

The New _____ **INTERNATIONAL**

May · 1943

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Meaning of the Miners' Fight

A MISSION IN FRAUD

Lessons of the Spanish Commune

By Miriam Gould

**UNEMPLOYMENT:
A POST-WAR PROBLEM**

By Albert Gates

Archives of the Revolution:

ON MARX and ENGELS

MANAGER'S COLUMN

Subscriptions to The NEW INTERNATIONAL have begun to come in with greater regularity since our last issue. It begins to look as if our readers are bringing the magazine to the attention of more of their friends—with the result that we are getting *new* readers, who appreciate the unique position of our review as an organ of socialist thought.

But these new subscriptions that come in are *nothing* compared to what we should be getting. *Labor Action*, the weekly newspaper representing the same political viewpoint as our magazine, now prints over 35,000 copies of each issue. The NEW INTERNATIONAL cannot be expected to come anywhere near that, under present circumstances; but there must certainly be many workers who read *Labor Action* who would also be glad to subscribe to the *NI* if they were approached by one of our present readers, shown a copy of the magazine, and told what an important aid it is in penetrating the political fog that surrounds us these days.

Back issues of the *NI* (1940, 1941 and 1942) may be sent to prospects; and if followed up with a letter or a personal visit, subs can often be obtained. Why not buy a bound volume of the *NI* for 1942 from us (\$2.50) and use your unbound copies for samples? We depend on those of our readers who are seriously interested in the promotion of Marxist education, to make the effort necessary to keep the *NI* appearing regularly and enlarging its sphere of influence. A magazine like ours cannot grow on the temporary impetus provided by current events. There must be, in most cases, a *deeper* interest on the part of a prospective reader; and he must be shown carefully and by concrete example how the *NI* plays an indispensable rôle in the field of socialist thought.

So far, *only* NEW YORK has sent in satisfactory returns in the *NI* sub drive—around fifty new subscriptions. We expect a good deal more from New York; but the rest of the country is far behind, proportionately. The very modest quotas that were set are not yet fulfilled. New York will almost certainly meet or surpass its quota of seventy-five; there is no reason why other localities should not do likewise, if a *systematic campaign is actually planned and carried through*.

The special six-months introductory subscription to the *NI* is a proposition that cannot be equalled in value. We may not be able to make this offer much longer. Give your friends the opportunity of taking advantage of it, especially if they already subscribe to *Labor Action*. Show them how many articles published in recent issues of our magazine could be found nowhere else, how solid a contribution each issue makes to socialist clarity. **TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY NEW SUBSCRIBERS IS THE GOAL!**

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER DURING THE SUBSCRIPTION DRIVE: *Labor Action* and The New International for One Year—\$1.75. Send your sub today to:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

114 West 14th Street

New York, N. Y.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. IX

No. 5, Whole No. 75

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

Editor: ALBERT GATES

•

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Notes of the Month:

THE MEANING OF THE MINERS' FIGHT

By A. G. 131

BEATRICE WEBB, REFORMIST

By A. A. B. 133

Articles:

A MISSION IN FRAUD

By A. G. 134

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH COMMUNE

By Miriam Gould 137

UNEMPLOYMENT: A POST-WAR PROSPECT

By Albert Gates 139

Discussion Articles:

WHAT ABOUT THE GERMAN REVOLUTION?—II

By Clara Werth 142

A NEW STAGE FOR WORLD LABOR

By Pierre Bellasi 146

Discussion on National Question:

THE WAY OUT FOR EUROPE—II

By J. R. Johnson 149

Archives of the Revolution:

DIVINE RIGHT OF THE HOHENZOLLERN

By Karl Marx 154

AN UNUSUAL FRIENDSHIP

By Franz Mehring 158

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME IX

MAY, 1943

NUMBER 5

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Meaning of the Miners' Fight

The fight of the United Mine Workers of America against the prevailing labor policy of the Administration, as expressed in its position on wages and the cost of living, has brought the labor situation to a crisis. When John L. Lewis announced, before the expiration of the miners' contract on April 1, that he would demand a \$2.00-a-day wage increase to meet the enormous rise in the cost of living in the coal areas of the nation, the crisis was certain. For against the altogether legitimate demands of the miners, and the increasingly determined demands of workers all over the country for wage increases, the Administration held steadfastly to the position that it would permit no departure from the "Little Steal" formula under which the ignominious War Labor Board operated.

In our Notes for last month, we point out that the President's "hold the line" order was directed exclusively against the American working class, because it sought to doom their living standards in this period when the cost of living has already gone beyond their ability to meet the fantastic rise in prices. The "hold the line" order, therefore, demonstrated that Roosevelt was prepared to meet the mounting dissatisfaction of the American workers with a head-on opposition. In doing so, and insisting that the WLB maintain an undeviating adherence to its wage formula, the crisis on the WLB, already sharpened, was extended. The AFL and CIO representatives, the former especially, threatened to resign unless remedies were immediately forthcoming. It is interesting to note how the Administration endeavored to meet the crisis in its relations with labor.

Lewis made it abundantly clear that unless the wage demands of the miners' union was met he would call a national strike. This announcement was the signal for one of the dirtiest journalistic campaigns in American labor history. It is necessary, in order to understand all of the ramifications of this situation, to recall the specific problems that existed.

The coal miners of America, engaged in a skilled, difficult and dangerous occupation, worked at a wage scale set before the war economy went into full swing. Under their contract, they could not alter their wage scale until its termination, despite the disparity of their income and the cost of living. Thus the miners worked for more than a year at inequitable wages.

The Office of Price Administration indicated its complete impotence to intervene for a rectification of the price rise. It could hardly do so when its director, Prentiss Brown, announced upon taking office that prices could not actually be

controlled and that there would be a slow but persistent monthly rise. As always, those who suffered in this situation were the workers, and in this case, particularly the underpaid miners. Lewis showed that the miners, because of their occupation, need a certain supply of basic foods which they were not getting with their existing wages. He put the issue squarely when he stated that "the miners are hungry" and need immediate relief.

The Administration Seeks to Break Lewis

This is when the show began. The Administration was determined to fight Lewis now for at least two reasons: a victory for Lewis would be the signal for which all workers were waiting to begin an open struggle to overthrow the WLB and its wage formula; political revenge on Lewis for his fight against Roosevelt.

The vermin press began its work when it was certain that Roosevelt was prepared to break Lewis and, in the process, strike a blow against the miners' union. Naturally the reactionary press was uninfluenced by anything that Roosevelt and his aids did or said. Their anti-labor line is fixed. But the so-called liberal press, the Pucks of bourgeois democracy, the *New York Post* and the scurrilous semi-Stalinist sheet, *PM*, became positively hysterical in their denunciation of John L. Lewis. With unabated fury, they carried on a daily denunciation of Lewis, his threat to strike and the arbitrariness of his demands. The only issue in the struggle, according to these sycophants, was President Roosevelt or John L. Lewis. In their completely totalitarian outlook they demanded that the miners, and the workers in general, choose between Roosevelt, the friend of labor, and Lewis, the dictator! James Wechsler, ex-Stalinist, was beside himself. He posed the issue: faith in Roosevelt or Lewis. And then he virtually pleaded with the miners to put all their trust in the President, the proved friend of labor!

But these gentlemen do not understand the working class, they do not understand labor's union organizations. Above all, they do not understand the interests of the workers. And in this case they showed themselves completely ignorant of the United Mine Workers, the most powerfully organized and experienced labor organization in this country.

The miners saw through the gas pouring out of the mouths of the "liberal" misleaders. In their simple proletarian way, they knew that the only ones who could gain from their defeats were the coal operators and the ruling class in general. They automatically understood that if they were defeated it would mean a defeat for the whole working class. And they also knew that if they won, the workers everywhere would win—the only group that stood to lose was the rapacious capitalist class enriching itself off the backs of the workers in this war period. The miners were not alone. Hundreds of thousands of other workers rallied to their support (witness the outbreak of strikes in Detroit), much to the discomfort of the Administration and its liberal wheelhorses of the yellow press.

One must have a class attitude toward the miners' fight. Lewis is not and cannot be the issue. Would it make any difference in this situation if the miners had another president? Would the Administration and the bosses act any differently? Obviously not! The presence of Lewis affected only secondary questions, not the main one. The point is that Lewis is fundamentally correct in this miners' fight. He has demonstrated a courage that is rare among labor leaders. He has exhibited a determination that must galvanize the labor movement. He has displayed an elasticity of tactics that has strengthened the fight of the miners against an array of foes which seem insurmountable. And, this is what hurts the anti-labor forces and the totalitarian liberals, the Administration and their Stalinist strike-breaking supporters, Lewis has remained coolly indifferent to their veritable lynch campaign against him.

Lewis' Role in the Situation

Does this mean that Lewis understands the full implications of his struggle against the Administration and the operators; that he is conscious of the class issues involved and their political significance; that he has advanced in a proletarian political way? No, Lewis hasn't changed in that respect at all. We believe that he remains a conservative political force in the labor movement; that he is unable to lead the labor movement in progressive class political directions; that he remains tied to the worst political enemies of the working class, the bourgeois politicians and their organizations. This is Lewis' greatest failure: a lack of political class consciousness; a lack of fundamental class consciousness! Otherwise he would now form an independent political party of labor against both capitalist parties.

His present fight does not change the past or cancel out his bureaucratic rule in the AFL, the CIO and the UMW. Neither does it obliterate the many serious mistakes he has made for many years prior to the organization of the CIO. But how can one overlook the initiative he took and the responsibility which is his, for the organization of the CIO? How can one overlook the progressive character of the present fight which he is leading?

Lewis *seems* to understand one thing: Unless the labor movement maintains itself during the war, adheres to a militant policy, seeks to extend its organization, achieves labor unity, it will be chopped up in the mad hysteria of the war and the inevitable economic collapse in the post-war period. He sees the forces now at work which threaten the entire labor movement. Unlike his inferior colleagues in the labor movement, he prefers not to put his trust in Roosevelt and the Administration, but in the fighting strength of labor. *As far as he goes*, Lewis is engaged in a progressive struggle and this is all that matters.

The press sent its representatives into the field, and these correspondents could not believe their eyes and ears. The miners are in ferment, they wrote. They are behind Lewis to a man because he is fighting for their very lives. They will strike unless they get their demands. They will strike even if Lewis calls off any strike. They admired Roosevelt, so it was reported, but Lewis was the leader of their union and their union meant their lives. This was quickly borne home even to the most obtuse.

A Frame-Up Against the Miners

It was clear from the opening day of the negotiations between the miners and the coal operators that something was afoot. The coal operators, on a tip from Washington that the Administration would not deviate from the "Little Steal" formula (this meant that the miners would get no raise) refused to negotiate. They held their ground in silence. Lewis in presenting his demands to them asked for counter-proposals so that collective bargaining could begin. But the operators would not budge. They had nothing to offer. By their refusal to deal with the union, the operators knew that the case would go to the WLB and the miners would get a big zero.

Lewis had already made clear that he would have nothing to do with the WLB; that such a step meant the end of any miners' demands; that the WLB was already stacked against the miners; that it operated under the "hold the line" order and thus automatically precluded any redress for the miners, and finally, the board was, in its majority, anti-labor.

Negotiations broke down, the miners' contract ended and the strike began automatically. Then follows a whole series of events which are in part still foggy. Roosevelt meets the strike danger with a seizure of the mines and proclaims them "government property" and the miners "government employees." Now there can be no strike! In the meantime, Lewis and Ickes, government "custodian" of the mines, meet in Washington and apparently a settlement is on the way. The strike is called off. Lewis takes the position that since there is no contract, since the government is now the mine owner, an adjudication of the miners' demands will take place through the "custodian."

In a pathetic way, the OPA suddenly announces its intention to investigate prices in the coal areas. Finding a disparity of *only* five per cent in prices, the OPA determined that prices were not "out of line"! But immediately thereafter it ordered a roll-back of prices of ten per cent as a partial face-saving gesture. This act was proof, if any proof was needed, that the position of the miners was completely justified. How do the OPA and the President proceed to effect a roll-back of ten per cent? By paying a subsidy to the purveyors of staple goods, the big farmers, the food processors, the rich merchants and commission houses. It is impossible, you see, to grant the miners a wage increase, but it is possible to effect a roll-back of prices by handing the profiteers a subsidy! The important point, however, is that a ten per cent roll-back will not materially improve the position of the workers.

Lewis and the Miners

Roosevelt, in proclaiming his order, called upon the miners to return to work on Monday. Lewis, following his meeting with Ickes, instructed the miners to go back on Tuesday. Whom would the miners follow? This was one crucial test and the miners answered it in a straightforward way. They followed the president of their union, their organization, and went to work on Tuesday. A two-week truce had been effected.

The WLB enters the situation and demands that the case, no matter what adjudication is made between Ickes and Lewis, or the operators and Lewis, must come to them for review! In the inter-departmental struggles in Washington, furious battles take place. Now Ickes announces that he cannot settle anything, the whole matter must go before the WLB. The

union officials charge a double-cross somewhere along the line, and maintain their position that they cannot and will not appear before the WLB. Once more the strike is imminent as the two-week period runs out. Again Ickes calls for Lewis and another truce is effected. This time it is certain that Ickes will force a settlement which will give the miners at least part of their demands, either in the form of a six-day week guaranteed for a year, with time and a half for the sixth day, perhaps a portal-to-portal rate, or perhaps a straight raise in the daily wage rate. But no sooner is another two-week truce announced than the WLB again demands that the issue be tried before it and orders the operators and the union to appear. But Lewis is adamant and will not fall for this old army game. What is the authority under which the WLB operates? It has no statutory rights. It has no right of subpoena or arrest. In other words, it has no real power except the power of "public opinion" and "persuasion." Then, too, what does it mean to say that the mines "are government property" and the miners are employees of the government? If that is true, why, then, does Ickes send the issue back for negotiation, and why does the WLB presume control over negotiations between the operators and miners? Contrast this with the case of the New York Transit Workers Union. In that situation the WLB declared it could not intervene because it was a struggle between a government and its employees!

The struggle between the miners and the coal operators is complicated by the political aims of the Administration in seeking complete control over and unanimous support from the labor movement in preparation for its political campaign, which is soon to begin. Lewis is a stumbling block in their plans.

And, finally, in the midst of this struggle, Lewis presents the miners' application for reaffiliation with the AFL. It is difficult, because of lack of information at the time of this writing, to assess the full significance of this action. It would seem, at first hand, to strengthen Lewis' position enormously and thus to fortify the fight of the miners. Lewis has far more allies in the labor movement than most people believe. His move will strengthen the tendencies toward labor unity. It will hasten the militant development of other large sections of the labor movement. On the whole, it appears as if Lewis has outgeneraled the formidable array of foes who are determined to kick the miners in the back.

The next issue of *The New International* will contain a complete review of the miners' struggle as the most important labor development since the outbreak of the war.

A. G.

Beatrice Webb, Reformist

In April, Beatrice Webb died. She was the wife of Sidney Webb, co-author with him of many famous books on the labor movement. Her career deserves examination.

She was born in 1858, the daughter of an English finance capitalist of international connections. She had both intelligence and character, and was expensively educated.

To appreciate the career of the Webbs, in this case Beatrice Webb, we must bear in mind the particular stage of development of European civilization in general, especially British capitalism, at the time when she grew to maturity. She

was twenty-two in 1880, when European capitalism arrived at a consciousness of its own difficulties and inaugurated the age of imperialism by the division of Africa and other colonial areas.

During the ensuing years, Marxism as an intellectual force enjoyed an immense prestige in Europe. In Germany, the Marxists were the official opponents of bourgeois thought. In Austria, Francis Joseph's financial minister, Böhm-Bawerk, devoted his literary life to the refutation of Marx. In Italy, Labriola, one of its most distinguished professors, was an open adherent; Gentile was for a time sympathetic to Marx; and Benedetto Croce, the greatest European scholar of his day, accepted in an academic way substantial elements of the doctrine. Masaryk thought it necessary to produce a ponderous volume against Marxism. We know what Marxism was in Russia; and even in France, Sorel, though no Marxist, was an apostle of violence and the class struggle.

Nor was this the interest of intellectuals only. In 1889, the Second International was organized under the ægis of Marxism. If in Britain there was only the unskillful pillage of Marx by Hyndman, there were sufficiently ominous signs. The growing loss of Britain's position on the world market threw the British economy into disorder; and the interest culminated in two great strikes, the dock strike and the strike of the match girls, both in 1889, when the semi-skilled and the unskilled became organized for the first time.

To this historical milieu, Beatrice Potter, rich, able, cultured, well informed, idealistic and British, reacted with a political program that perfectly expressed the contradiction of her type. The thing to note is that it was conscious. She set herself to guide the British working class along the road of gradual, peaceful, constitutional progress to something she called "socialism," and at the same time she waged an implacable war against Marxism and the doctrine of the class struggle. Her activities in the first sphere are widely known; not so well known are her activities in the second. In 1885, in *one of her earliest writings*, she denounced Marx's economic theory and the doctrine of class struggle and revolution. At the same time she was carrying on an agitation against the living conditions of the poorer London workers which gained special prominence owing to her social position. She actually lived among them for some months in order to be able to speak with the necessary knowledge and authority.

In 1890 she married Sidney Webb, a brilliant young Oxford man and a British civil servant. In a most literal sense they were agents of the British ruling class, finance and administration, in the working class movement. Together they wrote the books which made them famous all over the world, their studies of the trade union movement, of English local government, and the Poor Law. They were neither passionate nor brilliant writers, but they were conscientious, they were thorough and they were able to do research with an expensive apparatus. They sincerely hated the obvious evils of capitalism. The harsh realities of the early struggles in the trade union movement and the corruption of early English local government forced its way through their essentially conservative temperament and stood out in their writings. The British labor movement was built ideologically on these works more than on any other, and Lenin, in exile in Siberia, studied the Webbs. The Webbs did distinguished work on the Royal Commission on the Poor Law. They drew up a famous minority report to this commission, which accomplished results and enhanced their reputation.

