non-support of the slogan of a Constituent Assembly—it appears to the editors to be erroneous. Other comrades have indicated their intention to take up these questions in subsequent issues of *Fourth International*.

* * *

The world press has repeatedly printed dispatches and rumors on the coming reestablishment of the monarchy in Spain. Franco himself has been compelled, for the second time, to make known the official opinion of his dictatorship. At various intervals since the end of the civil war the restoration of the Bourbons has been widely discussed, but with greater insistence since Archbishop Spellman, special envoy of Roosevelt, went through Spain on his trip to Rome. At the same time, the enemies of the socialist revolution in the emigration are agitating and attempting to constitute republican governments and they aspire, with an insistence undaunted by the kicks they

receive, to obtain the sanction and help of Washington and London.

The people of Spain, particularly the proletariat and the peasantry, overthrew the monarchy which was traditionally responsible for the backwardness, the misery and the political oppression in which the country lived. The republic, first result of the popular ferment, showed itself absolutely incapable of solving any of the problems handed down by the monarchy, and of lifting the country out of misery, backwardness and oppression. The decade that the Spanish political crisis lasted showed that the basic evils, without whose suppression progress is impossible, flow from the system of private property, independently of the political form that it adopts. The opposition between bourgeois property and agrarian feudal property that in past centuries gave birth to the revolutions that assured the development of capitalism, making possible bourgeois-democratic regimes, has ceased to exist in modern times. The feudal property, where it has not been destroyed through revolution, has blended

with capitalist property interweaving with it in a thousand ways. The opposition between feudal and capitalist property, from which the bourgeoisie in its time obtained one of its fundamental revolutionary characteristics, has disappeared, being converted into juxtaposition or fusion. Its other principal revolutionary characteristic—the perspective of technical progress based on capitalist property—has also gone. On the contrary, the system of property is an obstacle to technical progress, creates unemployment, misery, political oppression, the degradation of the people, lack of culture, and favors dictatorial regimes, fascist or military. The bourgeoisie is now, in every aspect, a reactionary class which no progressive solution could tolerate. The world in general and Spain in particular will find a way out only through the socialist revolution. The efforts of our organization in Spain as well as in emigration should serve to prepare the taking of political power by the proletariat and the peasantry. To the task all the partial demands should be subordinated; this duty is the only one worthy of the revolutionary masses.

The republic succeeded the monarchy in Spain. During its existence the republic was attacked continually by the bourgeoisie (incessant attempts at *coup d'etats*, the attempt of the military in 1932, the military-fascist revolt of 1936), and by the proletariat and peasants (economical and political strikes, insurrection of 1934, insurrection of 1936, insurrection of May 1937, and socialist achievements of the first period of the civil war). Following the line of development marked by historical evolution, the revolutionary cycle which opened with the declaration of the republic persistently tended to turn into the socialist revolution. Because of the policies of the workers' organizations, opposed to the revolution, this failed, but then there was left the extreme alternative of Franco. Historical events, all the more irrefutable the greater magnitude they possess, demonstrate that while the proletariat and the peasantry tend toward the socialist revolution, the bourgeois and other reactionary strata tend toward dictatorial regimes that assure them the free right of exploitation and oppression of the poor. The undecided struggle between the capitalist-reactionary and the proletarian-revolutionary extremes results, and can result again in the republic as a temporary by-product; not the democratic-bourgeois, but the bourgeois and pseudo-democratic republic. Yielding to the revolutionary pressure of the masses, the monarchy left the scene. On the terrain of the republic, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat fought. The bourgeoisie tried to replace the republic with a dictatorial regime whenever it felt sufficiently strong; the proletariat, in spite of the opposition of most of its organizations, tried to institute socialism in place of the republic. And once the proletariat has armed itself, all of Spain was socialized. As the result of the anti-socialist politics of the leaders of the labor organizations in Spain, the proletariat was again thrown back during the civil war, disarmed, and the majority of its achievements suppressed. The road to socialism thus closed, the bourgeoisie represented by Franco triumphed.

But this triumph, in the midst of a Europe that is already shaking from one end to the other in search of revolution, did not give the desired tranquillity and stability. Seeing itself facing difficulties anew, one part of the bourgeoisie clamors for a monarchy; another, composed largely of the old republican political parties, as well as the same socialists and Stalinists who closed the path to socialism, pray for the republic and place offerings on the altar of Roosevelt and Churchill. The proletariat should respond to both of them: No, Messrs. monarchists, your regime is a hated and opprobrious past, equal

in the last analysis to that of Franco. But neither do we want you republicans, because your regime, besides being impotent to solve the great problems posed in Spain, has as its object the prevention of the truly effective solution. If we accept it, it would take us, through a round-about route, to another dictatorship. The proletariat has its own program, and its own system, the best for organizing the struggle of the masses against fascism and the only one that can offer a permanent solution—through the medium of a socialist state.

The Maneuver of a Monarchy

In effect, the plan to reestablish the monarchy represents, on the part of the Spanish reactionary classes, in addition to the generals and the clergy, a maneuver aimed to avoid the revolutionary fall of Francoism and of themselves. On the part of the United States and of England, who will support this maneuver in case it seems too cynical and too dangerous to uphold Franco, it signifies likewise a Jesuitical move against the socialist revolution. Whatever change may serve the convenience of the United States and England, it will be based on the same repressive apparatus that Franco utilized, not excluding the Falangists, baptized with another name. Yankee-British imperialism will appear throughout Europe as the ally and protector of the servants of fascism. The world has had colossal proof in the dirty game played in Africa and in Sicily.