Opponents of Marxism

But these two people knew what they were doing. Their psychology may be left to future Marxist biographers. But this much is certain: that, while negatively they guided the working class in a reformist direction, positively they built an intellectual barrier against the powerful Marxist current on the continent. They spent time, money and influence in founding the London School of Economics *for the special purpose of combating Marxism*. Webb for a time lectured there. Thus over forty years ago, with truly remarkable prescience, these two leaders of the British workers were creating new weapons for safeguarding the intellectual foundations of bourgeois society. In one of the rooms of the London School are two large portraits of them, a testimony to human futility, for the London School in its time became a center of Marxist and neo-Marxist study, especially among the student body.

It is their subsequent career which enables us to see their earlier activities with the proper comprehensiveness. The Webbs supported the war of 1914-18; as soon as they war was over, they published books on the decay of capitalist civilization, and the outline of a socialist constitution for Great Britain. But against the Russian Revolution, Marxism in the flesh, they were as hostile as they had been to Marxism in the spirit, and they saw no difference between the Russia of Lenin and Trotsky and the Italy of Mussolini.

Against Lenin and Trotsky; for Stalin

How clear-sighted these well educated members of the English ruling class were is proved by the latest phase of their consistent political career.

In 1932, Russia as a source of revolution was still a subject of violent hatred and fear all over the bourgeois world. The Communist International was in the throes of the third period, preaching revolution *today*, not tomorrow, in every civilized country. Yet all this time, the Webbs divined the fundamental conservativeness of the Russian bureaucracy. They settled down to years of devoted labor and produced in 1936 a study of Russia entitled *Soviet Communism, a New Civilization?* It is stated that they received all the necessary documents from the Soviet government itself or at least from its representatives. They visited Russia and, as early as 1932, Beatrice Webb was talking enthusiastically over the British radio about the USSR. The book, inordinately long, can be described in a sentence. It was a compilation of all the *plans*—considered as accomplished facts—of the Soviet bureaucracy and its promises to the Russian people. With ignorance, dishonesty and with an ill-concealed malice, the book attacked Trotskyism. It said that the new civilization would spread its doctrine best by showing the world what it could do, instead of by the Trotskyist doctrine of world revolution.

The volume was well timed. In 1933 the British labor

movement was in ferment and at the Brighton Conference voted by an overwhelming majority never to support British imperialism in another imperialist war. But in May, 1934, the USSR applied for membership in the League of Nations. The British labor bureaucrats, quaking at the Brighton vote, mobilized all their forces to swing British labor back into the imperialist fold under the smoke-screen of collective security, and the chief bait was Russia's entry into the League. But the job was not easily done, and as far as books and personal influence helped, the Webbs' endorsement exercised enormous weight. They ended as they had begun, friends and advocates of anything which would help the workers, as long as they remained in their place; and enemies of everything which would help them to realize that the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself.

The Socialism of the Webbs

A curious episode later in her career illuminates the mental process of this very typical social democratic English woman. When the Labor Party took over the government in 1929, Sidney Webb was made Colonial Minister; and as the Labor Party was weak in the House of Lords, he assumed the title of Lord Passfield and entered the upper house. This for Beatrice Webb became a principled question. To become *Lady* Passfield was treason to socialism. But to remain Beatrice Webb was to insult the traditions of the British ruling class, her class (in her early life she had been presented at Court).

Here was a problem for this septuagenarian. She could not solve it herself, and finally went to, above all people, Lord Balfour, a man who, in every possible respect, even in his personal appearance, was the most characteristic example extant of the traditional British aristocracy. He, the British earl, was to solve this socialist problem. As Marx found in his analysis of the commodity the clue to all the contradictions of capitalism, so you can see in this minor incident the clue to the Webbs' politics. Balfour snubbed her with amused contempt, said he didn't think the question was important. For her it was. She decided to remain Mrs. Webb, and the philistines applauded.

For us, she has a more than merely historical importance. Lenin, puzzled at the contrast between the quality of Sidney Webb's books and his apparently inane politics, once asked if the British bourgeoisie bribed him. Today, after forty years, we have no need to ask such questions. After 1914 and the long record of the post-war Social-Democracy, we deserve the branding iron if we are caught unawares by any of these people. Whatever their record, whatever their services, they are enemies of working class emancipation, and more conscious than we thought. They deserve from us no more and no less than the same unwearied, undeviating enmity that they have always shown to Marxism and the social revolution.

A. A. B.

A Mission in Fraud

Falsification by Hollywood Historians

Hollywood has been called a land of fantasy which turns out movies—not for the purpose of depicting life and people but to distort life and people, to produce fairy tales, exciting romances, horse operas, tales of heroes long dead—all with the single aim of making money.

This is called entertainment value and it has succeeded because, after years of conditioning, the movie public accepts it—in the absence of anything else. Art values are completely subsidiary in the cinema world—profit is the primary consideration.

Thus, Americans get a steady diet of movies about love in which the poor girl marries the rich man—all of this, however, only after a series of near-catastrophic adventures. Or else, we get the hero pictures. Or the cycle pictures about war, great men, minor historical figures. On rare occasions, amid this welter of make-believe and distortion, we get a good picture which has artistic and entertainment value, some historical truth and social importance. But when compared with the mass of undiluted drivel that is produced by the ignorant rulers of the movie companies, it is totally insignificant.

That is why Hollywood gave the world a distorted picture of America. People in Europe, South America and the Far East thought of the United States as a land where everyone was rich—there were no poor people. This country appeared to the peoples of other lands as one in which nobody worked, everyone lived a life of leisure in immense luxury. Or, this was a country ruled by gunmen; that Al Capone was the high potentate of the forty-eight states; that all rich were crochety old men with hearts of gold; that cowboys, Indians and rustlers ruled the West, shooting up saloons and seizing women and cattle—in a word, everything but the truth.

Falsifying a Bad Book

It took Warner Brothers, probably the most sickening of all the Hollywood companies, to reach a new low in filming the greatest lie in cinema history. For *Mission to Moscow*, issued as a movie version of ex-Ambassador Joseph Davies' book by the same name, is a lie from its opening scene to the closing. It is not a faithful reproduction of a bad book; it is not a documentary film, which nominally depicts a phase of life, or history, or a specific event. It is a lie which does not correspond to the book from which the movie was made. The scenario has the touch of the GPU, reflected in the mind and beliefs of Erskine Caldwell, the Stalinist literary fellow-traveler. The movie is a political offering to Stalin and his régime and was made to meet the political needs growing out of the war alliance between the United States and Russia. It was made for the specific purpose of making more palatable and acceptable to the people of this country the murderous régime of the totalitarian Stalin.

Has the film any official status? With the State Department? The Office of War Information? Nobody knows. It is said that of all the pictures Warner Brothers has submitted to the OWI, *Mission to Moscow* was not among them. Why? Was it because some people in Washington might have objected? Was it because there are currents of thought in this country which would have made public the scandal which is this movie before it was exhibited? Was it because Warner Brothers and those interested in a wide performance of the picture preferred to let it be shown before a storm of protest might prevent its release or compel drastic revision of all its lies? It is difficult to say, because those persons of responsibility in Washington and those who should comment are strangely silent!

Warner Brothers went all-out in producing this tedious and boring picture. *Mission to Moscow* was released after one of the biggest advertising campaigns in movie history. The usual previews by critics did not take place. Everything was prepared as a surprise. The ordinary movie reviewers went hook, line and sinker for the movie. These unfortunate people, lacking economic, political or social training, historically uneducated, themselves divorced from the real world, examined the picture as they would any ordinary Hollywood

production. It did not dawn upon them that here was a purely political production destined to cause enormous controversy. Their reviews were of no importance. They concerned themselves with the question of whether Walter Huston was the proper person to enact Davies, whether the film characters looked or talked like the living models. Whether the movie told the truth, whether it adhered to the real history which transpired during their recent lives—of this there is nothing to be found among the everyday movie "critics."

It took the political writers, columnists and commentators to open up a barrage against *Mission to Moscow* that threatens to become a veritable offensive against the biggest lie turned out by Hollywood.

Pious Mr. Davies Introduces the Picture

Mission to Moscow is opened with a five-minute statement by Davies testifying to the truth of the picture. Without shame the ex-Ambassador makes reference to his origins, his saintly mother and his adherence to the principles of Christian morality. Thereafter begins the series of lies! The mass of them are presented elsewhere, as in *Labor Action*. Let us, however, outline some of the more important ones.

1. Davies, in his book, stated that the principled reason for his being sent to Russia was to take up and see if he could not collect Russia's war debts to the United States. The book makes the point that this ambassadorship to Russia was temporary, until a better place could be found, since Davies and his wife would have preferred the London post. In the movie, Davies is represented as being sent to Stalin's country to find out and tell the truth about that country and to see what Stalin would do in the event of war.

2. In the book, Davies reports that his first experience upon crossing the border into Russia was the extremely bad food, the general appearance of poverty and dreariness of the country under Stalin. In the movies, Davies is elaborately greeted with a sumptuous meal. This is followed with scenes of happiness, sunshine and a joyful people.

3. In the book, Davies comments on the ever-present and terrifying OGPU, which makes life a constant nightmare for the people. In the movie, aside from a reference that the OGPU is spying everywhere, it is depicted in kindly and benevolent scenes as protectors rather than persecutors.

4. In the book, Davies writes of his own perplexity at the Moscow Trials, how "unbelievable" they were. He is aghast at the execution of the officers and generals without trial. He is aghast at the execution of the Old Bolsheviks, to whom he refers as old "government leaders." It is all brutal and without sense. The trials repel him. Stalin's justice is highly questionable and the conduct of the self-confessed saboteurs is suspicious. In the book, Davies recites the numerous trials of the different groups of Old Bolsheviks. But in the movie, all the trials are telescoped into one. Tukhachevsky, who was never tried, is shown confessing in a non-existent trial and uttering words which were made by Old Bolshevik Muralov. The defendants are depicted in the rôle of Hollywood villains!

5. Whereas Radek, Bucharin and the others were in jail during the ex-Ambassador's stay in Russia, in the movie they are shown to have been out and about, plotting and planning sabotage and the destruction of Stalin's state and industries. They are shown attending a diplomatic ball, where they hatched plots with the German, Italian and Japanese Ambassadors. That these Old Bolsheviks whom Stalin murdered were not even present at this diplomatic function can be very

easily verified—but to the “truthful” ex-Ambassador and corporation lawyer upholding truth and Christian morality, any lie will do!

When No Mission Becomes a Mission

6. *In the movie*, Davies depicts himself as engaged in a mission of organizing the “democratic” and “peace-loving” powers in a front against aggression and fascism. *As a matter of fact*, he engaged in no mission whatever, other than that explained in the first point above. *In the movie*, he is shown visiting Churchill on his return from Russia, explaining to the present British Prime Minister the need for a bloc with Russia against Germany. *As a matter of fact*, he saw Churchill while he was Ambassador to Belgium and it had nothing whatever to do with what the movie describes.

7. While *in the movie* Russia is described as having been forced into a pact with Hitler because of the machinations of Britain and France, nothing is said or pictured of the fact that French and British military missions tried desperately for a period of months to get an alliance with Russia. Nor is the fact related that the Hitler-Stalin pact was already initialed while the French and British and Russian military staffs were negotiating. Nor is the fact related that the Russian representatives continued their negotiations even after the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed, because they did not know about it!

8. The *movie* says nothing about the significance of the Hitler-Stalin pact, nor does it point out that this alliance gave Hitler the go-sign to fire the opening shots in this war.

9. The *movie* is a complete distortion of the Finnish invasion by the Red Army. In the picture, Davies perpetuates the Stalinist lie, long after the event, that the invasion of Finland was for the express purpose of defending Russia against Germany. Yet at the time of the invasion, *Stalin and his satellites claimed that the invasion was carried out in order to protect Russia against the threats of England, France and the United States!* The picture creates the impression that the Administration was in accord with the invasion. But *as a matter of fact*, it was Roosevelt who called for a “moral embargo” against Russia and for aid to Finland. Robert E. Sherwood, one of Roosevelt’s closest advisers, wrote a play especially designed to win the sympathy of the American people for the Finns. The play denounced the invasion, as did the whole American press. But now, *in the movie*, and *after the fact*, in the hope that people’s memories will be short, Davies and his collaborators on the film have distorted the whole history of the event.

10. *The movie* shows a scene from the League of Nations wherein Haile Selassie makes an appeal to all its members against the brutal invasion of Ethiopia by the fascist Italian armies. Litvinov is then depicted as calling upon all the nations to rally behind Ethiopia. But *the movie* says nothing about the fact that Russia itself violated the covenant of the League by sending oil and other supplies to Mussolini to aid him in his war against the defenseless people of the invaded country.

11. *The movie* shows that upon Davies’ return to this country he engaged in a one-man campaign to win this country to its present policies, always championed by President Roosevelt. But *the movie* fails to show that precisely in the period when Davies was supposed to be making this veritable Superman campaign, the American Stalinists, pursuing the policies of their Moscow mentors, campaigned against the Allies, fought conscription, opposed the war budgets, and denounced

England and the United States, not Hitlerite Germany, as war-mongers.

12. *The movie* does not show Stalin and von Ribbentrop smiling at each other during the signing of their pact. It fails to quote Premier Molotov’s declaration after the pact that “fascism is a matter of personal taste.”

A Lend-Lease Offering to Stalin

We have cited some of the more obvious lies of the picture, the most glaring distortions of historical truth. There are many more like them, some just as important and some of a minor character—for the picture is fiction, pure and simple.

What is the purpose of all this? Who is being served by a GPU version of history? Naturally, the war and the fact of an American alliance with Russia makes possible the production of this fraudulent cinema. But even the exigency of the war is not a complete explanation of this bare-faced misrepresentation, this falsification of history. For in addition to the American-Russian alliance, which is the root of the distortion, there is the added element that it gave the Stalinists in this country an opportunity to push through their own vicious anti-democratic and anti-socialist propaganda. The willingly gullible Joseph Davies made an admirable foil for the Stalinist cinematic frame-up.

Thus, Congress, for whom revolutionary socialists have not the slightest brief, is represented as composed of a bunch of boobs. The socialist movement and the working class in general would be committing a crime against themselves if they believed that the parliamentary representatives of American capitalism were all morons. This is not true and never was true. They are diabolically clever representatives and defenders of imperialist capitalism and they serve their class exceptionally well.

But in comparing the so-called efficiency of the totalitarian Stalinist régime, where dissension is cured by execution, with the terrible inefficiency of the American parliamentary system, the picture conveys the idea that what is needed here is a little bit of blood-letting *à la* Stalin. Thus, too, Roosevelt is presented in oligarchical glory, a god-like figure who is all-wise and all-knowing. In this manner, the totalitarian idea and the totalitarian practice are subtly inculcated in the minds of the American people.

Roosevelt, Stalin and Joe Davies, these were the men who were right from the very beginning; they foresaw everything; they planned everything right! Those who opposed them, those who oppose them now, whether they be other sections of the capitalist class, liberals or revolutionary socialists, are fascists or dupes of fascism!

It has been said that *Mission to Moscow* has the purpose of glorifying Roosevelt and his policies, to prove that he was right about everything. But the picture does more than that. It glorifies Stalin, his régime, his policies. Most of the picture is devoted to that single purpose. But it could not be done without violating the truth, distorting history and lying about every event of importance that has transpired in the last ten years.

It is necessary that the widest protests be lodged against this vile picture, before its lies and distortions seep into the minds of people, before the type of thinking that is embodied in the picture and the practices of totalitarian Stalinists, who are its chief exponents, become a serious factor in American life. For here the reverse side of the totalitarian coin is revealed—and its face is as ugly as the face of fascism. A. G.

Lessons of the Spanish Commune

On the Anniversary of the Barcelona Uprising

On the Monday afternoon of May 3, 1937, Barcelona, Spain, witnessed one more heroic attempt of the European working class to take the future into its own hands. On that day was repeated the tremendous effort of July, 1936, when the Spanish workers first declared their complete independence of the old ruling class plans for their future. Had they succeeded, the whole course of human history might have taken a different turn.

In these "May Days," the same forces that brought the entire European labor movement to its recent defeats—that is, the People's Fronters, the socialist-reformists, the Stalinists and trade union fakers—clashed in open and violent conflict with the aroused and determined revolutionary workers of Catalonia. To understand the full significance of these events, we must go back a few months to the beginning of the Spanish civil war.

In the months preceding the attempted fascist coup of July 19, 1936, the Spanish workers had shown their class maturity again and again. Mass actions, abortive insurrections and land seizures had mirrored for all who wished to see, their readiness for a drastic social change. But the anarchist and socialist mass organizations did not want to see. The *mis-leaders* of the labor movement were incapable of directing an aggressive fight in the face of the blows that the rapidly deteriorating Spanish economy was dealing the workers. While the vanguard of the labor movement dissipated its energy in sporadic actions, the political initiative was left to the monarchist and fascist generals who openly planned and staged the military revolt of July 19.

The republican government, vainly trying to stay on the fence between the aroused working class and the determined fascists, awoke one morning to find itself completely stripped of its army and police force. Those sections of the armed forces which had not gone over to the fascists, had joined the ranks of the revolutionaries. The epic of that July in Catalonia has been told many times—how the rank and file workers left their factories to seek arms (which were denied them by the People's Front government of liberals and pink-tea socialists); how they surrounded the barracks and disarmed, or conquered, the revolting fascist army.

The Initiative of the Spanish Workers

What has not been so well understood is the relation between the republic of 1931, the armed Spanish masses, and their betrayers in the weeks following the rout of the fascists.

The revolt was put down by the revolutionary workers in the big cities and industrial centers of Spain. The fighting spread across the Peninsula in a contest between the hastily formed workers' columns and the few remaining army divisions, to cross the country areas and reach the distant centers where the working class was, with difficulty, still holding out—Seville, Granada, Toledo, Saragossa, etc.

In order to stop the fascists, the organized workers—the only force which was offering them any resistance—took over every major industry in Spain within a few days of the revolt: transport, communications, steel, coal, metallurgy, etc., and, to all practical purposes, socialized distribution. On July

20, rank and file committees in politically and industrially advanced Catalonia were proclaiming the social revolution and calling for the organization of a new social system.

So tremendous was the impetus of the revolutionary movement launched by the Spanish workers in answer to the fascist attack, that their *official* chiefs—of the Socialist Party and the Iberian Anarchist Federation (FAI)—were pulled along in tow for almost two months, unable to stem the tide. All the leadership these gentlemen gave in those first few days was contained in an order to declare a general strike in those cities *where the fascist revolt was successful!*

On their own hook, the third and fourth-string leaders of the anarchist trade unions (CNT) and the socialist unions (UGT) went ahead to organize militias and confiscate factories. *But the moment soon arrived when centralized, co-ordinated leadership—in the true sense—was needed.* Overall plans for waging the war and reorganizing the economy to meet its demands were required, as Franco's general staff found its stride and began to coördinate its activities on the newly formed "fronts": Madrid, Aragon, and the southern front.

It was at this juncture, in September, 1936, that the Spanish working class fell victim to the tragic weakness of labor in our era: all their heroism could not substitute for the lack of a resolute, revolutionary, class leadership. Their old chiefs returned to the scene then, with all *their plans* for waging the war—plans that were inseparably linked with those of the British Foreign Office, and directed against the true interests of the laboring masses.

The *plan* of the socialist, Prieto, was to mortgage the future of the Spanish workers to Britain, in return for a negotiated peace. UGT leader Caballero's *plan* was to outwit Prieto by building on the support of the USSR, whose ambassador, Rosenberg, visited him almost daily with "advice." The *plan* of the anarcho-syndicalists was to *fool* Caballero and Prieto, Britain and Russia, into building up a powerful worker-owned economic unit in Catalonia which they, as union bureaucrats, would administer. They would fool them by entering the People's Front government and making whatever political concessions were asked of them—since every good anarchist knows that in the last analysis it is the economy which determines everything!

The CNT bureaucrats took Durruti's slogan as their own: "Surrender everything but the victory." And they embarked in fact on a program of surrendering every economic and social gain the masses had won—and were still in the process of organizing—in the fall and winter of 1936. None of the social and economic changes of the revolution were ever legalized by that People's Front government.

As early as November, 1936, the rank and file, both socialist and anarchist, began to see the fallacy of this program. So far had the bankruptcy of capitalism progressed in Spain, that almost every worker in a shop knew himself, through his own experience with the revolting army and the disorganized economy, that the old politicians ("Management," as such, was practically extinct on Spanish soil) couldn't organize any-

thing, least of all the successful prosecution of a complicated modern war.

Sharp Conflicts with the Betrayers

The Catalans, the Valencianos and the Madrileños had indeed put their hand to the wheel of guiding their own destinies, and did not propose that their worker-controlled economy or army should be returned to the discredited republican politicians, who planned openly to ask Britain for vast "reconstruction" loans. The tremendous awakening that swept through the Spanish fields and factories brought in its wake hundreds of local, regional and provincial papers and radios through which the local industrial unions and party branches declared their intentions. Here there were many who left records of their thoughts: they saw plainly that their leaders were taking them back into the old paths again; that their fight was being subordinated to the aims and politics of the old imperialists, who had always decided the fate of the world by means of their own private wars, so destructive to the masses.

Some groups of workers saw farther than others. But by May, 1937, after ten months of unsuccessful warfare, a deep unrest was stirring the whole population of anti-fascist Spain. They saw that their break with the old system and its plans for the future of Spain was being bridged over by the reformist People's Front government, in as many ways as it could devise. Alvarez del Vayo, the socialist foreign Minister, pleaded with Britain to accept responsibility for the future of Spain. In fact, on February 9, 1937, the government even offered Spanish Morocco to the "democratic powers," if only they would intervene.

The masses saw all this; but the thing they understood best was the government's repeated efforts to disarm them. Downing Street insisted on this "restoration of internal order" because it knew that as long as the Spanish unionists were armed and controlled the policing of Spain, they would never surrender the foreign-owned industries they had seized. The workers knew exactly the same thing; to them, their rifles and few machine guns were the symbol and the guarantee of their power. When Prieto said, his eye on London: "This war will be won on the home front"; and when Galarza, the socialist minister, actually launched the war on the home front to disarm the masses, *Pueblo Libre* (Free People) of Levante said: "They need rifles at the home front? Let them send up the 15,000 held by the republican police, and their machine guns and artillery along with them." (March 13, 1937.)

These sentiments were echoed by the unionists of Castille, Andalusia and Levante, as the "second front" offensive reached their villages—led by the Stalinists, ever zealous to show England how trustworthy and non-revolutionary they were. In February and March, 1937, the deaths and imprisonments in these regions totalled many hundreds as the anti-working class forces advanced. In Catalonia, where the reaction had less of a foothold, the riots only began in April, and there were not so many workers killed because the revolutionaries so outnumbered their opponents.

So it was that in May, 1937, the whole movement of the Spanish revolution was heading toward a climax, and with it the fate of the European labor movement. Was it possible for the heroic Catalan proletariat to finish the socialist revolution it started in July? It was a situation where the success or failure of the elemental and gigantic mass reaction that was shaking the political scene depended on the existence of an

organized party that could give conscious expression and direction to the feelings and needs of the workers.

The Stalinist Counter-Revolution

There were tardy fumbblings in the direction of such a party. There were regroupments going on within every labor organization, due to the impact, at the base, of the last months of "official" retreat. The big industrial federations of the UGT were forcing Caballero to a split with the Stalinists. In the libertarian movement, several left-wing groups were in opposition to the leadership; in the northern part of Catalonia, many local governments had signed mutual aid pacts to remain armed, in readiness for the Stalinist-bourgeois attack; in Bajo Llobregat, an industrial area near Barcelona, *Ideas* was openly calling for a second revolution to complete the first; the Friends of Durruti, a fast-growing group in the FAI, demanded the constitution of a revolutionary committee; in the POUM, a strong left wing threatened to wrest control from the old leadership.

The ranks were slowly educating their "leaders," so-called, and pushing some of them to the left. But not fast enough to make up for the months lost in retreat—months that the British had used to win over big sections of the union and party machines to their policies; months when able Stalinist propaganda had recruited sizeable groups of policemen, small merchants, government officials and army officers into their party.

The lead in resolving the tense situation was taken by the Stalinists. They were determined to gain control of the country's political life, and gained in this project the scarcely veiled support of the republicans and right-wing socialists. Their plans, laid out by the Kremlin, revolved around that favorite stratagem of the police mind: provocation.

The GPU confected a plot in Brussels to provoke the Catalan workers into armed revolt against the "legitimate government," in which their "own leaders were holding posts." This revolt was then to serve as the pretext for a total disarming and repression of all independent organs of class action. It was hoped that this would finally "sell" England on supporting Spanish anti-fascism—of the non-revolutionary variety.

The provocation itself was simple enough. Groups of Stalinists assaulted and disarmed or assassinated revolutionary militants for several weeks leading up to May 3, when they systematically began to occupy key buildings: the telephone exchanges in Barcelona and Tarragona, the anarchist headquarters elsewhere. The workers rose to the provocation, despite the repeated appeals of their leaders to remain "serene and calm." They saw what was behind the provocation—namely, the determination of the last defenders of the old ruling class to disarm and chain the workers once again to the worn-out system. On May 3, factory whistles of the collectivized plants in Barcelona signaled a general strike. The workers took to the streets and surrounded every police headquarters, government and Stalinist building with barricades. The district defense committees wanted to clean up their own parts of town and then concentrate on the official buildings in the center. Barcelona was surrounded by a "Red Ring" of armed workers' power.

In the rest of Catalonia, the issue had already come to a head and many of the towns were already in the power of joint POUM-CNT committees. On the Aragon front, where thousands of soldiers had been immobilized for months, columns were prepared to return to the rear and "clean it up."

The Valencia government was withdrawing troops from the front to send to Barcelona. From towns along the route of the troops came calls to the anarchist headquarters—should the union conductors bring the trains in? Should the village defense committees let them pass?

The whole tragedy of the Spanish revolution was given its most graphic expression in that week. History presented Europe with its last chance to change the nature of the coming war. The power was again in the streets; the armed Spanish workers were prepared to defend their independent revolutionary actions and carry them further.

But the official "labor" leadership was much farther to the right than it had been in July. The Barcelona CNT-FAI committees, under the tremendous pressure of the masses, wavered and stumbled toward a seizure of power. CNT ministers Garcia Oliver and Federica Montseny flew in by special plane from Valencia to reiterate over the radio the command: "Alto fuego!" ("Stop firing!") The FAI refused to allow its defense committee to call a mobilization for the center of the city.

The moment was lost. The careful preparatory work of building a revolutionary party had been lacking. The recent regroupings were isolated, disorganized and unclear as to

what they wanted to do. The courageous and militant Barcelona working class lost 500 killed and 1,500 wounded in its unsuccessful attempt to regain the road of socialist revolution.

With the defeat began a white terror in all anti-fascist Spain, directed by the GPU, toward the extermination of the most militant leaders. A few weeks after this silencing of working class objections, Negrin's "Government of Victory" was formed, which followed the directives of the Foreign Office and led Spain to slaughter on the altar of appeasement. The same People's Fronters, reformists and Stalinists led the French workers to defeat, discouragement and the débâcle of 1940.

The European working class is paying dearly for the betrayals of the revolutionary movement in Spain. They and we must learn the lessons of the heroic stand of the Catalan workers, which will go down in history as a Second Commune. This time it held out for ten long months and showed us again that only a party that remains absolutely true to the watchword of *independent political action of the working class* can lead the masses to a final victory over their oppressors.

MIRIAM GOULD.

Unemployment: A Post-War Prospect

Revelations of Recent Studies

The end of the war is nowhere in sight, but already the bourgeois leaders of the United Nations are busily engaged in discussing and mapping out post-war plans for so-called economic reconstruction. These discussions take on a more practical character with the increasing military strength of the Allies and the growing conviction that they shall win the victory in the war. The burdens of the economic and political theorists have become lighter—not in the problems they must solve but in the need to hurl vistas of the beautiful post-war life awaiting the masses. We have pointed out many times that, as the military power and the military fortunes of the Allies improves, the reactionary political and economic policies to which they really adhere, are spoken of more openly. The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms are now hardly uttered by their initiators and popularizers. Their watchword is: first the victory, then we shall see.

But at home the Administration and the congressional leaders are deeply concerned with the concrete economic problems which will confront the nation in the post-war period. Congress, the Administration and the organizations of big business (the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States) have been studying post-war economic problems and discussing these among themselves. They attempt to determine, on the basis of economic data of the prewar period extending over four decades, i.e., the economic trends and experiences through the rise of American imperialism, the prosperity years and the crisis, what lies in store for their economy immediately after the war.

Senator George's Future for America

All of them are acutely aware of one thing: There is a rocky road full of pitfalls ahead for capitalist economy. The crisis of 1929-32 shook this order to its very foundations. The

effort of reformism to stave off complete and irremediable collapse through the New Deal failed in its basic experiments. During the years 1929-40, there were improvements in the economy, but these improvements were measured against the low years of 1929-32. At no time did the Administration feel that it had really conquered the crisis. Prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe (September, 1939) American economy was again headed for a sharp decline. The war, with its tremendously abnormal demands, saved Roosevelt and his panaceas for capitalist economic survival. For the war demanded so much in goods that it absorbed the mass of unemployed and called upon the total capacities of American industry (primarily heavy and manufacturing) to meet its needs.

But these gentlemen are now worried again. Supremely confident of a military victory, they are also aware of the fact that the demands created by the war will cease immediately upon the military triumph. What will be the main problem then? How shall it be met? Needless to say, the main single problem facing the bourgeoisie will be mass unemployment. They will endeavor to solve that problem as in the past, and they will be unable to solve it. But other problems—decline in production, change in the character of goods, mass unemployment, reconstruction and readjustment—will be uniform to all the powers. They will be especially acute in the United States, with its tremendous industrial plant and high rate of productivity. That is why the discussion over these problems in this country has become so practical recently.

The greatest fear of American capitalism is that the economic problems of the post-war period will be so acute as to endanger "free enterprise." That which they fear so much, another period of "New Dealism," is a dead certainty. This was the theme of the speech made by Senator Walter F. George at the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of the

United States. Senator George is not a New Dealer. He came to the dinner to discuss the common problems of big business and the government and he said many things. He was for free enterprise (read: big business), but unfortunately he foresaw the inability of free enterprise to live without the closest collaboration and aid from the government. This must be reasonable, however. It must not interfere with initiative, ownership and profit. The government, in his eyes, as in the eyes of the Chamber, exists to aid business in need. Taxation will be high, but the government will try to keep it as low as possible; it will try to spread it so that it covers the mass of workers and poor farmers in the country. He is in favor, as are his listeners, of a national sales tax. Pay-as-you-go is likely to remain in the post-war period, etc. But the most important point made in the George address relates to the general problem of the rate and level of production and employment.

On the basis of well-established figures, the senator estimates a post-war labor force of fifty-five or fifty-six million workers. This figure is half again as large as the labor force in 1929 and two and a half times as large as that of 1932! In order to keep employment at a "normal" level, production will have to reach a peacetime level of \$155,000,000,000 annually! What this means concretely we shall soon discover.

A Department of Commerce Study

Senator George's figures are the result of many studies now being made by government economists and statisticians. But of particular interest is an important review entitled *Post-War Manpower and Its Capacity to Produce*, by S. Morris Livingston, published in the April issue of the Department of Commerce *Survey of Current Business*. Mr. Livingston investigated several basic tendencies in economy observed over four decades beginning with 1899: growth in labor force, a general shifting from industries of low productivity to those of high productivity, a constant increase in productivity in general and productivity per man-hour, and a tendency toward the shorter work-week. These basic tendencies, the study reveals, have been uniform during these many years covering the period of the upward development of American capitalism and its most severe and devastating crisis. In some respects, the tendencies were accelerated during the period of the crisis when capitalist economy sought to increase production at the expense of its labor force.

Dealing with the aim of American capitalism to enjoy a "normal" existence in the post-war period, Mr. Livingston writes that it will not exist unless "productive jobs can be provided for the vast majority of those seeking employment; and, that in providing these jobs, *the volume of production could go far above any pre-war level*" (emphasis mine—A. G.). The writer takes the year 1940 as a measuring point. In that year, "the nation turned out more goods and services . . . than in any previous year." Yet of the total labor force, only 46,000,000 persons were employed. *There were still 8,900,000 unemployed!* There were other millions "ekeing out an existence on sub-marginal farms and in other unproductive occupations."

The year 1940, however, marked the turning point in the transition from a partial peacetime and war economy to a total war economy. America's entry into the war implied a complete transformation of the economy. This transformation took place more rapidly than appeared during the days of the actual change. The most easily discernible features of this war economy is the almost complete change-over to the

production of war goods and the precipitate decline in the production of consumer goods, luxury and service commodities.

A marked shift took place in the occupations of millions of workers. The tendency to shift from unproductive to productive industries was sharply accented by two factors: the guaranteed profits arising from government war orders and the establishment of priorities in raw materials virtually excluding non-war industries and compelling either their permanent dissolution or temporary closing. By the year 1943, unemployment was reduced from 8,900,000 to about 1,000,000, which is regarded as normal in capitalist economy. This decline in unemployment was accompanied by the longer work-week, an influx of women into industry, partially offsetting the drain of manpower by the enlarged armed forces, and an increase in the physical volume of production half again as large as in 1940.

Some Basic Trends in Economy

In assessing the relative values of production in 1940, when there was a reserve army of unemployed totalling 8,900,000, to 1943, when unemployment reached a "normal" stage, Mr. Livingston points out in a footnote that the present annual rate of production of the gross national product is at about one hundred and seventy billion dollars as compared to ninety-seven billion dollars in 1940 (first quarter estimates). Taking the price differences into account, the 1940 production value would be one hundred and forty-six billion dollars as compared to one hundred and seventy billion in 1943. According to the Federal Reserve index of industrial production, an increase of sixty-five per cent is to be recorded from the year 1940 to the first quarter of 1943.

We have already mentioned several constant factors in the economy, as, for example, growth of the labor force arising from the natural growth of population (despite the fact that the birth rate in this country has been declining), and increasing productivity per man-hour. Livingston points out that during the years 1929 to 1941 there was a two and a half per cent growth per year in output per man-hour. At the rate of growth of the labor force and productivity, the available manpower capacity in 1946 (1946 is used on the *assumption* that the war might end in that year) will be fifteen to twenty per cent greater than the capacity in 1940 and output will be forty to fifty per cent greater than the actual output in 1940. The writer then adds: "This takes into account the long-term trend toward shorter hours. It allows for only a rock-bottom minimum of unemployed. Therefore it is an optimum goal and not a forecast." Why it is a goal and not a forecast is indicated in his review and we will refer to it.

There is an interesting discussion of population growth and the sources for increased manpower in Livingston's study, but these are not wholly essential for this article. He does show that the present increase in the total number of workers employed has been 3,500,000, despite the vast expansion of the armed forces. Moreover, the "abnormal" increase in the number of workers may reach 6,000,000. A large section of this labor force will, upon the conclusion of the war, leave industrial occupations. In general, however, it is expected that by the year 1946, the total labor force will have reached 59,400,000. Population growth *after* 1946 will "add about half a million per year in each of the years immediately following." This will not lessen the problem of employment, but make it more acute.

Interestingly enough, this Department of Commerce economist hazards a guess as to the number of persons remaining in the armed forces for "policing the world" at 1,900,000. This might be inadequate, he adds, but points out that it is more than "five times the manpower devoted to this purpose in 1939."