This is the fundamental pattern marked out by the English-speaking imperialists for all the countries now occupied by Hitler. The same will be done in Spain if it seems profitable to them financially-politically to make any changes. The monarchy would be as injurious to the interests and to the political liberty of the workers of Spain as the clerical-Falangism of Franco. It would be based exactly on the same social elements and it would employ, with unimportant changes in personnel, and identical system of repression. The Spanish militants of the Fourth International should declare themselves strongly against the reestablishment and denounce it as a dirty maneuver, actually or potentially patronized by the imperialists in London and Washington. No means of fighting it can be excluded. Our militants must be aware and explain to the people that in the coming period the United States and England will reveal themselves as the most reactionary powers on the planet. The United States will be even worse than England.

Another maneuver, of different character and origin, but with the same purpose of choking off the proletarian revolution in its formative stage, is being plotted by the exiled Stalinist, republican and socialist leaders. They will try to carry out the plot at a reunion of the deputies of the old Cortes. Its ex-president, Martinez Barrio, is trying to constitute a government under his direction, probably having him as president. The Negrin group, on its part, does not cease to be "the government" and asks recognition of its authority as a condition of any agreement with the other groups. The Stalinists don't know for the moment whether to play along with Negrin, as in the past, or to change to Martinez Barrio. Prieto sounds out the dominating imperialists and finds they have no interest in supporting the republican moves; and announces himself favorable toward national unity, that is, toward unity against the class struggle. All the differences and rivalries of the groups have absolutely no value for the workers. Republicans, socialists and Stalinists—the same as to say three categories of bourgeois republicans—adopt as a common banner the reestablishment of the republic based on the constitution of 1931. They propose to give to Spain, as an ideal organization, the bourgeois republic.

The Spanish workers should not allow themselves to be deceived by these political horse-traders whose spines are so flexible when facing the imperialists. They speak of democracy and liberty because otherwise they could not even aspire to govern. If they by chance should once again arrive in power, they would administer it, as in the past, with the dictatorial law of the Defense of the Republic, administrative arrests, the state of alarm, press censorship, the repression of workers' demonstrations, the suppression of workers' meetings, and the suspension of revolutionary newspapers. The Spanish proletariat cannot expect more liberties or more rights than those it can conquer through the struggle against its class enemies. The language of national unity attempts now, in advance, to sabotage the fight of the proletariat and peasants against their exploiters.

The Maneuver of a Republic

The Stalinist, socialist and republican horse-traders seek also, like their monarchist competitors, the help of the English-speaking imperialists. To show their complete harmlessness, to be more accurate, their basic anti-revolutionary nature, all the groups vie with each other in offering agreements to the bloody accomplices of Franco and the Falange. If Indalecio Prieto applies his genius to perfecting a Spanish version of "Christian order," dictated by the representatives of Wall Street, the Stalinists extend their collaboration toward the "honest" merchants jailed by Franco himself because of their scandalous speculations, appeal to the *requetes*, and give promise of attracting to themselves the generals stained with the blood of the workers. It is said that, on his part, Martinez Barrio, in preparatory discussions, proposes to annul—and this would be one of the first acts of the Cortes—all the legislation after 1935. The blow would be directed against the achievements that the workers attained in 1936 when they conquered the reactionary uprising.

Whatever their differences may be today, all these scheming politicians will easily reach an agreement as soon as there is the slightest possibility of receiving the blessing of the Anglo-American bourgeoisie. The latter, for the moment, deals with Franco, but if it is convenient it will favor the ascent to power of the monarchy, which seems most probable after the Italian events ushered in a new epoch of proletarian offensives. And only when the revolution shows itself to be gravely threatening, will the Anglo-U.S. rulers resort, in order to check it, to the farcical assembly of Stalinists, republicans, socialists. Then this "Cortes" would proceed to govern, leaving intact the majority of the bureaucracy created by fascism, its body of officials, and its repressive bodies, as well as its judiciary. With these as a base, the Stalinist-republican-socialist coalition, shouting for "national unity" would plunge the bayonet into the proletarian revolution.

The proletarian cannot expect anything from the monarchists or from the bourgeois republicans who call themselves "communists" or "socialists." Today, even more imperiously than before, the proletarian revolution is the only possible salvation. The experience acquired from 1931 to 1939 should not be forgotten. The proletariat and the peasantry will not solve their problems or assure guarantees of liberty without prolonging the struggle against Franco and the Falange until the socialist revolution is reached. The republican program, which pretends to transform Spain into a "strong" republic, absolutely impracticable historically, will again prepare the road for future clerico-military dictatorships.

Spanish workers! The monarchists are the same Falangists

with another name, who even now torture and oppress you. But the people of the republican program are the same ones that permitted the military revolt and facilitated its triumph, strangling the socialist revolution. One must be aware of this more than ever. Repulse and combat energetically the monarchists.

And to the republicans, who speak of democracy and of the fight against Franco, we must say: We have our own program, the social revolution through the taking of power by the proletariat. You propose unity under a bourgeois program which has repeatedly proven itself deceitful and impotent. In the future these characteristics will be more evident, exacerbated by the Anglo-American imperialists to whose subjection you are anxious to submit us. The power most interested in conquering Franco, and the largest in number, is the proletariat and the peasantry. Disciplining ourselves to your program, and undertaking to walk a false road leading to future defeats would considerably diminish our capacity to fight. The program of the social revolution is one that can mobilize the most energy among the masses and summon the greatest capacity for sacrifice. Your bourgeois program of unity, besides being a snare to the revolution, is the least able to crush the Falange. We, even though being the overwhelming majority, do not ask that you submit to a unity based on our socialist program.

The workers who remain in the Stalinist and socialist parties do not have a correct socialist program, inasmuch as their parties are totally anti-revolutionary. But the workers, who have observed the conduct of their parties during the civil war, have become more or less aware of this situation. To break away from the old parties they await only an opportunity. It is perfectly legitimate to speak generally of a socialist program of the workers.