Another factor of interest revealed by Livingston is that while there has been a decline in the work-week and the output per worker has greatly increased, as previously mentioned, the output per worker has been two-thirds greater than the increase in output per man-hour. This means that the process of rationalization, i.e., the rate of exploitation of labor, has greatly increased. One of the features of the crisis years was the rise of productivity with a reduced labor force and this was one of the reasons, though not the most important, for the inability of American capitalism to relieve mass unemployment.

Thus, on the basis of past trends and current tendencies, the *potential* "man-hours of productive employment in 1946 become twenty per cent greater than the actual employment in 1940, or ten per cent greater than in 1941." Taking the figure of 2,000,000 as a "normal" army of unemployed in 1946, Mr. Livingston presents the following chart:

	Average 1940	Average 1941	Average 1946
	(Millions of persons)		
Total labor force	55.5	56.1	59.4
Armed forces6	1.7	1.9
Civilian labor force	54.9	54.4	57.5
Unemployed	8.9	5.6	2.0
Civilian employed	46.0	48.8	55.5
Increase 1940-46	20 pct.		
Increase 1941-46, adjusted for shorter hours in 1946.	10 pct.		

It will be immediately noted that the reduction by one-half for shorter hours is an assumption based on past trends. This seems very probable, but how great a decrease is difficult to estimate now because that too is dependent on many factors, economic and political, which the writer does not even consider, but which are completely dependent on the war, which side wins, how the victory is won and what the relations of the powers will be in the post-war period as respects the domination of the world market.

On the other hand, Mr. Livingston is quick to recognize that the reduction of the unemployed army to one million in March of 1943 has been *unusual* and resulted wholly from the demands of the war. "In other words," he adds, "it is better than we can hope for during a peacetime year."

Part of the explanation is to be found in the following situation: increase in productivity. From 1899 to 1941 "the number of persons employed in all manufacturing increased by 130 per cent. The average hours worked per week declined 25 per cent from 54.0 to 40.5. Thus the number of man-hours worked in manufacturing increased only 72 per cent. Over the same period the physical output of manufactures increased 458 per cent. Over the forty-two years the gain in output per man-hour averaged 2.9 per cent per year compounded. From 1929 to 1941 the increase was 3.1 per cent per year" (emphasis mine—A. G.).

It is obvious that the sharp rise in per man-hour output during 1929-41 resulted from the requirements of the economic crisis. But the main over-all tendencies are clear. "In constant prices the gross national product in 1941 was approximately thirty-one per cent greater than in 1929. . . . Thus the output per man-hour was increased by roughly one-third over

the twelve-year period, or at the rate of about 2.5 per cent per year compounded."

In addition to all the factors already cited, the problem of technological advances must be considered. That these will be enormous, goes without saying. To what extent productivity will be influenced is difficult to say now, for the facts are as yet unavailable. But the war will greatly accelerate technological progress as it did after the First World War. Livingston, while mentioning this factor, is unable to incorporate the problem in his forecasts except on the basis of past trends. But it is certain that the rate of acceleration will be greater now than twenty-five years ago.

Post-War Output and Employment

On the basis of his investigation, however, taking the figure of a 2.5 per cent per year average increase since 1929, our economist determines that by 1946 output per man-hour will be 13.5 per cent greater than in 1941. And further, on the basis of the available labor force, improved technology, increased productivity, Mr. Livingston writes: "the potential output of available manpower in 1946 would be 25 per cent greater than the actual output in 1941 and 46 per cent above 1940."

Thus, for unemployment "to be held within reasonable bounds," output in 1946 must "substantially exceed the 1940 level." And suppose that this enormous output cannot be fulfilled? Mass unemployment will be the outstanding feature of economic life! If production is maintained on the level of 1940, on the basis of the same hours of work, Mr. Livingston concludes that there will be the 8,900,000 unemployed which was normal in 1940, plus 2,600,000 of the increased civilian labor force (population growth), plus 8,000,000 who will have been displaced by "improvements in efficiency over the six-year period, or a total of more than 19,000,000! And he adds: "Even with an average work-week five hours shorter than in 1940 there would be more unemployed than in 1932" (emphasis mine—A. G.).

These are the prospects of the continued existence of capitalist society. All of this assumes the best variant of a quick military victory (not a paralyzing war-exhaustion). Only American economic dominance of the post-war world can effect the above prospect. But if the war is protracted, if exhaustion accompanies a long war, if American imperialism fails to achieve its economic and political aims, the above variant will be unrealized, i.e., a variant of 19,000,000 unemployed! *It will be much worse!* Thus the victory will confront the masses with economic conditions worse than 1932. The problems which the working class will need to solve in such a situation become inherently clear.

Fully conscious of these economic prospects, American imperialism plans to solve them by a ruthless drive for world political and economic hegemony. In this endeavor, it will face the competition of the other powers composing the United Nations. Whatever the concrete turn in events, international relations are certain to be sharply antagonistic, the economic and political rivalries severely intensified. Given the certain inability of capitalism to solve its problems on the home front, under conditions even less favorable than before the war, the class struggle will inevitably sharpen. It will be a period of heightened international and national contradictions of imperialist capitalism.

The new socialist society will be on the order of the day!
ALBERT GATES.

What About the German Revolution?—II

Conclusion of a Discussion Article

[Concluded from Last Issue]

There is no other situation in history that so clearly reveals the objective revolutionary possibilities that are ruined by lack of determined, revolutionary leadership. The above-mentioned Held, however, goes so far in his stupidity that he states:

Numerous utopian radical elements lacking theoretical knowledge and political experience had linked themselves to the Spartakusbund during the first days of the revolution. Some of them considered armed uprising as a panacea and every other form of political activity as sheer betrayal, etc., etc.

How Held would organize in revolutionary crises, especially after the experiences of the last twenty-five years, after the victory of the counter-revolution in Europe, other than with *inexperienced* elements, remains *his* secret, which we shall not try to uncover. The entire anti-Hitler movement, and especially its revolutionary wing, would fall off its feet with joy today if there were only some groups, no matter how small and inexperienced, who would be ready to fight with arms in hand against the Nazis in Germany. Even the Cannonites would not go so far in folly as to call these elements "slum proletarian adventurers," but would naturally contend at the top of their lungs that they are "genuine Trotskyists" or at least sympathizers of the Fourth International. Unfortunately, however, many and variegated influences combined to combat, suppress and destroy all the active elements in the German labor movement, and a not insignificant factor in this campaign of destruction was the Paul Levi so eulogized by Held, the Paul Levi who, twenty years afterward, is praised for having purged the Spartakusbund of "radical elements" and expelling the majority of the activist worker-elements at the Heidelberg Congress in September, 1919, with highly undemocratic methods, in the hope of being able to take the road of a large, oppositional, mass party with the remaining minority.

The historical misfortune of Paul Levi, Brandler, Paul Frölich, Jakob Walcher, *e tutti quanti*, consisted, however, in the fact that once they had at last kicked out the radical elements and gotten started on the road of the "conquest of the masses," these same masses played them a trick by once more endeavoring to unhorse the counter-revolutionary rider.

The German working class did not have the insight into the weakness of the counter-revolution that we are now able to gain in the dead calm of the Stalinist counter-revolutionary era by a study of the documents. It knew nothing about the "feeling of depression and despondency of the Supreme Army Command" upon receiving the revolutionary reports from Berlin in December, 1918. It knew nothing of the grave internal crises, inside the Supreme Army Command itself, of the ghastly fear of the bourgeois young men who collected in the White Guardist and various counter-revolutionary organizations (characteristic of this is, among other things, the description in the autobiography of Ernst von Salomon of the quaking terror of the Baltic gangs before the Harburg workers—Harburg is an industrial city near Hamburg). But impelled by the right instinct, by the right awareness that the

forces of the counter-revolution can only grow and those of the workers only diminish if the régime should be allowed to stabilize itself, they tried over and over again, with countless sacrifices and by staking "their own and their blood," that is, their jobs and their lives. The various partial struggles from 1918 to 1923, the March Action included, must be examined from this standpoint in order to be able to analyze them in connection with the *subsequent* National-Socialist development, to be able to gain a correct point of view. In this connection, the much-debated question of how the March, 1921, Action was organized, "badly" or "well," is a question of second-rate or third-rate importance.

That this uprising was possible at all shows the lasting revolutionary restlessness and the revolutionary possibilities in Germany of that period. Let someone just try to bring Pittsburgh to the point of an armed uprising against Roosevelt and he will learn in practice the difference between truly genuine "Putschism" and real adventurism, namely, the difference between an armed uprising in a non-revolutionary situation and an armed uprising in a revolutionary situation. Max Hölz's action in the Vogtland, for example, is thus one of the most instructive episodes of the revolutionary German labor movement; and it might be said in passing, that it is necessary for the *future* German labor movement, which will face tremendous struggles with the counter-revolution of the whole world, especially with the counter-revolution of the Stalinist tint, to link itself to the tradition of its active pioneer fighters, and among them are Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht—and Max Hölz as well; but not the Luxemburgian epigone, Paul Levi. In passing it might also be said that the Russian Central Committee first supported the March Action, only to condemn it later on, but not so much on grounds of a different appraisal of the situation alone, but rather in connection with the change of course of Russian policy after Kronstadt and the commencing preparation for the NEP.

V.

One of the most important and interesting episodes is the Kapp Putsch. Against the feeble and immature attempt to set up the Kapp-Lüttwitz dictatorship, the whole German proletariat arose, and wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie and certain fractions of the bureaucracy associated themselves with it. The Noske-Ebert government was losing strength; it fled first to Dresden and then to Stuttgart and saw its whole "work of stabilization" imperilled. The fighting labor movement proceeded from defense against the Putsch and developed in the direction of the proletarian struggle for power. Things reached the point at that time of the formation of the Red Army in the Ruhr region, the only large, cohesive, armed formation that the German working class was able to produce out of its midst. The Spartakus Central Committee, under the leadership of Thalheimer, taken completely by surprise, came out in favor of "neutrality" at the beginning of the movement. Paul Levi was then in prison and disapproved of this position. But it was only the consequence of his political line, especially the consequence of the splitting-off of the Commu-

nist Labor Party (KAPD). The Ruhr uprising was strangled by the Bielefeld Agreement, which was signed by another supporter of Paul Levi, Wilhelm Pieck, along with the social-democrat, Severing, and which opened wide the gates to the White reaction in the Ruhr region. The platform of the Spartakusbund in the Kapp Putsch was the demand for the formation of a "Workers' Government," by which it understood a coalition government between the Independent Socialist Party (USP) and the majority Social-Democratic Party. Lenin criticized this attitude of the Spartakus Central Committee in his *Infantile Malady*, but confined himself to the criticism of the concrete mistake during the Kapp Putsch, without disclosing the connection with the precedent political events and the attitude of the Spartakus Central Committee in these events. How far removed the Spartakus Central Committee was from a genuinely correct estimation of the situation is shown by a report of a member of the committee, probably Wilhelm Pieck in the *Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 10, which says:

There was a possibility of forcing the Ebert-Bauer government to establish a workers' government with the bourgeoisie excluded by threatening it with the continuation of the general strike.

In this formulation, every word is characteristic of the fundamental line of the then communist leadership. The general strike was "threatened," that is, an energetic *continuation* of the general strike and its extension to an armed action is *renounced*, and that in turn means that the leadership was trailing the movement *which changed from a general strike into an armed action*. The armed workers in the Ruhr region and Saxony had the very modest aim of marching on Berlin to finish off the counter-revolution. The Central Committee, however, sets the aim of "excluding the bourgeoisie," that is, the exclusion of the bourgeois parties from the parliamentary coalition. Here too the slogan trails behind the actual standing of the movement which, by the formation of Workers' Guards and Revolutionary Committees, is in the process of organizing the "dual power" and of doing it on a higher and more developed foundation than the movement of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils in November, 1918, because between 1918 and March, 1920, lie two and a half years of revolutionary struggles and experiences.

Let us note in passing that the left wing, so disdainfully designated as adventurist by Held, arose under the leadership of Maslow inside the KPD in March, 1920, when a few representatives from Berlin, Hamburg and the Ruhr region criticized the lamentable failure of the Spartakus Central Committee in the Kapp Putsch. This failure did not prevent the independent social-democratic workers from shifting to the side of October a few months later, that is, to separate from their reformist leadership in Halle and to undertake seriously the formation of a revolutionary party. It is not the Twenty-One Points of the Comintern that split the USPD, but the revolutionary events and experiences the working class had gone through in the Kapp Putsch and especially the enormous betrayal of the workers by the Bauer-Ebert government after the Putsch. The Bauer-Ebert government, which called for a general strike to protect itself against Kapp-Lüttwitz, which cleared out of Dresden because it feared arrest at the hands of its own General Märker, later let the same Reichswehr march into Saxony, the Ruhr region and Berlin against the striking and fighting workers, disarmed them, arrested them, destroyed their organizations—and all this made a much greater impression and spoke much more emphatically of the

need of a revolutionary party than all the theses and speeches from Moscow.

VI.

In the anti-Stalinist movement, especially in its Trotskyist wing, it is an axiom that the situation in Germany in 1923 was objectively revolutionary, ripe for the overturn and for the seizure of power by the Communist Party of Germany. In saying this, it is always taken for granted that Trotsky, then still a member of the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party and of the Præsidium of the Communist International, was the exponent of this conception in the Russian party, its protagonist and pioneer. Trotsky defends this conception in his *Lessons of October* and in many other articles and theses, although he *nowhere* expressed himself on the early history of the Communist Party of Germany, nowhere analyzed how the collapse of the communist movement in 1923 came about. In passing, he once said casually:

In their criticism of Brandler, the ultra-lefts aired many correct ideas *at the end of 1923*, which did not hinder them from committing the grossest mistakes in 1924-25.

In this statement, the phrase "the end of 1923" should be borne in mind above all, because it provides indirectly a confirmation of the fact, covered by many legends, that Trotsky, in the internal disputes of the Communist Party of Germany, adopted the views of the then left wing of the KPD only at the *end of 1923*. A mendacious concealment of the real state of affairs, dangerous for the young generation, has indeed been created by Trotsky's *Lessons of October*, which in no wise suffices for an understanding of the crisis of 1923.

The occupation of the Ruhr region by the Franco-Belgian troops took place in *January, 1923*, on the grounds of the failure to pay reparations and with the aim of a lasting occupation of this important industrial center. First of all, the march into the Ruhr broke off all the possibilities of coöperation between German and French imperialism and promptly created a political and economic crisis of the first order. The German bourgeoisie organized the so-called passive resistance in the Ruhr, that is, *sabotage*. At the same time, it tried to combine with English imperialism against the French. The result of this policy, the result of the occupation, was a tremendous weakening of the strength of the central power in Berlin and a precarious situation in one of the most important key regions of German economy. The occupation power was in no position at all to organize administration and production, and the working masses understood very well and very soon that the absence of the hated counter-revolutionary Reichswehr troops and the weakness of both adversaries—the French as well as the German—could be exploited by them at that moment and made possible an independent revolutionary movement. The costs of the emptied pits and of the dissolving administrative apparatus had to be borne by the Ruhr proletariat, a proletariat that was seething more than in any other locality in Germany, and in which the revolutionary struggles and experiences of the years past, especially during the Kapp Putsch, were still alive.

At this moment, that is, in *January, 1923*, the Congress of the Communist Party of Germany met in Leipzig under the leadership of the Brandler-Walcher-Thalheimer-Frölich Central Committee, whose political line was very strongly influenced by Karl Radek, a politician closely linked at that time with Trotsky. The line of the Central Committee was based

upon the relative stabilization of the class fronts in Germany, upon a struggle within the democratic republic or, as the theses adopted at the congress expressed it, "within the framework and with the methods of the democratic republic." The road to this struggle was to be participation in a coalition government in the provinces of South Thuringia, Saxony, whose industry bore a different character from that of the Ruhr, and whose working class, by origin and tradition, represented the type of the radical, social-democratic *party member*.

The left wing in the KPD demanded at the January Congress that the Ruhr crisis be placed in the center of the debates and action. This proposal was voted down by the Brandler Central Committee and its majority and a split almost took place in the Communist Party over the Ruhr crisis, prevented with great difficulty only by the Moscow emissaries. In this sharp conflict, which revolved exclusively around German questions, that is, the appraisal of the revolutionary crisis in Germany and the road the KPD should take in this first-rate crisis—in this sharp party crisis, which, as has been said, almost led to a split, Trotsky stood on the side of the Brandler faction and supported its political line against the Left Opposition. The Brandler Central Committee tried to throw the left wing out of the KPD all through the year 1923, and to organize a second Heidelberg. To achieve this aim, it employed every means of provocation and persecution (of course, within the limits of party methods of those days, removing party officials, transfers, disciplinary interventions from above, party orders to defend conceptions in public with which the comrade did not agree), and personal calumny, especially against Maslow.

In this sharp party crisis, the interests of Brandler's conception, which would not be moved by the Ruhr crisis from its line of approachment to the social-democratic policy and the renunciation of "civil war methods," were backed for the time being by the foreign-political interests of the Political Bureau of the Russian party. In this Political Bureau, the opinion prevailed throughout the first half of 1923 that the Ruhr crisis might lead to a military collision between France and Germany which would force the German bourgeoisie to establish the "Eastern orientation," that is, to lean upon Soviet Russia and to dissolve the tendency toward coöperation with England, which was feared in the Russian Political Bureau as the premise of a possible war of intervention against Russia. Such an Eastern orientation was being prepared by intensive collaboration between the heads of the Red Army and the Reichswehr, and it is this foreign-political line to which the interests of the German working class were entirely subordinated.