Like Karl Liebknecht we reject all unity that has as its purpose the blocking of the road toward revolution; but we offer the challenge, seeing that you speak of conquering Franco. You think you will restore the republic as a durable regime; we are convinced, through the past experience of the republic, that only the proletarian revolution can give the radical solution and end the fascist peril. Franco's falangist dictatorship is the first and principal obstacle in our path. We propose a common struggle to overthrow this common obstacle. If you do not accept anything except "uniting" in terms of your bourgeois program, it is evident that the fight against Franco interests you only conditionally—and the condition is to maintain the yoke of capitalism on the workers and the farmers. We do not impose any conditions for entering into the combat together on the following points:

Amnesty for all political prisoners without restrictions or conditions.

Return of jobs to all those discharged because of political reprisals.

Freedom of speech, meetings, demonstrations, and the press. Down with the Falangist assassins, down with Franco.

For general municipal elections summoned by a provisional government.

The working class cannot tolerate that the elections be convoked by Franco, or any other of the elements connected with him, even if called monarchist. It would be a complete fraud. Equally must be rejected the remnants of the "legal" government, who may constitute themselves on the parliamentary basis of the ex-Popular Front. Their primary object would be to substitute for the revolutionary struggle against Franco and the Falange diplomatic maneuvers in the service of the United States and England. Whatever its makeup, it would be a government of reconciliation with the accomplices of the Falange.

For the workers and peasants it is not a matter of declaring and upholding the bourgeois republic but solely of sweeping away all Falangist authorities, creating the most democratic position possible that will permit the masses to use their own strength, their radicalism, and to act accordingly.

The demand for a provisional government should have a character complementary to the general municipal elections. It is simply a means of assuring greater liberty of expression in the voting. On our part we are convinced that the Spanish proletariat and peasants, as soon as they obtain their first serious triumph against fascism, will launch into the reestablishment of the various organs of proletarian democracy—the committees that appeared by the thousands after the victory of the 19th of July. The municipal elections, which undoubtedly would make a clean sweep of all the elements connected with Franco, would create a favorable situation for the birth and growth of the organs of proletarian democracy. The possibility of immediately demanding the power for the Committees exists and is left open. And if, for any reason, the masses pass through another pseudo-democratic parliamentary stage before putting

themselves in a position to reclaim power, they would still be in the best possible position to go forward. The elections for deputies to the Cortes would have the maximum democratic expression possible under the limitations and falsehoods of bourgeois democracy. But a revolutionary party cannot even promise to uphold the slogan of “a constitutional assembly.” The Spanish masses already have a great experience, and it is very probable that they would immediately pass from a triumph against Franco to creating their own organs of democracy. The obligation of all revolutionists is to facilitate a situation that will permit workers and farmers, soldiers and marines to form their committees and to prepare them for taking power.

All the anti-Falangist programs of a bourgeois-republican character are at least as anti-revolutionary as they are anti-Francoist.

Let us put an end to the maneuvers and the pseudo-democratic demagogy which is directed, in the last analysis, against the proletariat.

Long live the Spanish socialist revolution!

Long live the European and world revolution!

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Letters on the Spanish Revolution

By LEON TROTSKY

EDITOR'S NOTE: In April 1931, King Alfonso fled Spain and the republic was declared. But it solved none of the vital needs of the masses, above all the agrarian question. The following letters, written in the first months of the revolution, have not only historical value, but are illuminating to read in the light of the events in Italy which, like Spain, has a backward agriculture as its predominant economy but at the same time has a proletariat, concentrated in a few industrial cities, at least equal in culture, militancy and qualities of leadership to any section of the workers elsewhere in the world.

* * *

The Character of the Revolution

June 18, 1931

The course of events today puts on the agenda an imposing question on the subject of which the Left Opposition can and must say its word. I speak of the *Spanish revolution*. It is not a question now of a criticism after the event; it is a question for the International Left Opposition* of an active intervention in the events in order to prevent a catastrophe.

We have few forces. But the advantage of a revolutionary situation consists precisely in the fact that even a small group can become a great force in a brief space of time, providing that it gives a correct prognosis and that it issues correct slogans in time. I allude not only to our Spanish section, directly involved by the events, but also to all our sections, because the further the revolution advances, the more it will draw the attention of the workers throughout the world. The verification

of the political lines will take place before the eyes of the world proletariat vanguard. If we are really the Left wing, if we are really strong through our correct revolutionary conception, we must show this strength in a particularly sharp manner during a revolutionary situation. If we are really internationalists, we must do this work on an international scale.

Two fundamental questions must be put squarely by us: (1) the question of the general character of the Spanish revolution and the *strategical* line that flows from it, and (2) the question of the correct tactical utilization of democratic slogans and of parliamentary and revolutionary possibilities. I endeavored to say everything essential on these questions in my last work on Spain.* Here I want only to express myself succinctly on the totality of the questions on which we must *pass over to the offensive against the whole line of the Communist International*.

Ought we to look forward in Spain to an intermediate revolution between the accomplished republican revolution and the future proletarian revolution, a so-called “workers and peasants” revolution with a “democratic dictatorship”? Yes or no? The whole strategical line is determined by the reply to this question. The official (Communist) Spanish party is sunk up its neck in an ideological confusion on this fundamental question; a confusion which was sown and is still being sown by the epigones and which finds its expression in the program of the C.I. We have here the possibility of unmasking from day to day before the proletariat vanguard, in the light of living facts, the whole emptiness, the whole absurdity and at the same

*International Left Opposition (ILO) was the original name of the worldwide Trotskyist organization.—Ed.

**The Spanish Revolution In Danger*, by Leon Trotsky. It was written on May 28, 1931.—Ed.

time, the terrific danger represented by the fiction of a middle-of-the-road, intermediate revolution.

The leading comrades of all the sections must have in mind that it is precisely we, as the Left wing, who must place ourselves upon a *solid scientific* basis. Thoughtless dabbling with ideas, journalistic charlatanism in the style of Landau and Co. (German centrists) are contrary to the very essence of a proletarian revolutionary faction. The fundamental questions of the revolution must be studied in the same way that engineers study the resistance of matter or doctors study anatomy and pathology. The problem of the permanent revolution, thanks to the events in Spain, has now become the central problem of the International Left Opposition.

The questions of democratic slogans, of the utilization of the elections and, later on, of the Cortes, are questions of revolutionary tactics subordinated to the general question of strategy. But the most correct strategical formulas are worth nothing if one does not find a tactical solution to these formulas at every given moment. However, matters look very bad in Spain from this point of view. The French newspapers carry dispatches according to which the leader of the Catalonian Federation, Maurin, is reported to have said in his Madrid speech that his organization will not participate in the elections because it does not believe in their "sincerity." Is it possible that this is true? It would mean that Maurin is not approaching the problems of revolutionary tactics from the point of view of the mobilization of the forces of the proletariat, but from the point of view of morality and petty bourgeois sentimentalism. Two weeks ago I would have believed that the bourgeois press was recounting stupidities; but after having acquainted myself with the platform of the Catalonian Federation, I am obliged to acknowledge that this news, monstrous as it may be, is nevertheless not impossible and must not be excluded in advance.

* * *

Following the Russian experience, the question of democratic slogans in the revolution was posed anew in the course of the struggle in China. However, all the European sections did not have the possibility of following all the stages of this struggle. Thanks to this fact, the discussion on these questions had a semi-academic character for certain comrades and for certain groups. But today, these questions are the very incarnation of the struggle, of life. Can we permit ourselves to be bound hand and foot at so important a historical turning point? Just as during the Sino-Russian conflict which threatened to let loose a war we could not lose ourselves in discussions over whether it was necessary to support the Soviet Union or Chiang Kai-shek so today, face to face with the Spanish events we cannot even admit an indirect responsibility for the sectarian, semi-Bakuninist superstitions of certain groups.

Problems of the Spanish Revolution

June 24th, 1931

Unfortunately, I don't have enough information to know how the various groups of the Spanish communists pose the political questions of the day. The analysis of the revolutionary situation is, in such a case, more difficult than playing chess blindfolded. On all questions there remain some points on which I require additional elaboration.

The main part of my article concerning the dangers threatening the Spanish revolution consists in proving that between the bourgeois republican revolution of April of this year, and the proletarian revolution to come, there is no room for a special

"workers and peasants" revolution.* Incidentally, I noted that this does not mean that the party of the proletariat has to devote itself to the peaceful assembling of strength until "the final and decisive conflict." Such a conception would be a philistine anti-revolutionary one. While there cannot be either an intermediary *revolution* or an intermediary *regime*, there can and will be intermediary mass actions, strikes, demonstrations, clashes with the police and the troops, tumultuous revolutionary convulsions in which the communists will naturally be at the most exposed fighting points. What may be the historical meaning of those intermediary fights? On the one hand, they may introduce democratic changes in the bourgeois republican regime. On the other hand, they will prepare the masses to conquer power in order to create a proletarian regime.

The participation of the communists in these fights, and especially a leading participation, demands from them not only a clear understanding of the development of the revolution as a whole, but also the capacity to put forward at the right moment such partial, sharp, fighting slogans that by themselves don't derive from the "program," but are dictated by the circumstances of the day and lead the masses forward.

The enormous role of the Bolshevik slogan "Down with the ten capitalist ministers" is well known, in 1917, at the time of the coalition between the conciliators and the bourgeois liberals. The masses still trusted the socialist conciliators but the most trustful masses always have an instinctive distrust for the bourgeoisie, for the exploiters and for the capitalists. On this was built the Bolshevik tactic during that specific period. We didn't say "Down with the socialist ministers," we didn't even advance the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government" as a fighting slogan of the moment, but instead we hammered on one and the same point: "Down with the ten capitalist ministers." This slogan played an enormous role, because it gave the masses the opportunity to learn from their own experience that the capitalist ministers were closer and dearer to the conciliators than the working masses.

Slogans of that type are the best fitted for the present stage of the Spanish revolution. The proletarian vanguard is fully interested in pushing the Spanish socialists to take over the whole power. For that purpose, it is necessary to split the coalition. The next task is the fight for the expulsion of the bourgeois ministers from the coalition. The achievement of this task in full or in part is conceivable only in connection with important political events, under pressure of new mass movements, and so on. Thus, in Russia, under the constant pressure of the masses, first Guchkov, Miliukov, then Prince Lvov, were ousted from the coalition government, which was then headed by Kerensky; the number of "socialists" in the government rose, and so on. After the arrival of Lenin, the Bolshevik party did not solidarize itself for one moment with Kerensky and the conciliators, but it helped the masses to push the bourgeoisie out of power and to test the government of the conciliators in practice. That was an indispensable stage on the road of the Bolshevik movement to power.

Insofar as it is possible to see from far away, the elections to the Cortes will show an extreme weakness of the rightist republicans of the Zamora and Maura type, and will bring about an overwhelming majority of petty-bourgeois conciliators

*"The Spanish Revolution in Danger," June, 1931. Pioneer Publishers. The "democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasantry," as a state-form in between bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship, was a theory then promulgated by the Stalinists.—Ed.

of different coloration: Radicals, Radical-Socialists and "socialists." Notwithstanding this, we can expect almost with certainty the socialists and Radical-Socialists to cling with all their forces to their allies on the right. The slogan "Down with Zamora-Maura" is perfectly on the order of the day. It is only necessary to make one thing clear: the communists are not agitating in favor of the Lerrox ministry, nor are they assuming any responsibility for the socialist ministry, but at every given moment they deliver the strongest blow against the most definite and consistent class enemy, thereby weakening the conciliators and clearing the way for the proletariat. The communists say to the socialist workers: "Differing from us, you believe your socialist leaders; then, force them, at least, to take the power. In *this* we shall honestly help you. Afterwards, let us see by what happens which of us is right."