The high point of the revolutionary crisis in Germany in 1923 was reached in the spring and summer, when the inflation was rushing to its peak, the German bourgeoisie vacillated impotently between passive resistance and negotiations with England and France, and big strike movements of a political character broke out in the Ruhr region. The strike of the Berlin workers against the Cuno government on August 12 should have been the moment for the organizing of the uprising movement. During these months, however, the Political Bureau, in complete agreement with Trotsky, followed the line of coöperation with Cuno's government, a line represented at that time in Berlin by Radek in person, who turned fiercely against any policy of revolutionary sharpening of the situation and who had his friend Thalheimer provide a theoretical foundation for this policy of supporting German na-

tionalism. Thalheimer wrote at that time, entirely in agreement with Radek, and thereby also with Trotsky, the following:

The German bourgeoisie, counter-revolutionary though it still is, has reached a situation, thanks to the cowardice of petty bourgeois democracy (that is, primarily, of the social democracy) where its actions abroad are objectively revolutionary. Abroad (at least temporarily) it is revolutionary in spite of itself [*wieder Willen*], just as Bismarck was in 1864-70 and for analogous historical reasons. The failure of the German socialist revolution of 1918, left to Cuno, Stinnes & Co. the rôle that should have been that of the German socialist revolution. . . . Vanquished, disarmed Germany, threatened with dismemberment and complete political and economic enslavement, is, it is true, a future imperialist power according to purely theoretical reality. Today that is certainly not the case. It is not the subject but the object of imperialist policy.

This article, inspired by the Russians, is remarkable not only for its under-estimation of German imperialism, but primarily for its declaration of the "*finally collapsed German socialist revolution, whose tasks must now be solved by Cuno and Stinnes.*" Stinnes is mentioned here particularly because he was the exponent of the passive resistance of heavy industry in the Ruhr and because he was also the exponent of class hatred against the Ruhr workers, to whom this kind of collaboration with Cuno and Stinnes was thus to be made more palatable. This astounding counter-revolutionary, disastrous, liquidationist botching of history should not really be charged against the theoretician, Thalheimer, alone. The statement dates from the early summer of 1923 and can be supported by countless and much cruder statements by Bukharin, Pawlowski and others. What Thalheimer writes here was the line of the Russian Political Bureau of the time, and this line was the real reason for the KPD holding back at the moment of the maturing of the revolutionary crisis.

After the strike of August 12, the Cuno government withdrew and the Stresemann-Hilferding government, oriented toward the English, began its secret negotiations with the *Comité des Forges*. This swing of German foreign policy was regarded in Moscow as extremely dangerous and the "betrayal" of the German bourgeoisie was answered with a change in the line of the KPD. The Brandler Central Committee received the order for an uprising in September, and it is unimportant if Trotsky urged the turn in the German line somewhat sooner than the others, that is, some time in July or in August. Preceding the Cuno strike was a series of *internal* conferences between the right wing Central Committee and the left opposition in Moscow, especially a "conciliation conference" in May, at which the Præsidium of the Comintern completely supported the Brandler policy, with Trotsky—if nuances are to be dealt with—far stronger for Brandler than, say, Zinoviev.

When Brandler received his order for an uprising, the movement was already receding. Brandler rightly always brought up this fact in his defense, although to this day he has not expressed himself with complete frankness on how he actually became a deceived deceiver who, in the course of 1923, received two entirely different directives from Moscow. Brandler received the order for the uprising with the firm conviction that it could not be executed, that the situation was not objectively revolutionary and that the German proletariat was not capable of seizing power. He staged a complicated comedy of obscurance which was expressed in the wretched caricatures of the so-called workers' governments in Saxony and Thuringia and ended in the conference of the Chemnitz Workers' Councils in October, 1923, at which

Brandler let himself be "overpowered" by the social-democratic majority under the leadership of Graupe.

It is then, certainly, that Trotsky turned against Brandler. But that is when the *entire Russian Political Bureau* turned against Brandler, for a different communist policy was wanted in Germany against the English-oriented Stresemann government. It is not to be disputed that Trotsky was sincerely for the uprising at the end of 1923, but it is disputable that this position suffices to uphold the Trotskyist legend of an *always-correct* standpoint in the German crises. Rightly appraised, it was then the left opposition in the KPD under the leadership of Maslow that was alone in recognizing from the very beginning the first-rate revolutionary character of the Ruhr crisis and in seeking, in good time, both in the Ruhr as well as in Berlin and Hamburg, to bring the party on to the road of the struggle for power. This fact has been covered over by Stalinist baiting and by Trotskyist legend-making. It is necessary to reestablish it, not for reasons of historical research, or because of any personal polemics that have now become quite senseless, but because the future revolutionary party of Germany cannot move ahead without a discussion of this question which is peculiarly its own.

VII.

We want to disregard entirely, for the time being, the question of whether the main historical mistake of the left communist opposition consisted in its "adventurism" or in its insufficient respect for the wise teachings of Paul Levi, but essentially in the fact that it did not split at Leipzig and thereby free itself not only from the reformist politics of Paul Levi and Brandler but also from the foreign-political zigzag of the Russian Political Bureau. The reply to this question can be reserved for subsequent consideration.

What must be borne in mind here is the fact that with the defeat of 1923, the revolutionary period in Germany was terminated and the counter-revolutionary development made powerful advances. The strengthening of the counter-revolutionary forces in Germany went parallel with the counter-revolutionary process in Russia, which led to the victory of Stalin and the Stalinist bureaucracy after the sharp conflict with the Opposition Bloc of Zinoviev-Trotsky in 1925-27, and took the singular road of the "exploitive state," the road of bureaucratic terror against the working class. If the Stalinist rule and the Stalinist régime are regarded as a peculiarly new, unprecedented form of counter-revolution, another estimation is reached of the development in Germany directly before the seizure of power by Hitler; in the rise and triumph of National Socialism and the National-Socialist Party may then be seen a *peculiar German form of the European counter-revolution* which, while revealing very many essential differences from the Stalinist régime, especially in the form of production, is nevertheless understandable only as a product of the historical process of the European counter-revolution. The KPD, connected with the counter-revolutionary Stalinist center in 1929-33, a German detachment of the corrupted and corrupting Russian bureaucracy, is then seen as utterly incapable of taking over the leadership of the working class in the struggle against fascism and in the struggle for power.

In the above-quoted polemic of Trotsky against Urbahns, Trotsky is wrong. The task of the Trotskyists and of all anti-Stalinists in Germany before Hitler should have been the construction of a revolutionary party independent of the Stalinist center, militantly opposed to it theoretically and prac-

tically. The Trotskyist conception of the workers' state in Russia led to the *false estimation of the KPD and thereby to the false posing of the question of the united front between the KPD and the SPD as the best fighting tactic against National Socialism*. A correct policy probably would not have prevented the temporary victory of National Socialism, but the tremendous tragedy of our present situation does not consist *merely* in the victory of the counter-revolution in Russia, Germany and Europe. The tragedy consists primarily in the fact that no bridges were built from the October Revolution to the other shores, that not only was the October generation destroyed by Stalin but that the ideas of October had almost no living representatives left; that the "defense" of the Stalinist Soviet Union is one of the most mendacious and misleading formulæ that was ever introduced into revolutionary Marxism and has led to such an obscuring of all essential theoretical questions that the youth either follows the Stalinists, or surrenders to the philosophy of spontaneity which leads to the rejection of party thinking and reveals itself in practice, for example, in the existence of countless "independent existences" of a comparatively meaningless kind within the German emigration.

A commencing clarification of the German question cannot take place without a debate with the historical mistakes of Trotskyism and it is false to recoil from it in horror. The heritage of the great revolutionist, Trotsky, is not diminished by living criticism, but increased. We need a new gathering of all the undecayed elements, for tomorrow we may be "taken by surprise" by new tasks.

CLARA WERTH.

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO :

**The NEW INTERNATIONAL
and LABOR ACTION**

JOINT SUB OFFER

YOU CAN GET BOTH FOR

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS

\$1.75 FOR ONE YEAR

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

A New Stage for World Labor

Where Must the Socialist Movement Begin?

In 1888, Frederick Engels wrote in a letter to a leader of the German Social-Democratic Party:

From eight to ten millions of soldiers will choke one another and at the same time so thoroughly devour the whole of Europe as swarms of locusts never could devour it. The ravage wrought by the Thirty Years War compressed into the space of three or four years and spread over the whole continent—famine, epidemics, a general lapse into savagery, not only of the soldiery but also of the people, caused by bitter need, the hopeless confusion of our artificial mechanism in commerce, industry and credit, all this will end in general bankruptcy. The collapse of the old states and their routine political wisdom, such a collapse as will bring crowns by the dozens into the roadway and no one will be found to pick them up; the absolute impossibility of seeing how it will all end and who will emerge victor from the struggle, with only one result absolutely beyond doubt, general exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class....

Such a war would be the greatest misfortune for us, it might put the movement back for twenty years. But the new party which in the end would have to be created as the result of all this in every European country would be free of all the hesitations and trivialities which are now everywhere holding back the movement....

Among many possible consequences which war holds out for us and which it is hard to foretell, once can be foreseen with certainty. After the war we should have to begin again from the beginning, though on an infinitely more favorable ground than even today.

A new stage is beginning for the international labor movement. Its new forms cannot yet be clearly defined. We can, however, already recognize a fundamental change of the historical position of the post-war labor movement as compared with the traditional labor movement of pre-war times. One of its main characteristics was its national limitedness. This also applied to the labor movement destroyed in countries where fascism and totalitarian dictatorships came to power. The mass organizations which had been destroyed in these countries were firmly rooted in national traditions. They were more or less international in theory but nationally limited in action. This contradiction, from which even the communist parties of pre-fascist Europe could not escape, was the fundamental root of the failure of the pre-war labor movement.

For the first time in history, conditions have now arisen which make it possible and necessary for the labor movement to overcome its national limitations. An understanding of the national limitations of the labor movements of the past will facilitate an understanding of the new historical conditions for the labor movement of the future.

The National Character of the Labor Movement

The national character of the old labor movement had two causes: a) the national character of the bourgeois revolution, and b) the rise of imperialist capitalist states.

The beginning of the labor movement was closely related to the successes and failures of bourgeois revolutions. The proletarian class which rose together with the rise of modern

capitalism was able to fight effectively for the improvement of its social conditions under capitalism and for political or class aims by fighting for and making use of democratic rights and liberties. They even seemed to guarantee a relatively peaceful "Western" road to the goal of socialism.

Therefore, radical or politically-conscious workers were the most ardent fighters for the democratic bourgeois revolution, even when the capitalist upper class was already betraying it by accepting the political leadership or supremacy of former feudal and state-bureaucratic castes. The bourgeois revolution succeeded under the leadership of the bourgeois class, with the latter as an active democratic revolutionary factor only in few countries—America, England, France and Holland.

But in America, nineteenth century capitalism could expand in the wide spaces of the West largely as an agrarian economy where the individual could easily become an independent producer or owner of means of production. Therefore "free workers" were relatively scarce on the newly-discovered continent. Political labor organizations could exist only as a sectarian movement of immigrants, as remnants of the class struggles in Europe.

The early labor movements in England and France were able to take advantage of successful bourgeois revolutions. Feudal forms of ownership and of personal relations had more or less disappeared. It was now the turn of the bourgeois class to become anti-democratic by suppressing the working class, which tried to utilize democratic rights and liberties for its own class purposes, thus threatening the new capitalist property rights. Therefore, Karl Marx came to the conclusion that the successful bourgeois revolution in advanced capitalist countries would be the prelude to a second, a socialist or proletarian, revolution.

History took, however, a different course. The advanced capitalist countries where the bourgeois revolution had succeeded, became centers of the expanding world economy on an imperialist basis, with privileged world positions (based on international monopolies). This transformation also changed the social structure of the new imperialist mother country, and especially the social conditions of labor. Labor was able to take advantage of democratic rights and liberties, especially the right to form trade unions, in order to improve its economic situation. This had become possible on a national scale without provoking a conflict with capitalist society as such because their privileged world position enabled the capitalists to make concessions to labor. The labor movement became more "peaceful" and unpolitical. This transformation of the labor movement was considered one of the "natural laws" of the "progress of capitalism." Labor leaders became provincial-minded. Unpolitical trade unionists became patriots and, as defenders of the world position of their national capitalism, common chauvinists.

The result of this development was that the labor movements of the past were international only in theory, but nationally limited in action. The labor movement could not overcome this limitation. Even in countries where labor was

relatively radical and where the revolutionary wing of the labor movement was predominant, labor action was handicapped by national limitations. In these countries, the bourgeois revolutions had never been "completed," thus also limiting the immediate goal of labor action to issues which could be realized only on a national scale. This contradiction between international programs sustained by the existence of the working class on an international scale, and nationally-limited action, was the fundamental root of the failures of the old labor movements.

Although the international monopolies of imperialism—control of raw material resources, of trading centers, of industrial processes of production, etc., on which world economy was dependent—intensified the international ties of world economy, these ties did not create an effective international solidarity among the exploited classes. On the contrary, the working classes of imperialist countries raised their standard of living, and many of them reached the status of labor aristocracies, precisely because the imperialist owners of international monopolies exploited other countries than their own.

The national state became a protector of privileged world positions for the ruling class, mitigating the internal social conflicts at the expense of the rest of the world. As a result, vast strata of the workers in the imperialist countries became nationally-minded and adopted the spirit of the *rentier*-minded middle and upper classes. In short, international monopolies intensified the national rather than the international character of labor as a social class.

The economic internationalism created by modern imperialism thus weakened the political or social consciousness of the majority of the producers in the imperialist countries. They became subservient to a national economy which drew huge "super-profits" from the rest of the world through international monopolies. The middle classes were relatively prosperous and could extend their economic spheres because of the expanding basis of consumption of high-priced luxury products of an upper class whose investments were spread over the entire world. This change of the social structure in capitalist society also changed the character of the labor movement.

The workers were somehow fooled by the "facts" which they could perceive as their own personal experiences. During the era of bourgeois revolutions, the struggle of labor for democratic rights and liberties necessarily also was a struggle for the success or "completion" of the bourgeois revolution. This struggle of labor was a national affair, though of great international importance. The workers had to adopt a national consciousness as part of their rise as a new social class. This national consciousness was a factor which helped to make the bourgeois revolution a success.

A crisis in this national consciousness would have arisen had the capitalists acted as a single international class, or if internal social conditions had worsened until they became unbearable. Such a crisis was avoided because of the rise of imperialism. It created a new kind of national consciousness, not only reflecting the existence of a social community but also as a chauvinistic spirit of superiority over other peoples.

Thus bourgeois national consciousness was modified when the national state became the successful protagonist of imperialism and national capitalists were able greatly to enlarge their sources of income through the acquisition of international monopolies—with huge investments abroad, control of international transportation lines, trade centers, shipping and

other "services," of important raw materials resources, etc. Even in countries which participated only to a small extent in the world privileges of capitalism, the spirit of the national bourgeoisies, of the middle classes and in part also of labor was molded by the factor of gaining a certain degree of economic security and prosperity on an international parasitic basis, profiting from colonial and other privileged world positions.

We can thus discover another apparently paradoxical historical development. During the struggle for the completion or the success of the bourgeois revolution, a national consciousness arose that was a weapon in the struggle against the old feudal elements and for democratic rights and liberties that the suppressed classes were fighting for all over the world. During this period the labor movement was pervaded by a spirit of international brotherhood which complemented the struggle for the completion of the bourgeois revolution. This international spirit was to a great extent lost during the rise of national capitalism on an imperialist basis when the national consciousness was corrupted by the spirit of chauvinism.

The European labor movement, more than any other social movement, seems to have been internationalist in spirit. International brotherhood and solidarity with the suppressed and exploited toilers all over the world were affirmed in speech after speech before the First World War scattered the hopes and illusions of the pre-1914 labor movements. Their immediate tasks were nothing more than the completion of the bourgeois revolution in the political field, and the accomplishment of mere reforms in the economic field in countries where national capitalism had "progressed" on an imperialist basis. International socialism was an abstract idea and a distant goal. In those countries where capitalism was fully developed and labor had the right to express and organize itself, national capitalism possessed international or colonial monopolies which operated at the expense of the rest of the world. The conditions which enabled labor to improve its economic situation in such imperialist countries were not recognized as such by those who took advantage of them.

A short review of the aims and failures of former labor movements will sustain the point that they were unable to achieve positive results beyond the task of the "completion" of the bourgeois revolution. They declined and perished because they were subject to social conditions of their national capitalism, which created national limitations for the proletarian class struggle.

The Bourgeois Revolution

Let us consider the first political movement of the working class, the struggle of the Chartists in England during the Twenties and Thirties of the nineteenth century. This movement could strike for nothing more than the completion of the bourgeois revolution and for social reforms eliminating the worst features of early capitalism. The immediate goal of this struggle at its peak was the right of vote, political representation of labor in Parliament, and social legislation which would limit the working day. At the end of the Thirties, the Chartist movement, after its violent suppression, was dead. Attempts to revive it failed. The new English trade union movement which arose during the Fifties and Sixties, twenty years after the Chartists' defeat, was already possessed by a spirit of unpolitical trade unionism. It became a respectable movement which was able to win a number of economic struggles for a limited number of workers, especially in skilled trades. They took advantage of the privileged position of

British capitalism, which had become the financial center of the world during the second half of the nineteenth century.

The historical conditions for the Chartist movement had passed at the middle of the nineteenth century. There was no chance for a revival of the first revolutionary movement of the working class. Its defeat during the Thirties was final, not primarily because the police terror had destroyed the political organizations, but because historical conditions had changed. Britain's national capitalism expanded on an imperialist basis. The newly-arising trade unions took little interest in political struggles or social reforms which would conflict with the capitalist system. They were only concerned about wages and working conditions for their particular trade group, and they were able to improve the economic situation for the organized workers largely due to the rise of England's international monopolies. The growing "incomes from abroad" raised the parasitic luxury consumption of the "island state."

During the Forties, Karl Marx placed great hopes on a revival of the Chartist movement in England. He finally recognized the "corruption" of some sections of the British working class, and of the British labor movement, as the result of imperialist expansion of British capitalism. Then Karl Marx placed his hopes on the labor movement in Germany, where, unlike Britain, the bourgeois revolution had not yet been achieved. The democratic rights which the German workers were still deprived of could not be won without a revolutionary struggle. But the young capitalist class in Germany—after 1948—was already afraid of a bourgeois revolution. Under the Kaiser, it renounced its struggle for political supremacy out of fear that the continuance of such a struggle would unleash forces neither feudalism nor capitalism would be able to control.

The German bourgeoisie needed a strong national state to suppress the new menace of organized labor and to enable it to compete successfully against foreign countries which were industrially more advanced. Therefore they were inclined to appease the militarist-feudal elements, which were in firm control of the state. They finally gave up all thought of bourgeois democratic revolution.

Marx was well aware of these difficulties for the success of bourgeois democracy in Germany. They led him to believe that the bourgeois revolution in Germany would succeed only as a result of working class action, and that the bourgeois revolution would be the prelude to a second, a proletarian, revolution against capitalism and for socialism. The working class would be able to utilize democratic rights and liberties to strengthen its class position and improve its social conditions. The result of such a bourgeois revolution, achieved against the "will of the bourgeoisie," would have been an intensified class struggle between the capitalists and the workers. Then the working class would be compelled to fight against the capitalist system in order to safeguard immediate economic interests as well as democratic rights and liberties.

But German capitalism too had become part of a world system, and social conditions at home were molded by the relationship between national and international capitalism. Therefore, even a successful proletarian struggle against the ruling classes had to fail if it remained a mere national affair, with (nationally-limited) forms typical of the bourgeois revolution.

The notion of a bourgeois revolution succeeding against the will of the capitalist class and becoming the prelude to a proletarian revolution proved fallacious in the case of Ger-

many; for German capitalism after 1848, and especially after 1870, succeeded in becoming an imperialist world power. Yet the German labor movement continued to strive for the completion of the bourgeois revolution, still believing that it would be the preliminary to a socialist or proletarian revolution. The goal of the general strike which Rosa Luxemburg, the heroic leader of the German left-wing opposition and the martyr of the November revolution (1918), propagated on the eve of the First World War, was the equal right to vote for Parliament. At the same time, like the British, German labor, in its effort to liberalize society, succumbed to the influence of comparatively unpolitical trade unionism, and trade union bureaucracies became the decisive element in the German Social-Democratic Party.

Finally we can refer to the Russian experience. It is a still more striking example of the fact that the political struggle of the proletarian class was subject to national limitations so long as it was only a struggle for the completion of the bourgeois revolution. Lenin was fully aware of the task of the Russian proletarian revolution to "complete the bourgeois revolutions." However, in 1917, under quickly changing world conditions, Lenin recognized the danger that the leaders of the Russian revolution would not go beyond the goal of the completion of the bourgeois revolution, thus making the struggle in Russia a mere national affair. His hope was that the acceleration of the proletarian class struggle in Western capitalist countries—largely due to the World War—would make the Russian revolution coincide with proletarian revolutions in Western countries.

During this period, revolutionary crises arose in Germany and in a number of other countries of Central and Western Europe. But the traditional organizations and ideas of labor had been molded either by the struggle for the completion of bourgeois revolutions, or by unpolitical trade unionism, related to the rise of national capitalist states as imperialist world powers.

The Russian revolution started as a "completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution" in that country; but by that time, completion of the bourgeois revolution was opposed by all other capitalist states. The historical task seemed to be to look forward toward the opportunity to transform the Russian revolution into the beginning of a socialist world revolution. Thus the Russian revolution may be considered as the end of the epoch of working-class struggle for the completion of the bourgeois revolution and as the beginning of a new epoch for international labor.

PIERRE BELLASI.

[Continued in next issue]

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA:

'INDIA IN REVOLT'

By HENRY JUDD

Order from the

PRICE: 25 CENTS

WORKERS PARTY

In Bundles of

114 W. 14th St., N. Y. C.

Five or More—20 Cents

Discussion on the National Question:

The Way Out for Europe—II

[Continued from last issue]

The European barbarism is embodied in the struggle of the two groups of imperialist powers. If the suicidal self-destruction is evidence of the depth and acuteness of the general contradictions of capitalism, then an examination of the more specific forms of the struggle should show today how much nearer the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe is to our practical activity than it was in 1917 or 1939.

The Imperialists Divide Against Each Other: Eastern Europe

By the end of World War I, Poland, Finland, the Baltic states, the Czechs and other groups of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had gained a not negligible degree of national independence. As was inevitable under capitalism, however, the Treaty of Versailles "liberated" some only to send other millions into national subjection. This subjection sometimes took subtle forms. Before Hitler, ninety per cent of Austria clamored for the Anschluss with Germany, a form of self-determination forbidden by Britain, France and Italy. Internationalism, an inherent necessity for twentieth century Europe, being denied expression by the continuing class structure, took a fearful revenge by perverting nationalism into a scourge of scorpions. It became one of Hitler's most potent weapons.

Today capitalism can no longer afford to be ashamed of barbarism. In the first of two notorious editorials, the *London Times* has stated that the security of Europe "will not be settled by any organizations based on the conception of national independence which entails the partition of Europe among twenty separate and jarring military and economic sovereignties" This is the language of Hitler translated into English. Stalin demands Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, East Poland and Bessarabia, with an eye on Finland and Constantinople; Britain, seeking support, admits Russia's claims to her strategic frontiers—an elastic term, which ends just as near or just as far as you can stretch it.

But Roosevelt cannot allow himself to be out-manuevered in Europe. With a shamelessness that testifies to the sharpness of the imperialist contradictions, he pats Otto Hapsburg on the head and assiduously kisses the great toe of the Pope. Whether Russia gets her strategic frontiers or not, it is obvious that there are powerful elements in the United States and most certainly in Europe who will seek and create cordons, sanitary and insanitary, against an all-powerful Russia. Germany, yes Germany, may be forced into an Anschluss with an unwilling Austria, or possibly a willing Austria may be forced out of an Anschluss with Germany and impelled into some kind of Catholic federation. All this is to be decided by the relative positions and strengths of armies at the end of the war. What the armies get they will hold or barter, as a just reward for this war and as preparation for the next. Whoever wins, the small nations of Eastern Europe will have lost any national independence they ever had.

Such is their Europe. To think that in this continent, today, the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe has less urgency than it had because Europe is now divided into one national state and several subordinate ones, that is a proposition drawn entirely from superficial forms and devoid of any content whatsoever. To propagate that idea is to encourage the most cruel delusions of the United Nations' more hypocritical and more ignorant supporters. Even these are dropping them. The *New Republic* comes out straight for Stalin to have his strategic frontiers, and even *Life*, imperialist organ that it is, admits Russia's probable "claims on nearby by territory, such as the Baltic nations; to the annexation of strategic areas and the setting up of satellite states—all in the name of security. And however his might violate our ideas of a just and stable peace, there is little we could do to prevent it." Self-determination, national independence, in Eastern Europe today without socialism, is a mirage. The last peace called colonies, mandates. The next one will call the European mandates, colonies. Some will have the freedom of Egypt and the independence of Syria. That is the most they can hope for.

Have we forgotten Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Eastern Poland so easily? These names have a place in our history. In 1939 we belatedly made it a principled question that the workers in those countries should fight against both imperialists, Russian and German. The German invasion was then hypothetical. Then, presumably, the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe held its accustomed position in our strategic line. But since then the Russians have been swept out and the Germans are in. What do we now propose? To push into the background or to moderate the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe. This is completely false. Exactly the opposite must be done. In 1939 it was necessary to foresee. Today we have only to look and see. The moment the Germans go out, the Russians are due back in. Every worker in Eastern Europe knows that. If you look at the episodic fact of Europe being today one state and subject nations, you will see the slogan further away. If you grasp the basic fact of degenerating capitalism, grasp it in its concreteness, the slogan can be seen here in this true relation, nearer, not further away.*

The Imperialists United Against the Proletariat: Germany

It is German imperialism which oppresses Europe and therefore any consideration of the national question on such a scale, and particularly in the historical circumstances, must give special attention to the situation and prospects of the German proletariat. A democratic Germany meant democratic Europe. A fascist Germany means a fascist Europe. A Soviet Germany means a Soviet Europe. But if that were not enough (and it is), there is a special and overwhelming reason for centering our analysis upon the situation in Germany. There are today seven and a half million foreign workers in Germany, seven and one half millions of Frenchmen, Poles,

*The same is true, though more remotely, on the Atlantic Coast. But we are confining ourselves within rigid limits.

Czechs, Lithuanians, Russians, Esthonians, etc., *workers all, whose sole aim in life is to overthrow the Hitler régime!* This, we mention briefly, is only in appearance an accident. It is merely a reflection of the concentration of capital and the hurling of masses of workers from one branch of site of production to another, which is its inevitable accompaniment. These seven and a half millions must also be liberated. Who is to liberate them? Is the job to be left to Roosevelt, Churchill and Eisenhower? Or is it the task of the German proletariat, with whom they suffer side by side?*** Thus, even if we had, for some incomprehensible reason, neglected the rôle of the German proletariat in the liberation of the oppressed nationalities, the European barbarism compels us to face the question of the nationally oppressed peoples and the German proletariat against the common enemy—Hitlerism. It is precisely this which so sharply differentiates the national question in our epoch from the remote possibilities indicated by Lenin and Trotsky.

The Proletarian Revolution in Germany

First, however, Germany. Totalitarianism represents the contradictions of modern society carried to a logical extreme. Engels in his time castigated the simplicist conception of one reactionary mass against the revolutionary working class. Today in the German barbarism we have that reality, insofar as so pure a distillation can ever represent the complexity of a modern society. The fascists have destroyed every vestige or semblance of authority except their own. If and when, for whatever reason, the Hitlerian power collapses, then there is no social force left in Germany in hold the nation together except the working class in workers and soldiers councils. Even in 1918 this was true in Germany. But the proletariat was kept in bourgeois chains, for the Social-Democratic Party still functioned. In 1945, for instance, it will not be so.

Here is how one recent writer† envisages Germany in the moment of the defeat which now looms over it:

Besides the fragmentation of the German economic apparatus—and its bombed and worn-out factories, its shattered transportation system, its exhausted farming land, its valueless money—we must expect a bewildering fragmentation of its social and political loyalties. The German body politic will fall literally to pieces.

Although the old state of the Reich will try to resume their local rule, they will not, in fact, be able to administer their own territory. Each city in a mad scramble for available food and industrial material will become a law unto itself. Nor will the cities be able to maintain orderly government. They too will be ridden with civil war and private murder as the people settle scores with the Nazi oppressors. The units of local authority will more probably be such entities as church-parishes, political party cells, hastily formed shop unions, district farmers' leagues, voluntary vigilante bands, improvised factional militias. And throughout the country will reign wandering elements of the former German Army which our forces will not yet have been able to disarm, looting and requisitioning, fighting one another in the name of some political gospel or slogan—the very substance of national anarchy.

True to the bourgeois trend, Motherwell writes "national" where he should have written "*capitalist*" anarchy. But there is no doubt that many trained bourgeois writers today are seeing things very clearly and consequently expressing themselves very well. This indeed will be the Germany of 1945, except for one possibility which our bourgeois commentator does not take into consideration. The break in the morale of

***We mention this only to characterize the ridiculous doctrine that Hitler, by some magical means, is able to keep insuperable barriers between the German workers and these foreign workers. Presumably two cups of ersatz coffee instead of one distinguish the German Stakhanovite.

†Hiram Motherwell in *The Nation*.

armies, or the endurance of civil populations, is quite unpredictable. If a Germany Army is resoundingly defeated far enough from home so that the military power of the conqueror does not overawe or in other less dramatic ways, the military failure of fascism impends, then in the ensuing crisis the German proletariat may put its hand upon the power in much the same way that the Catalonian working class was *de facto* master of Catalonia in seventy-two hours.‡ Let us not forget, as Marx has so carefully pointed out, that the working class is disciplined, united and organized by the very mechanism of capitalist production itself. Five thousand workers in a factory are in one most fundamental sense organized. They can transform themselves into a soviet in an hour, *given the complete, the shameful bankruptcy and disgrace of the ruling class and the absence of any of its agents masquerading as workers' leaders.*

The Labor Front may very well find the power thrust into its hands. (What it will do with it is another question. Soviets do not necessarily mean soviet power.) But such is the future of a defeated Germany: chaos, with or without American occupation; soviets; or a seething mixture of both. The German capitalist must have this fearson vision before him half the day and through the watches of the night. For closely associated with fascism as he is, for him life, liberty and the pursuit of profits are at stake. Is Roosevelt aware of this? If even he were so stupid as not to be, which he most certainly is not, Goebbels reminds him of it often enough. For a similar situation in France, Roosevelt has already commissioned his strong-arm man, Giraud. But there are no influential or reliable Germans outside Germany. He seeks them in the only place he can find them—inside Germany itself.

"Unconditional Surrender"

Unless this war is different from all other wars that have been fought for the last 400 years, Roosevelt and Churchill received peace feelers from Germany, and not only from one source, at Casablanca. But whereas at the critical turn in the last war Wilson came out with fourteen points, that is to say, fourteen conditions, Roosevelt loudly demands unconditional surrender, that is to say, no conditions at all. Taken literally, this is nonsense. Generals on battlefield demand unconditional surrender, not statesmen. The conditions were not mentioned, because they were unmentionable. By this slogan Roosevelt repudiated any peace with Hitler & Co., for the simple reason that neither the proletariat of the United Nations (nor the proletariat of Germany) would stand for any peace with a defeated Hitler. But at the same time the slogan was a direct invitation to any anti-Hitler group of capitalists or military camarilla in Germany. If they would make a complete *military* surrender as soon as possible, in return they would get all assistance necessary in keeping the German workers in their proper capitalist place, and in any case would not risk war to the dangerous stage of complete exhaustion. If these German leaders who wish to draw out in time wanted guarantees, they could judge for themselves by seeing the welcome that was given to Darlan and Giraud while that fledgeling democrat, de Gaulle, shivered outside in the cold. The same message was probably "indicated" to those who were feeling out the possibilities. The memoirs of the last war are always useful refreshers for what is happening *sub*

‡It was, among other reasons, to prevent this that Weygand capitulated so early.

rosa in the present. Military tactics change. Imperialist tricks do not.

Not only does this flow from the whole situation and from much that has been written by the more thoughtful bourgeois, such as Hoover and Lippman. For months before, Churchill was trilling an Italian roulade, "One man alone in Italy is responsible," in itself a stupidity not even worth contempt, but indispensable as a similar reassurance to Italians looking for a way out. It is, however, impossible to talk about one man alone in Germany. There is nothing but Hitler and the Nazi Party.

The fascist reaction was immediate. Both Hitler and Mussolini struck mercilessly at the potential opposition. Goebbels rushed to his typewriter and warned England: "Do not listen to Roosevelt. If you do, you will ruin Europe. It will mean bolshevism. And think what that will mean for you." Whereupon Churchill countered a few days later: Fascist power must be destroyed, justice must be stern and implacable, but, however, "within her appropriate bounds." From his Italian pronunciamento we know what are the appropriate bounds for Italy: one man alone. The German capitalists and German generals, quaking at the future, can read and understand. They know too that Stalin on this matter is with Roosevelt and Churchill. As the *London Times* put it in one of its historic editorials: "The proposition that it is impossible to exterminate the German people, or *destroy the German state* (our emphasis) has behind it the authority of Stalin himself." The *Times* understated Stalin's view. Stalin himself had already told Harry Hopkins that he is not opposed to the German people or *to the German general staff*. The plan will be changed or modified, as always in a war, according to the fortunes of the military struggle. But whatever their plans for themselves and against each other, the imperialists of the United Nations are united on one thing: to keep the German proletariat in chains even if it takes the German Junkers to do it.

Roosevelt has to send in armies and somehow or other fill the vacuum created by the Nazi defeat. But as Churchill says, this is a "stupendous" task, full of "peril" and "mystery." The proletariat is the peril and the mystery. There is the imperialist weakness and there is our strength. We have no armies but the proletariat, and the German proletariat is our main army in Europe. It holds the interior lines, so to speak. But it is in great danger and one of its greatest dangers is just this national domination of the European peoples by Germany. It is the most powerful political weapon that Roosevelt and Churchill can use against the German workers and though they fear it, they will, if need be, use it with all the ferocity and unscrupulousness of a Streicher or a Vishinsky. The revolutionary movement, whatever its size, must on this issue take the offensive. But it can do this only around the slogan, the Socialist United States of Europe. Let there be no mistake about this. Stalingrad and the American invasion of Africa marked a new stage of the war—the impending defeat of Germany. This poses for us the fate of the German proletariat. If the European proletariat allows itself to be drawn into any attempt by the United Nations to destroy Germany, the cold barbarism of the peace will be no less destructive of European civilization than the flaming barbarism of the war.

The National Question in Germany

It is here that the seven and a half million foreign workers in Germany become of supreme importance in the whole Eu-

ropean tangle, and we can imagine with what eagerness Marx and Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, who never failed to foster and to raise high before the workers any manifestation or possibility of international unity, would have swooped upon this extraordinary phenomenon and explained both its historical and immediate tactical importance.

Let us place ourselves in the position of those workers in Germany today who are being impelled by the whole situation to work out the problem of a revolution by the German working class against Hitler. They will know by now that certain elements of the German ruling class are seeking a way out by overthrowing Hitler and making a last desperate effort to keep the German working class where it is. Foremost in their minds is the pent-up vengeance which a tortured and plundered Europe nurses in its bosom for Germany. At home and abroad these German workers can see nothing but hatred and implacable enemies. They know by heart Roosevelt's plan for policing Germany. Sooner or later they will turn to the only allies they can speak to, the millions of French, Belgians, Dutch, Poles, Czechs, Austrians, Slovaks, Norwegians now constituting almost one-half of the German labor force. Such are the contradictions of capitalism that it is compelled to link these diverse elements. There in Germany today is a gigantic international combination of workers such as Europe has never seen before. Revolutionary theorists may ignore these workers; German workers will not. Any revolution in Germany, the tamest of revolutions, will have to say to them: "Hitler oppressed you. Before him we did not, and we wish you to enjoy your own freedom. Help us to win ours."