We have approached this question in connection with the composition of the Cortes. But other events, for instance repressions against the masses, may give an extreme acuteness to the slogan: "Down with Zamora-Maura." The victory in that field, i.e., the resignation of Zamora,* would assume in this new stage almost the same importance, for the further development of the revolution, as the resignation of Alfonso in April. In putting such slogans forward, we must not let ourselves be guided by doctrinary abstractions, but by the state of consciousness of the masses, their way of taking the events, and the way they react to the various partial successes. The bare counter-balancing of the present regime with the slogan "A proletarian dictatorship" or "A workers-peasants republic" is in itself absolutely insufficient for it will not catch on with the masses.

In connection with this, the question again rises of *social-fascism*. This silly invention of the terribly leftist bureaucracy is presently becoming in Spain the greatest obstacle on the way to the revolution. Let us turn again to the Russian experience. The Mensheviks and the S-R's, then holding the power, led an imperialist war, defended the owning class, persecuted the soldiers, the peasants and the workers, made arrests, introduced the death penalty, condoned the killing of Bolsheviks, forced Lenin into illegal existence, kept the other Bolshevik leaders in prison, spread the most ignominious calumnies against them, etc., etc. All that is more than enough to call them in retrospect "social-fascists." But there, in 1917, that word did not exist at all, which did not prevent the Bolsheviks, as is well known, from coming to power. After the terrible persecution of the Bolsheviks in July-August, the Bolsheviks sat together with the "social-fascists" in the bodies set up to fight against Kornilov. In the beginning of September, Lenin, from illegality, proposed a compromise to the Russian "social-fascists": "Break with the bourgeoisie, take the power, and we, the Bolsheviks, shall peacefully fight for power within the Soviets."

If there had been no difference between the conciliators and the Kornilovists, the real "fascists" of that time, the struggle of the Bolsheviks jointly with the conciliators against the Kornilovists would not have been possible, whereas that struggle played the greatest role in the development of the revolution, by throwing back the attack of the generals' counter-revolution and by helping the Bolsheviks to tear the masses away once and for all from the conciliators.

It is precisely the nature of petty-bourgeois democracy to oscillate between communism and fascism. During the revolution, these oscillations become particularly acute. To regard

* President of the Provisional Government and then of the Republic, 1931-35.—Ed.

Spanish socialists as a variety of fascism means to abstain beforehand from profiting by their inevitable oscillations to the left, to close off our way to the socialist and trade union workers.

As a conclusion to this letter, I shall note that the criticism and the unmasking of Spanish anarcho-syndicalism is an extremely important task, which cannot be postponed for a single day. The top leaders of anarcho-syndicalism represent the most masked, the most treacherous, and the most dangerous form of conciliationism with and servility toward the bourgeoisie. In its rank and file, anarcho-syndicalism contains large potential revolutionary forces. Our basic task here is the same as in regard to the socialists: oppose the rank and file to the tops. This task, however, must be carefully adapted to the specific nature of the syndicalist organization and the specific character of the anarchist mask. I shall deal with this in one of my next letters.

Tactics Flowing from the Election Results

July 1st, 1931

1. I have before me the local newspaper of July 1st with the first information on the results of the Spanish elections. Indeed everything up to now rigorously follows a "planned" succession of events. The movement toward the left took place as if according to plan. Let us hope that our Spanish comrades will analyze the results of the elections with indispensable precision, after gathering all the material. It is necessary to ascertain how the workers, and particularly the anarcho-syndicalists, voted. In certain districts, the answer must quite clearly derive from the electoral statistics. It is most important, of course, to learn how the peasants in the various provinces voted. At the same time, it is necessary to gather all the "agrarian programs" which were presented by the various parties in the various parts of the country. This is a very urgent and very important work.

2. The socialists, as was to be expected, appear to have won a great victory. This is the central moment of the parliamentary situation. The socialist leaders feel happy for not being the majority in the Cortes, their coalition with the bourgeoisie consequently being justified by parliamentary statistics. The socialists do not want to take the power, for they justly fear that a socialist government will only be a stage on the road to the dictatorship of the proletariat. From Prieto's speech it is clear that the socialists intend to support the coalition so long as it is thereby possible to hold back the proletariat, and then, when the pressure of the workers becomes too strong, under some radical pretext, pass into the opposition, leaving it to the bourgeoisie to discipline and crush the workers. In other words, we have before us a variation of the line of Ebert and Tseretelli. Let us remember that the line of Ebert was successful, that Tseretelli's policy failed, while the decisive factor in both cases was the strength of the Communist Party, and its policy.

3. We must immediately expose the plan of the socialists (their political game of playing to lose), unmasking them on each particular question. This, of course, concerns in the first place the Spanish Left Opposition. But unmasking alone is not enough. A clear political slogan, corresponding to the character of the present stage of the Spanish revolution, is necessary. The results of the elections make that slogan absolutely clear: The workers must break the bloc with the bourgeoisie, and force the socialists to take the power. The peasants must help the workers, if they want to obtain the land.

4. The socialists will appeal to the fact that they don't

have the majority in the Cortes. Our answer to that: genuinely democratic elections to the Cortes on the basis of a truly universal and equal suffrage for men and women from 18 years of age. In other words, to the non-democratic, falsified Cortes, we oppose in this given stage a truly popular, truly democratic, honestly elected Cortes.