But if that German revolution is a revolution of the proletariat, in a ruined and devastated Germany where no social force exists except the working class, then these foreign workers will be swept into factory committees to take their place in a truly proletarian assault on Hitler and the fascist state. Whatever the ultimate outcome, there will be forged here a unity of the European workers such as was never seen before, such a unity as can set the whole of Europe aflame and, under any circumstance, will be a never-to-be-forgotten influence on the future of the European proletariat. *The revolutionary socialists will take care to emphasize the right of the oppressed nationalities to national independence. But the very circumstances of Germany and the position of the proletariat in a ruined Germany, with seven and a half million foreign workers revolting against German capitalism concentrated in the fascist state, automatically places on the order of the day the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe.* Not to see this is to miss the true depth of the European, particularly the German, chaos. Such as this is what Goebbels means by bolshevism. That is what Hitler has been blackmailing Europe with for ten years. But every bluff can boomerang. The European barbarism is not one-sided. Every stage of degeneration creates its nemesis. The fusion of the national and socialist revolution inside Germany is such. As soon as you begin to probe into the European chaos anywhere, the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe automatically begins to take shape under your fingers.

The German Question in Occupied Europe

But if there is the revolutionary perspective inside Germany, if the compelling movement of European capitalism has concentrated the whole problem of national liberation within the borders of the Reich itself, then the revolutionary movement abroad must recognize the European situation as a

whole and indefatigably bring the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe before the workers in the occupied countries and the occupying German soldiers. *In the historical circumstances of Europe today, April, 1943, the national question must be posed as the combined liberation of the occupied countries and the enslaved proletariat of Germany from their common oppressor: German fascism.* It cannot be posed in any other way.

This is perhaps the greatest battle that the European proletariat will have to wage, the battle for Germany. It is just beginning. It will continue through war and peace until the proletarian revolution. Let us begin it well. The revolutionary movement with resolution and with passion must scornfully repudiate the idea that Germany is a problem and must make the cause of the German people indisputably our own. That is the test of the revolutionary in the oppressed country. In the Europe of today and still more of tomorrow if he should waver on this point, he is lost. With colossal impertinence these bourgeois statesmen, who encouraged and supported Hitler in every move he made, now with their whole train of journalists, economists, ethnologists, historians, parsons and other fakers debate what they are going to do with sixty million Germans. The *London Times*, which yesterday, with unctuous piety, denounced Stalin's liquidation of a few millions, now willingly and impotently, accepts with resignation the opinion of the Russian expert that the German people cannot be exterminated. Behold the true face of modern Europe. Attila the Hun and Genghis Khan would be but jackals to these butchers of decaying capitalism.

The revolutionary movement must fumigate itself and the working class against this miasma. For us there is no German problem. There is a problem of capitalism in Germany. That is all. We of the revolutionary movement will proclaim our faith in Germany, our recognition of the rôle of Germany in any reorganization of Europe, of the fatal mistake it would be for the workers to joint in any hounding of Germany, of the necessity to win the German workers and the great German people away from Hitlerism to the side of the European proletariat. But mere assertion would be capitulation. It must take the form of a ceaseless pounding day and night, of the slogan, the Socialist United States of Europe. Inside Germany, outside Germany, in every country, occupied or unoccupied, we make this an indispensable part of our *platform*, with special emphasis on the German liberation from Hitler.

Does this mean that in Poland, France or Esthonia we try to organize a mass demonstration for the Socialist United States of Europe, as we would try to organize a strike against mass deportations? Such stupidity need not be theoretically refuted. If attempted by some lunatic, its ignominious failure would be refutation enough. Yet the slogan is closer to reality today than before. There is a task here of combination.

III. The Concrete Application

How to apply this slogan in the occupied countries? We shall be as specific as possible so that there can be no possibility of misunderstanding.

Let us imagine half a dozen revolutionary socialists in Lyons today. They know their duty, which is to fight with the proletariat in defense of all its rights. The proletariat is being robbed, persecuted and kidnapped for "compulsory labor service" abroad by the German imperialist power. Side by side with the de Gaullists and others, the revolutionaries fight with the workers against the common enemy. They raise the

banner of national freedom. But they are not de Gaullists. They have their own method of freeing France from the enemies of the French workers and they therefore address the following leaflet to the German soldiers:

FROM THE FRENCH WORKERS TO THE GERMAN WORKERS

What do you get by staying here? Why don't you go home? If your officers prevent you, why don't you deal with them? You, German workers, who are here helping Hitler and Laval to oppress the French workers, we are going to make your life here one long death-trap.

We, the common people of France, wish you no harm. We want to be friends with you and all the German people. We don't want to see French or British or American soldiers oppressing you in Germany. But we don't want any German soldiers marching through our cities and persecuting French workers.

All Europe hates you and is aching to destroy you. You are only storing up trouble for yourselves by continuing with this devil's work that you do. Your only hope is to get together with your brothers and sisters in Germany, and over throw Hitler and his fascists. Then you, the soldiers and the other workers, seize the power in Germany and punish the Hitler criminals. Why don't you and the other workers of Germany try your hand at ruling the country? Every other class has tried. That is the true socialism: workers' power, not Hitler's Germany and Hitler's crimes.

Our brothers are in Germany, seven and a half millions from all occupied Europe. Can't you see you can make them your friends and make all of us your friends, Poles, Czechs, French, Esthonians, Belgians, Dutch, simply by putting arms in their hands and telling them to fight with you against Hitler. The moment you and they overthrow Hitler, all the blood and bitterness between us will be over. We swear to you that then we shall be your friends and your defenders. Roosevelt and Churchill would not dare to molest you then, for all Europe will be your allies and not your bitter enemies, as today.

We have to live and you have to live and work and raise our families and build a new Europe and make new contacts with the world, in place of the old struggles for power which have led all of us into the mess in which we are. All of us, as workers together, can form a real unity and peace in Europe. We shall be invincible. But as long as you do Hitler's bidding, it will be destruction and blood-shed, your blood and ours.

Perhaps, German soldier, you are wondering if there is a way out of this misery Europe is in. Perhaps you are thinking that if you don't keep doing this to us, American and British soldiers will do it to you and your people. The way we show you is the only way out for you. It looks as if you are going to be beaten. Think fast. Perhaps what we propose to you seemed impossible yesterday. Perhaps today it is still very difficult. But we warn you. Think fast. Talk it over with your friends. Perhaps if not today, tomorrow it wouldn't be so hard to do. Maybe when the time comes a lot of you can even join us. We would welcome you and protect you as our own.

We would welcome you in France as friends. If you like France, you can stay here afterward. You can get work if you are a worker, and a French girl to be your wife. But as long as you stay here, doing Hitler's work, we shall fight against you and do our best to kill every one of you.

Long live Free France!

Long live Free Germany!

Long live the power of the workers!

For the Socialist United States of Europe!

P.S.—There were many millions of good socialists in Germany only a few years ago. Many of you are still there. Why don't you give us a sign? We will understand and it will help us to rebuild the movement here again. And when you go back to Germany, or wherever you go, tell your friends what we say.

There may be controversy in the revolutionary movement about this leaflet. Outside there will be none. Hitler, Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill, Eisenhower, de Gaulle and Giraud will all cast a unanimous vote: against.

The German Workers in France Today

What is basically wrong with that leaflet?

Who proposes to take out of it the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe? If so, for what reason?

Produce a leaflet for the German workers in uniform which will not have as its axis the Socialist United States of Europe?

Or is it proposed to ignore the German soldiers altogether and leave them to Hitler and Roosevelt?

Finally, who says that a revolutionary in France cannot, today, far more than in 1939, insist to French workers *as he fights side by side with them*, that this is the workers' way of driving the German army out of France, defeating Hitler, preventing imperialist treachery and salvaging Europe?

That, concretely, is one method of combining the national struggle with the struggle for socialism in the present historical stage.*

However (to prove the point negatively), if the war was over, if Hitler remained undisputed master of Europe, if American gave up the dream of the American century, if Europe had settled down to some sort of stability, if both French workers and occupying German soldiers saw the *status quo* as likely to last within the guessable future, then we would have a new situation. Note well that the immediate concrete task would still be the expulsion of the German invader, the immediate slogan would be for national freedom, but, and here one difference would come in, the socialist slogan would be an echo from a distant past or a vision in the remote future. A leaflet like the above would be an absurdity. But today? No.

We present this policy to the French workers not as propaganda, but as a strictly practical policy. We present it as one of the greatest lessons of the present war, the combination of military and political warfare. It aims at disintegrating the forces of the enemy and winning him over to our side. Like Roosevelt and Hitler, we devote our main weight to *our* military warfare, our mass agitation, physical struggle, etc., but we combine the political with it. A French workers, sceptical, might say, quoting Voltaire "You can kill a flock of sheep by witchcraft, but you must take care to give them plenty of arsenic first. My arsenic is my weapon and I see that you fellows, along with your witchcraft, believe in your arsenic even more than I do." We would accept that without ill-feeling. The Darlan affair would shake this doubter considerably, as it shook all France. But far more than that, he would be impressed by what is actually taking place among the German soldiers in France and all occupied Europe today. Here is one account from a Frenchman recently returned from France, which tallies with others

The garrisons now act as if they too are prisoners of war. Perhaps they are. Certainly they behave like whipped men—either under the whip or conscious that they are beaten. The French, on the contrary, no longer behave as if they were beaten. The change in this respect in the last three months is remarkable. It is as if people in a trance had come to life.

The cracks in one imperialist structure are beginning to appear. Are we going to help close them or open them wider? To open them wider, of course, and with what weapon, pray, but the Socialist United States of Europe?

The Abstract and the Concrete

But, it is urged, the proletariat in the occupied countries is sluggish, it is not organized; the revolutionary movement is non-existent, etc. But how much bigger was the revolutionary movement yesterday than it is today? And the proletariat is resisting. It is workers whom Hitler seeks to get to Germany. It is workers who resist. To do so they must organize themselves. The general strike in Lyons which halted for a time the deportation of workers was not a movement of or-

*The immediate necessities, food, etc., the international aspects (non-European) are not included here. They are of great importance.

ganized workers, but it was an organized movement of workers. These arguments, apart from their theoretical invalidity, lag behind the tremendous speed of development in Europe today and the contradictory dynamics of the actual conditions.

In 1939 the French soldier went forth to war, bitted and blinkered by the French bourgeoisie. The French army, educated by the bourgeois state, was deafened by bourgeois orators, dazzled by bourgeois writers, blessed by bourgeois priests, and chained hand and foot by the bourgeois leaders of the Social-Democracy. Under bourgeois officers the army took the field against the same type of disciplined, controlled bourgeois German army. Both fought in an organized bourgeois war, advanced or fell back as commanded, killed here and were killed there, docile pawns on a chess board. Under such conditions, fraternization was something in the books, and even to the civilian population, the slogan, the Socialist United States of Europe, was abstract, something unreal, though invaluable as a summation of the socialist program.

Today these powerful barriers between workers of Europe so elaborately organized by bourgeois society, have been destroyed by declining capitalism itself. The German soldiers are in contact with the French masses, not with the French bourgeoisie "representing" the French workers, not with Jouhaux nor Marcel Cachin, nor Leon Blum. The most dangerous enemies of the militancy of the workers, the flourishing Social-Democratic and Stalinist bureaucracies, no longer exist in Europe. Despite the de Gaullist leadership, anyone who is bold, fearless, cautious, trustworthy, has his chance today to lead workers and to be listened to when he speaks. Our hypothetical half a dozen revolutionaries have an opportunity today a hundred times greater than in 1939, so long as they do not counterpose theories and slogans to action.

Also, on the German side the situation is radically different. The German worker is not meeting French divisions in an organized battle, both under rigid command. He is policing a now actively hostile civil population—the most hated and demoralizing of all military duties. Today, when the elite guards are being sent to the front, the German workers policing Europe will increasingly be comprised of civilians dragged from factories and pushed into an emergency uniform. The élan and military pride of 1940 are gone. The German workers walk downcast along the street and the French or Polish worker stands on the sidewalk and watches them go by, perhaps even say a few words sometimes; while Goebbels screams to Germany and all Europe that Europe is facing destruction. The European workers are contacting the German workers for the first time since 1933, while Europe, and particularly Germany, is blasted to pieces around them both. They fight, it is true, but it is an elemental struggle, the mass meeting the mass in occupied Europe, as in Germany itself. It is possible that under the circumstances of an invasion, (particularly if revolutionary detachments have not been built up or if they allow themselves to be drowned in the purely nationalist movement) that the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe may once again become somewhat abstract. But today? No. The living truth is that the slogan is now more concrete than at any time since 1933.

It must be so. Socialism is not an abstraction nor an ideal in the distance. It is the concretely developing alternative to a society that can no longer exist without destroying its own achievements and at the same time creating the social relations which are to replace it. All Europe today is but an exemplification of the main theme: socialism and barbarism.

The concentration of the means of production and the socialization of labor, the slow achievement of innumerable centuries of class society, have at last reached a point where they have become incompatible with their latest integument—the capitalistic. The advancing socialist society compels the capitalists to treat the productive forces as social forces, while they maintain social relations which compel the productive forces to remain capitalistic. This is the conflict which creates the horrible, the monstrous perversions of European society today.

The concentration of the capital of Europe in the hands of Germany is the bourgeois perversion of collective production. The totalitarian state, the folk community, are the bourgeois perversions of the free community of associated producers. Nationalism rampant is the bourgeois perversion of socialist internationalism. But far from checking, these perversions only redouble the convulsions of an old society stricken with a new one struggling to be free. In the very

ruthlessness with which it is compelled to torture, uproot and throw together the European workers, in its forced destruction of the established superstructural relations of the old order and its incapacity to substitute new, capitalism lessens the gap between the minimum needs and the maximum tasks of the proletariat, between its immediate consciousness and its historical self-consciousness. It is this dual rôle of collapsing capital which undeviatingly and inexorably moves the slogan, the Socialist United States of Europe, from the realm of abstraction to the realm of actuality. We have seen it unmistakably in Eastern Europe and in Germany. The socialism or barbarism of Engels, a theoretical prognosis, is now the socialism and barbarism of Europe, potentiality and reality locked together in mortal contradiction. This we must, more than ever today, find ways and means to bring before the workers. In the vast vacuum created by a collapsing system, our slogan can have a mighty reverberation.

J. R. JOHNSON.

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

Divine Right of the Hohenzollern

An Historical Article by Karl Marx

May 5, 1943, was the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx. The life and work of this titan of our age is fairly well known by millions. The political movement of the working class the world over, from its inception to this very day, is the embodiment of the teachings and practice of Marxism. Even the modern trade union movements have been, in one manner or another, affected by the doctrines of Marxism.

Hailed by the most down-trodden and exploited, and assailed by the powerful rules and lackeys of bourgeois society, betrayed by sycophants speaking in its name, Marxism is unscathed and remains the only vital force for social reconstruction. It offers the only program for the emancipation of the proletarians of all countries and of the colonial peoples cruelly exploited by the fiendish practices of capitalist imperialism. It points the only way out of the horrible contradictions of class society.

The critics of Marx have been many. In an endless stream they came and continue to arrive, each with a special critique, but all of them with a single refrain: Marxism is outlived; it is not scientific; Marx was unduly influenced by Hegel. His economic doctrines are abstractions incapable of being "proved" by the reality of capitalist production; and his politics are inapplicable in this modern era of capitalism. Aside from the fact that he was a "great man," say these critics in the spirit of obeisance, everything he thought, wrote and projected as a practical program for the liberation of humanity was and remains wrong. For clinching proof that Marxism is an outlived doctrine, these gentlemen of futility point to the lamentable state of the world socialist movement, to the series of paralyzing defeats suffered by the international working class, to the degeneration of the workers' state in Russia, and to the apparent strength of international capitalism.

The more recent critics of Marx are not innovators. For the most part, their criticisms are weary repetitions of the criticism made by Marx's contemporaries, by the misleaders of the Second International, and the specific American critics, whose views in decades now gone forever were strengthened by the apparently endless upward development of American capitalism.

The revival of anti-Marxist criticism comes particularly at a time when the bankruptcy of capitalism as a world economic order is most visible. The war is not the expression of a revival of bourgeois strength. On the contrary, it is the most potent demonstration that the diseases of capitalism are incurable. But the extreme pressures of the war in the many guises it assumes is sufficient to bend the will and the thoughts of

erstwhile intellectual supporters or fellow-travelers of the revolutionary socialist movement. Their conduct in these times, the "enthusiasm" they display in their newly-found admiration for the qualities of bourgeois democracy, are merely the reverse of the "enthusiasm" and admiration they held for Marxism when the economic crisis of capitalism more seemingly displayed its complete decay.

The only thing needed to bare the charlatany of these intellectual soothsayers was the rise of "national unity" for the purposes of waging war. Gentlemen who in retrospect were able to diagnose the imperialist character of the war of 1914-18, became enthralled with the purposes of this war, at least with one side in the war. Completely sterile in their social and historical vision, they regard this war as one truly embracing, again on one side, the shibboleths of the last war.

No, they are not opposed to socialism—in the last analysis—but in order to reach this "common goal" it is necessary to support one side in the war, for on this side is to be found the gateway to socialism. Thus, that scholar in philosophy and notorious failure in politics, Sidney Hook, in presenting reasons why it is necessary to support, critically, of course, the democratic imperialists in the war, offers such a tediously prosaic and uninteresting example of the landlord and mortgagee faced with a home engulfed by flames. Shall the tenant and the landlord fight about who shall put out the fire, or shall they unite and get to work! Hail the "lesser evil!"

Shades of a worn-out social-democratic ideal; an ideal so well carried out by the Second-International that it resulted in the temporary decapitation of a once powerful labor and political movement of socialism. The fact of the matter is that the landlord (the bourgeoisie) is incapable of putting out the real fire. They are theoretically capable of dousing a fire in a garbage pail or an outhouse, but they are incapable of destroying the cause of the flames (war) which burst continually upon the heads of the masses of the world with varying fury.