5. If the communists, in this given stage, would turn their backs to the Cortes, opposing to it the slogan of the soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat, they would only demonstrate that they cannot be taken seriously. There probably is not a single communist in the Cortes (this is the information given by the Turkish telegrams). Of course, the revolutionary wing is always stronger in deeds, in the struggle, than in parliamentary representation. But still, between the strength of the revolutionary party and its representation in parliament, there is a certain relation. The weakness of Spanish communism is fully disclosed. Under these conditions, to speak of the overthrow of bourgeois parliamentarism by the dictatorship of the proletariat would simply mean to play the part of imbeciles and babblers. The task is to gather strength for the party on the basis of the parliamentary stage of the revolution by rallying the masses to us. Only thus can parliamentarism be overcome. But precisely for that purpose is it indispensable to develop a fierce agitation under the most decisive and extreme democratic slogans.

6. What should be the criteria for the launching of the slogans? On the one hand, the general direction of the revolutionary development, determining our strategic line; on the other hand, the stage of consciousness of the masses. The communist who does not take the latter factor into consideration will break his head. Let us meditate a little on the way in which the Spanish workers *en masse* take the present line-up. Their leaders, the socialists, have the power. This increases the demands and the tenacity of the workers. Every striker will figure that the government not only is not to be feared, but that on the contrary help must be expected from it. The communist must direct the thoughts of the workers precisely on that path: "Demand from the government. It is your leaders that are in it." The socialists will appeal, in reply to the workers' delegations, that they do not have the majority yet. The answer is clear: With a truly democratic electoral right and the split in the coalition with the bourgeoisie, the majority is assured. But this is what the socialists do not want. Their situation places them in contradiction with the slogans of thoroughgoing democracy. If we simply oppose to the Cortes the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the soviets, we weld the workers with the socialists, for both will say: The communists want to command us. Whereas under the slogan of democracy and of split between the socialists and the bourgeoisie, we push a wedge between the workers and the socialists and prepare the next stage of the revolution.

7. All the above reasoning would hang in the air if we limited ourselves only to democratic slogans and their parliamentary refraction. There cannot even be talk of such limitation. The communists participate in all the strikes, in all protests and demonstrations, raising ever new strata of the population. The communists are in the battle with and in front of the masses. On the basis of these battles, the communists put forward the slogan of the soviets, and, at the first opportunity, build soviets, as the *organizations of the proletarian united front*. In the given stage, the soviets cannot be anything large. But if they emerge as the combat organizations of the proletarian united front, under the leadership of the communists, they will

inevitably transform themselves at a certain stage into organs of insurrection and then into organs of power.

8. While audaciously presenting our agrarian program, we must by no means forget about the independent role of the agricultural workers. This is the main and basic piston of the proletarian revolution in the rural districts. The workers have an *alliance* with the peasants, while the agricultural workers are a part of the proletariat itself. This deep difference must always be borne in mind.

9. I learn from the *Verite* that the Stalinists accuse either the Left Opposition *en masse*, or me alone, of the fact that we allegedly are opposed to the immediate confiscation of the landlords' estates. It can never be foreseen, indeed, in what direction the bureaucratic demagogues will turn this time. What does the "immediate" confiscation of the land mean? By whom? By what organizations? The inimitable Peri, it is true, asserted already in April that the Spanish peasants were creating soviets, and that every worker followed the communists. We, of course, are for the *immediate* taking over by the soviets (or unions, or committees) of the landlords' estates. But it is still necessary to arouse the peasants. And for that it is necessary to tear the workers away from the influence of the socialists. One cannot be done without the other.

Or maybe the Stalinists want to say that we are protecting the landlords' property? But even in calumny there has to be some logic. How can the defense of the landlords' property be derived from the position of permanent revolution? Let them try to explain that to us.

We, on our side, shall recall that when the Stalinists in China pursued the policy of the bloc of four classes, the Politburo, under Stalin's leadership, sent a telegram to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, demanding that the peasants' movement be held back, in order not to repel the "revolutionary generals." In the agrarian program, Stalin and Molotov included a small limitation: the confiscation of landlords' estates, except those of the officers. And as all the landlords, their sons and nephews entered Chiang Kai-shek's army, "revolutionary" officership became the insurance of landlords' property. This shameful chapter in the history of Stalinist leadership cannot be crossed out. At that time, the Opposition found a copy of the telegram in the minutes of the Politburo, and disclosed and stigmatized this ignominious treason to the agrarian revolution. Now, these gentlemen attempt to throw on us in Spain the crime which they themselves committed in China. But no: now the Opposition has its sections in almost every country, and it will not let lies and filth be spread on it unpunished. In the living experience of the Spanish revolution the Left Opposition will clear up all the basic problems and will make a gigantic step forward. It is not in vain that revolution is the locomotive of history.

The Role of Strikes in a Revolution

August 2nd, 1931

The purpose of this letter is to exchange our views on the occasion of the tumultuous strike movement in Spain. In my second pamphlet on the Spanish revolution, I indicated in detail one of the *possible* perspectives: the revolutionary movement develops violently without the correct leadership and concludes in an explosion which the counter-revolutionary forces may exploit in order to smash the proletariat. As pointed out in the pamphlet, this perspective does not of course mean that the role of the communists should be to hold back the revolutionary movement. I do not doubt that in this respect we

will have no differences, but I would like to analyze this question more thoroughly, because it may become of great practical importance.

First of all, it is necessary to make clear that this violent elemental outburst of strikes is the inevitable outcome of the character of the revolution itself, being in a certain sense its basis. The overwhelming majority of the Spanish proletariat does not know what organization means. During the time the dictatorship lasted, a new generation of workers grew up, which is lacking in independent political experience. The revolution awakens—and in this lies its force—the most backward, down-trodden, the most oppressed toiling masses. The strike is the form of their awakening. By means of the strike, various strata and groups of the proletariat manifest themselves, signal to each other, verify their own strength and the strength of their foe. One layer infects and awakens the other. All this together makes the present strike wave absolutely inevitable. Least of all do the communists have to be afraid of it, for this is the very expression of the creative force of the revolution. Only through these strikes, with all their mistakes, with all their “excesses” and “exaggerations,” does the proletariat rise to its feet, assemble itself in one unit, begin to feel and to conceive itself as a class, as a living historical force. Never have revolutions developed under a conductor’s stick. Excesses, mistakes, sacrifices are the very nature of any revolution.

Had the Communist Party told the workers: “I am still too weak to guide you, therefore, wait a little, don’t press too much, don’t start the fight by striking, give me a chance to become stronger,” the party would have made itself hopelessly ridiculous, the awakening masses would have stepped over it, and instead of becoming stronger, the party would have only weakened.

Even if you have foreseen correctly a historical danger, this does not mean that you may eliminate it by mere reasoning. The danger can be removed only if you possess the necessary strength. But in order to be such a force, the Communist Party must enter whole-heartedly into the arena of the developing “elemental” or semi-elemental strike movement, not in order to hold it back, but in order to learn to direct it, and in the very process of the struggle, acquire authority and strength.

It would be a mistake to think that the present movement was provoked by the anarcho-syndicalists. The latter are themselves under the indomitable pressure from below. The leading group of the syndicalist nucleus would like to slow up the movement. Individuals like Pestana are certainly negotiating behind the stage with the employers and administration about the best means of liquidating the strikes. Tomorrow, many of these gentlemen will prove to be the executioners of the workers and, while shooting them, as the Russian Mensheviks did, will preach against the “intoxication of strike,” and so on.

One cannot doubt that along this line will grow the differentiation among the anarcho-syndicalists. The most revolutionary wing, the further it goes, will find itself ever more in contradiction with the syndico-reformists. From out of this left wing will inevitably surge up putschists, heroic adventurists, individual terrorists and others.

Needless to say, we cannot encourage any kind of adventurism. But we must in advance be certain that not the right wing which combats the strikes, but the left revolutionary syndicalist wing will come closer to us. It will be all the more easy to overcome all kinds of adventurist elements, the sooner the revolutionary syndicalists are convinced that the communists are fighters—not rationalizers.

The official [Communist] party is being accused of an adventurous policy in the field of strikes. I personally cannot judge in the matter due to my lack of information. The general attitude of the party in the previous period, however, leads one to think that this charge is probably justified. But precisely for that reason there is a danger that having burnt its fingers, the party may abruptly turn to the right. The greatest misfortune would be if the working masses would come to the conclusion that the communists, just as the syndicalists of the type of Pestana, would like to instruct them dogmatically, from the top downward, and not to rise with them from the bottom upward.

Summarizing: The danger of June days* remains without any doubt the gravest in the perspective, but the most immediate danger for the communists may become abstract arguing, “trying to appear intelligent,” abstract coaxing, which revolutionary workers will regard as pessimistic croaking.

The Left Opposition must not forget for a single moment that dangers which arise from the development of the revolution should be overcome not by watchful caution but by audacity, audacity, and more audacity.

From a Letter to Andres Nin**

September 1, 1931.

Maurin*** has issued the slogan: “All power to the proletariat.” I think you are quite right in pointing out that he has chosen slogans of this sort in order to provide himself with a bridge to the syndicalists and to lend himself the appearance of greater strength than he actually possesses. Unfortunately, the chase after appearances is very strong in politics, and very disastrous in revolutionary politics. I ask myself—at times—why are there no Soviets in Spain? What is the cause of this?

On The Slogan of Soviets

In a former letter, I expressed several ideals in this connection. I have developed these much more amply in an article I sent you on workers’ control in Germany. It appears that the slogan of “juntas” is associated in the minds of the Spanish workers with the slogan of Soviets; and for this reason it seems to sharp, too decisive, too “Russian” to them. That is to say, they look at it in a different light than did the Russian workers at a corresponding stage. Are we not confronted here with a historical paradox in that the existence of Soviets in the USSR acts to paralyze the creation of Soviets in other revolutionary countries?

This question must be given the utmost attention in private conversations with workers in the different parts of the country. At any event, if the slogan of Soviets (juntas) fails as yet to meet with response, then we must concentrate on the slogan of factory committees. I dealt with this topic in the above-mentioned article on workers’ control. On the basis of factory committees we can develop the Soviet organization without referring to them by name.

* A deliberate provocation to bring the workers into the streets in order to shoot them down; derived from the bloodletting of June in the French revolution of 1848.—Ed.

**Nin was a well known Spanish revolutionist, for many years a close collaborator, and personal friend of Trotsky. He later broke with the Trotskyist movement in order to organize a centrist party, the POUM, together with Maurin. He was murdered in Spain by Stalin’s GPU during the Spanish Civil War.—Ed.

***See letter of June 18, 1931.—Ed.

On the question of workers' control, you are in my opinion absolutely correct; to renounce workers' control merely because the reformists are for it—in words—would be an enormous stupidity. On the contrary, it is precisely for this reason that we should seize upon this slogan all the more eagerly and compel the reformist workers to put it into practice by means of a united front with us; and on the basis of this experience to push them into opposition to Caballero and other fakers.

We succeeded in creating Soviets in Russia only because the demand for them was raised, together with us, by the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries, although, to be sure, they had different aims in mind. We cannot create any Soviets in Spain precisely because neither the Socialists nor the syndicalists want Soviets. This means that the united front and the or-

ganizational unity with the majority of the working class cannot be created under this slogan.

But here is Caballero himself, forced to it by the pressure of the masses, seizing upon the slogan of workers' control and thereby opening wide the doors for the united front policy and to forging an organization that embraces the majority of the working class. We must seize hold of this with both hands. Certainly, Caballero will try to transform workers' control into the control of the capitalists over the workers. But that question already pertains to another domain, that of the relationship of forces within the working class. If we succeed in creating factory committees all over the country, then in this revolutionary epoch that we are witnessing, Messrs Caballero and Co. will have lost the decisive battle.

What Is Fascism?

By LEON TROTSKY

What is Fascism? The name originated in Italy. Were all the forms of counter-revolutionary dictatorship Fascist or not? That is to say, prior to the advent of Fascism in Italy.

The former dictatorship in Spain, of Primo de Rivera, is called a Fascist dictatorship by the Comintern. Is this correct or not? We believe that it is incorrect.

The Fascist movement in Italy was a spontaneous movement of large masses, with new leaders from the rank and file. It is a plebeian movement in origin, directed and financed by big capitalist powers. It issued forth from the petty bourgeoisie, the slum proletariat and even to a certain extent, from the proletarian masses; Mussolini, a former socialist, is a "self-made" man arising from this movement.

Primo de Rivera was an aristocrat. He occupied a high military and bureaucratic post, and was chief governor of Catalonia. He accomplished his overthrow with the aid of state and military forces. The dictatorships of Spain and Italy are two totally different forms of dictatorship. It is necessary to distinguish between them. Mussolini had great difficulty in reconciling many old military institutions with the Fascist militia. This problem did not exist for Primo de Rivera.

The movement in Germany is analogous mostly to the Italian. It is a mass movement, with its leaders employing a great deal of socialist demagoguery. This is necessary for the creation of the mass movement.

The genuine basis (for Fascism) is the petty bourgeoisie. In Italy it has a very large base—the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and cities, and the peasantry. In Germany likewise, there is a large base for Fascism...

It may be said, and this is true to a certain extent, that the

new middle class, the functionaries of the state, the private administrators, etc., can constitute such a base. But this is a new question that must be analyzed. This is a supposition. It is necessary to analyze just what it will be. It is necessary to foresee the Fascist movement from this or that element. But this is only a perspective which is controlled by events...

In order to be capable of foreseeing anything with regard to Fascism, it is necessary to have a definition of that idea. What is Fascism? What are its base, its form, and its characteristics? How will its development take place? It is necessary to proceed in a scientific and Marxian manner.—*Extracts from a letter to an English Comrade.*
November 15, 1931.

*Another important pamphlet
off the press!*

The End Of The Comintern

By James P. Cannon

with

*The Manifesto of the
Fourth International*

36 PAGES

10 CENTS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

GET YOUR COPY NOW!

Leon Trotsky's

IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

(AGAINST THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS OPPOSITION)

240 Pages—Paper \$1.50; Cloth \$2.

Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N.Y.

YOU NEED THESE MARXIST WORKS!

CHECK YOUR LIBRARY OVER NOW

- THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY, by James P. Cannon 320 p., cloth 2.00
paper 1.50
- THE END OF THE COMINTERN, by James P. Cannon 36 p., paper .10
- YOUR STANDARD OF LIVING—WHAT'S HAPPENING TO IT? by C. Charles 32 p., paper .05
- THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY, by The Dewey Commission 600 p., cloth 3.00
paper 1.00
- TRADE UNION PROBLEMS, by Farrell Dobbs 44 p., paper .10
- FOUNDING CONFERENCE OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL 127 p., paper .25
- THE ASSASSINATION OF LEON TROTSKY, by Albert Goldman 74 p., paper .15
- IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM, by Albert Goldman 95 p., paper .10
- WHAT IS SOCIALISM? by Albert Goldman 48 p., paper .10
- FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS, by Daniel Guerin 340 p., paper
Sale price .75
- MARITIME: A Historical Sketch; A Workers' Program, by Frederick J. Lang 182 p., paper 1.00
- MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL ON THE IMPERIALIST
WAR AND THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION 48 p., paper .05
- MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL TO THE WORKERS AND
PEASANTS OF INDIA 24 p., paper .05
- REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow 208 p., paper .50
- DEFENSE POLICY IN THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL, by Munis and Cannon 64 p., paper .20
- NEGROES IN THE POST-WAR WORLD, by Albert Parker 16 p., paper .05
- THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO EQUALITY, by Saunders and Parker 32 p., paper .05
- FROM LENIN TO STALIN, by Victor Serge 112 p., paper
Sale price .25
- RUSSIA 20 YEARS AFTER, by Victor Serge 308 p., cloth
Sale price 2.75
- THE WORKERS AND THE SECOND WORLD WAR 48 p., paper .10
- WHY DID THEY CONFESS? 32 p., paper .10
- THE NEGRO AND THE U S. ARMY, by Eugene Varlin 32 p., paper .05

Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

- WAR AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL 36 p., paper .10
- IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION 40 p., paper .10
- STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM 40 p., paper .10
- LEON SEDOFF 32 p., paper .10
- THEIR MORALS AND OURS 48 p., paper .20

Books by Leon Trotsky

- IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM (*Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition*) 240 p., cloth 2.00
paper 1.50
- LESSONS OF OCTOBER 125 p., cloth .75
paper .50
- LIVING THOUGHTS OF KARL MARX 184 p., cloth 1.25
- THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN 327 p., cloth 2.00
- WHITHER FRANCE? 160 p., cloth .75
paper .50

O R D E R F R O M

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.