The only force capable of extinguishing the flames forever (and this is what matters) is the proletariat organized as a revolutionary socialist movement. There is no other force. There is no other way but the road of irreconcilable opposition to the landlord (bourgeois rule).

How Marx would have treated these "well-wishers" who travel the by-paths of the workers' movement to spread their learned doctrines of confusion, disorientation and demobilization of the proletarian vanguard! He would have heaped upon them the scorn they so richly deserve, especially upon political scavengers whose accomplishments in the movements for socialism have been anything but admirable.

The point of the whole situation is that the opponents of Marxism have literally nothing to offer to the peoples of the world, nothing except conditional surrender (as though that were truly superior to abject surrender) to world imperialism. The need of the epoch is a more forthright application of the doctrines of Marxism, for it alone is capable of directing the way out of the impasse of bourgeois society with its crises and wars, its society of poverty and destruction!

There is no better time to recall the life and work of Marx and his coworker, Friedrich Engels. It is impossible in these archives to summarize the life and deeds of these two founders of the modern socialist movement. But it is not necessary. The two selections which follow have historical interest for our generation. *The Divine Right of the Hohenzollern* presents Marx as an acute observer of history, a brilliant writer on a current event, and at the same time a trenchant critic of the then existing monarchical system in Europe. Mehring's introduction to this article brings the affair up to date and acquaints the reader with the specific situation in Marx's article.

In Mehring's *An Unusual Friendship*, we have an extremely interesting portrait of Marx and Engels, their relationship and their way of work. Although Mehring's biography of Marx is the classic study of this type, the book is now unavailable except in libraries. Even so, his article is "new" for the present generation of revolutionary socialists.

Both articles appeared in *The Class Struggle*, published in New York, the first in the months of May-June, 1918, the second in May, 1919.—G.

INTRODUCTION

The following article was originally published in *The People's Paper*, a Chartist organ, on December 13, 1856, where it was discovered by Comrade Ryazanov. It deals with the "Neuenburg Question," one of the serio-comic incidents by which the Prussia of Frederick William IV and his romantic reactionaries used to amuse all Europe. Today the matter has been forgotten, therefore a few words of explanation are necessary to understand the article of Marx:

The manner in which Neuenburg came under the sway of the Hohenzollern is pictured by Marx perfectly. As far back as the time of the Burgundian Kingdom, the little country had its own ruler and was recognized by Switzerland, but had neither voice nor vote in the Swiss Assembly. When, after many changes, its feudal dynasty died out in the year 1707, there appeared fourteen claimants, among them the King of France and the King of Prussia. The latter was supported by England and Holland, in view of their intense opposition to the hegemony of Louis XIV, and he was equally supported by the Swiss Cantons as a neighbor who was not dangerous. The result was decided by the feudal ruling class of Neuenburg for the reasons described by Marx, or, as the loyal Prussian historian, Stenzel, puts it, "after many promised favors had been secured by them." Indeed, a divine reason for the Divine Right of the Hohenzollern to Neuenburg.

It is not quite correct for Marx to say in his article that the French Revolution destroyed the domination of the Hohenzollern in Neuenburg. On the contrary, as late as February 15, 1806, Frederick William III ceded the little country to Napoleon, who turned it over with all sovereign rights to his marshal, Berthier. After the first Treaty of Paris by agreement dated June 3, 1814, Berthier turned Neuenburg over to the King of Prussia in consideration of a life income of 34,000 Prussian dollars. This was confirmed by the Treaty of Vienna, but Neuenburg was incorporated in the Swiss Union as the Twenty-first Canton.

The salvation of the little country proved to be the fact that it finally emerged from the swamp of feudal domination.

The constitution of 1848 gave everyone in Switzerland the full rights of citizenship after a residence of two years, so that

by 1856 nearly half of the population consisted of those who had immigrated, who by means of the universal suffrage could easily assume power.

In country and city the Patricians saw their power steadily vanishing. They, therefore, hit upon the desperate idea of restoring feudal conditions by a royalistic "coup." Some of the leaders went to Berlin, but Frederick William IV, while too cowardly to sanction the undertaking openly, was dishonest enough to accord it silent consent. Thus a handful of Junkers tried their luck, "in the name of the King," and on the third of September, 1856, took the castle of Neuenburg by surprise, arrested the authorities and proclaimed the restoration of the Hohenzollern. The farce lasted just two days; Swiss militia from Berne put an end to the matter quickly, without the loss of a drop of blood. Sixty-six prisoners fell into their hands and were turned over to the Swiss Court on the charge of treason. The latter made no secret of the fact that the guilty parties would be given their freedom provided, once and for all, the King of Prussia gave up his claims of "divine right" to Neuenburg.

The latter addressed a communication to the Swiss in which he extended to them the "urgent recommendation" to free the prisoners, and subject to this proviso, tendered "his good offices to finally solve the whole question."

But the Swiss hadn't the remotest intention of giving up sure guarantees for vague promises. Thus it looked as though war were unavoidable; in Prussia preparations were made to mobilize 160,000 men and insure their transit through South Germany; the Swiss sent several divisions of the militia to the border.

But the whole stupid affair was becoming too ridiculous for the European powers. Bonaparte gave Switzerland positive guarantees, and in January, 1857, the prisoners were freed. Frederick William IV had to hand Bonaparte a renunciation of his claim of "divine right" and on March 5, 1857, the four neutral great powers met in Paris as a tribunal before which Prussia and Switzerland were to come to an understanding in regard to details. Frederick felt deeply insulted by being obliged to treat directly with the Swiss rebels, but he tried to combine the profitable with the disagreeable by demanding a feudal restoration, an allotment of an income of \$2,000,000 etc., etc. When, after much juggling and haggling, he was awarded \$1,000,000, he ended the fiasco by the ridiculous statement that he did not care to bargain for money with Switzerland, and that he would rather take nothing, so that he did not get a sou for his "divine right."

Marx wrote his article about the time when the Neuenburg incident threatened to embroil Europe in war.

FRANZ MEHRING.

• • •

Europe, just now, is interested in only one great question—that of Neuenburg. That is to say, if we are to credit the Prussian newspapers. The principality of Neuenburg, even if we include the county of Valangin, covers the modest area of about 220 square miles, but the royal philosophers of Berlin maintain that not quantity but quality is the determining factor in the greatness and smallness of things, which stamps them as sublime or ridiculous.

The Neuenburg question, to them, embodies the eternal dispute between revolution and divine right, and this antagonism is influenced by geographical dimensions as little as the law of gravitation by the difference between the sun and a tennis-ball.

Let us see of what the divine right consists to which the Hohenzollern dynasty lays claim. It is based, in the case before us, on a London protocol under date of May 24, 1852, in which the plenipotentiaries of France, Great Britain and Russia "recognize the rights over the principality of Neuenburg and the county of Valangin belonging to the King of Prussia according to the stipulations of articles 22 and 76 of the Vienna Agreement, and which from 1815 to 1848 existed simultaneously with those rights which are allowed to Switzerland by Article 73 of the same agreement."

By this "diplomatic intervention" the divine right of the kings of Prussia is determined within the limits of the Vienna Treaty. This treaty, however, refers back to the claims which Prussia acquired in 1707. What was the situation in 1717? The principality of Neuenburg and the county of Valangin, which in the Middle Ages belonged to the Kingdom of Burgundy, became members of the Swiss Confederation after the defeat of Charles the Bold and continued in that capacity under the direct protectorate of Berne, even in the course of subsequent changes that occurred in its feudal "sovereignty" up to the time of the Vienna Agreement, which made it a sovereign member of the Confederacy. The sovereignty over Neuenburg was conveyed first to the house of Chalons-Orange, then through the mediation of Switzerland to the house of Longueville, and finally, at the extinction of this line, to the widowed sister of the Prince, the Countess of Nemours. When she tried to assume power, William III, King of England and Duke of Nassau-Orange, entered a protest and conveyed his right and title to Neuenburg and Valangin to his cousin, Frederick I of Prussia; this agreement was hardly given any notice during the lifetime of William III. But upon the death of the Duchess Marie of Nemours, Frederick set up his claim. As fourteen other candidates came forward, however, to assert their claims, he, with wise moderation, submitted his claim to the local nobility, not, however, without first having assured himself of the support of the judges by bribery. Thus by bribery the King of Prussia became Prince of Neuenburg and Count of Valangin.

The French Revolution annulled these titles, the Treaty of Vienna restored them, and the Revolution of 1848 removed them again. Over against the revolutionary right of the people, the King of Prussia set up his divine right of the Hohenzollern, amounting to nothing more than the divine right of bribery.

The Corruption of the House

All feudal conflicts are characterized by pettiness. In spite of this, there are distinctions among them. History is always willing to occupy itself with the innumerable petty intrigues, quarrels and betrayals by means of which the kings of France managed to overcome their feudal vassals, for they enable us to study the origin and development of a great nation. This is not the case in Germany. On the contrary, it is most tiresome and monotonous to trace how one vassal after another managed to gobble up greater or smaller portions of the German Empire for private gain. Unless some particular set of circumstances happen to enliven the scene, as is the case, for instance, in the history of Austria. In the case of the latter we see one and the same prince as chosen head of the empire, and as feudal lord of a province of the same empire, by descent, intriguing against the empire, in the interest of the province. His intrigues are successful, for his successes toward the south seem to revive the inherited conflict between Germany and

Italy, whereas his expansion to the east leads to a continuation of the bitter fight between the German and Slavic races, and the resistance of Christian Europe against the Mohammedan Orient. Finally, by shrewd family alliances, his personal power attains such an eminence that for a time it not only threatens to engulf the whole empire, which he managed to surround with an artificial glamor, but to bury the whole world under the domination of a universal monarchy.

In the annals of the Margraviate of Brandenburg (now a province of Prussia and originally the home and possession of the Hohenzollern family) we do not meet with such gigantic characteristics. Whereas the history of her rival appeals to us as a Mephistophelian epic, that of Brandenburg creates the impression of a dirty family squabble in comparison. Even where, in view of the identity of interests, we would be led to expect similar tendencies, there is a tremendous difference. The original importance of the two border states—Brandenburg and Austria (Eastern Margraviate)—is traceable to the fact that they were the advance guard of Germany against the neighboring Slavs, whether for defensive or offensive purposes. But even from this point of view the history of Brandenburg lacks color, life and dramatic action, for it comprises only actions on a small scale with unknown Slavic races scattered over a comparatively small strip of territory between the Elbe and the Oder, none of which ever attained historical importance. The Margraviate of Brandenburg never subdued or Germanized a single Slavic race of historical importance, and in fact succeeded only once in reaching out as far as the confines of Brandenburg. Even Pomerania, whose feudal lords were the margraves of Brandenburg from the time of the twelfth century, had not been entirely incorporated in the Kingdom of Prussia in the year 1815, and by the time the electors of Brandenburg tried to appropriate it piecemeal, it had long since ceased to be a Slavic state. Even the credit for having transformed the southern and southeastern seaboard of the Baltic Sea was due partly to the mercantile enterprise of the German trader, and partly to the sword of the German knight, and belongs to the history of Germany and Poland, not to that of Brandenburg, which came only to reap where it had not sown.

Power Derived by Bribe

We may be so bold as to claim that among the numerous readers who are interested in the importance of the classic names Achilles, Cicero, Nestor, and Hector, very few will have come across the fact that the sandy soil of the Margraviate of Brandenburg, which today produces only sheep and potatoes, gave birth to four electors who enjoyed the proud titles: Albrecht Achilles, John Cicero, Joachim I. Nestor, and Joachim II Hector. The same glorious mediocrity which is responsible for the fact that the electorate of Brandenburg matured so slowly to what we will politely call a European power, shielded its internal history from any indiscreet curiosity on the part of the outside world. Based on this, Prussian statesmen and historians have tried their utmost to get the world to accept and understand that Prussia is the military state par excellence, from which it follows that the divine right of the Hohenzollern is the right of the sword, the right of conquest. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is possible to assert, on the contrary, with perfect accuracy, that of all the provinces which the Hohenzollern possess today, only one was conquered—Silesia. This fact is so isolated in the annals of the history of the house that it earned for Frederick II the

surname of "Peerless." The Prussian monarchy comprises 107,578 square miles; the province of Brandenburg at present contains 15,514, and Silesia 15,748 square miles. How, then, did she manage to acquire Prussia with 25,035, Posen with 11,391, Pomerania with 12,050, Saxony with 9,776, Westphalia with 7,778, Rhenish Prussia with 10,180 square miles? By the divine right of bribery, of open purchase, of petty thievery, of legacy hunting, and traitorous partition agreements.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century the Margraviate of Brandenburg belonged to the house of Luxemburg, at the head of which was Sigismund, who at the same time wielded the scepter of Imperial Germany. Sigismund was always in financial difficulties and was hard pressed by his creditors. He found in Count Frederick of Nuremberg, of Hohenzollern descent, a friend who was both agreeable and helpful. At the same time, as security for the sums loaned to the Emperor at various times, the administration of Brandenburg was conveyed to Frederick by the Emperor in 1411. After the shrewd creditor had managed to secure temporary possession of the property of the spendthrift, he continued always to involve Sigismund in new debts; in the year 1415 upon final accounting between creditor and debtor, Frederick was invested with the hereditary title of Elector of Brandenburg. In order that there should be no doubt as to the nature of the agreement, two clauses were inserted: the one contained the condition that the house of Luxemburg had the right to buy back the electorate for 400,000 florins, and in the other, Frederick and his heirs bound themselves in the case of all subsequent elections in Germany to cast their vote for the house of Luxemburg. The first clause shows that the agreement was a bit of bargaining, the second that it was pure bribery. In order now to acquire complete possession of the electorate, it was merely necessary for the avaricious friend of Sigismund to get rid of the option to repurchase, and it did not take long before a favorable opportunity for undertaking this operation presented itself.

At the Council of Constance, when Sigismund was once again unable to raise the necessary funds to defray the expense of imperial attendance, Frederick hurried to the Swiss border and bought with his purse the cancellation of the fatal clause. Such is the nature of the methods employed by the divine right, by virtue of which the ruling dynasty of Hohenzollern acquired possession of the Margraviate of Brandenburg. That is the origin of the Prussian monarchy.

Frederick's successor, a weakling, who was given the surname "Iron" because he had a preference for going about in armor, bought an additional section from the Order of Teutonic Knights, just as his father had done before him. Just as the Roman Senate had once been accustomed to serve as arbitrator in the internal disputes of neighboring countries, so a policy of acquiring by purchase the lands of principalities overloaded by indebtedness became the customary method of the Hohenzollern princes.

We shall not dwell further on these dirty details, but shall proceed to the time of the Reformation. It would be absolutely wrong to suppose that, because the Reformation proved to be the mainstay of the Hohenzollern, the Hohenzollern were the mainstay of the Reformation. Quite the contrary. Frederick I, the founder of the dynasty, at the very outset of his reign, led the armies of Sigismund against the Hussites, who rewarded him for his trouble by giving him a sound thrashing. Joachim I. Nestor (1493-1535) was an adherent of the Reformation until he died. Joachim II Hector, while

he was an adherent of Lutheran Protestantism, refused to draw the sword in defense of the new creed, and this at a time when it was in danger of being overcome by the overwhelming power of Emperor Charles V. Not alone did he refuse to participate in the armed resistance of the Smalcaldic League, but he offered his services to the Emperor surreptitiously. The German Reformation therefore met with an open animosity on the part of the Hohenzollern at the time of origin, false neutrality during the period of its initial struggles, and at its terrible conclusion through the Thirty Years War, weak vacillation, cowardly inactivity, and base perfidy. It is a known fact that the elector, Georg Wilhelm, tried to block the way of the liberating army of Gustavus Adolphus so that the latter had to drive him by force into the Protestant camp, from which he afterward tried to steal away by means of a separate peace with Austria. But even if the Hohenzollern were not the saviors of the Reformation, they certainly were its beneficiaries. Even though they hadn't the least ambition to fight for the cause of the Reformation, they were only too willing, and in fact eager, to commit plunder in its name. The Reformation, to them, was merely a religious pretext for secularizing church property, and the greatest part of their conquests in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be traced back to a single great source: the blunder of the church, a futher curious emanation of divine right.

By the Grace of God They Grew

In the genesis of the Hohenzollern monarchy, three events stand out prominently: the acquisition of the electorate of Brandenburg, the addition of the Dukedom of Prussia, and finally the elevation from a duchy to a monarchy. We have seen how the acquisition of the electorate was accomplished. The Dukedom was acquired by the following three measures: first, through secularization; secondly, by marriage and moreover, in an equivocal manner: the elector, Joachim Frederick, married the younger daughter, and his son, John Sigismund, married the older daughter of the insane Duke Albrecht of Prussia, who had no male heirs. The third measure was bribery. And, moreover, he bribed the court of the Polish King on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the Parliament of the Polish Republic. The corruption was full of complications and lasted a number of years. A similar method was used to convert the Prussian Dukedom into a monarchy. In order to obtain the royal title, the elector, Frederick II, who subsequently became King Frederick I, had to secure the consent of the Emperor, whose Catholic conscience, however, was an obstruction. Frederick thereupon bribed the Jesuit, Father Wolf, the confessor of Leopold I, and added in trade 30,000 sons of Brandenburg, who were slaughtered in the Austro-Spanish War of the Succession. The Hohenzollern elector went back to the old Germanic institution of employing living beings as money, save for the difference that the Germans of old paid with cattle, and he with human beings. Thus it was that the Kingdom of the Hohenzollern was founded by the grace of God.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century, as the power of the Hohenzollern grew, they improved their methods of expansion; in addition to bribing and bargaining, they also used the system of division of spoils by partnerships and confederates, against countries which they themselves had not defeated, but which they plundered after defeat. Thus we see them, together with Peter the Great, partitioning the Swedish

provinces, and with Catharine II taking part in the partition of Poland, and with Alexander I in that of Germany.

Whoever, therefore, opposes the claims of Prussia to Neuenburg by contending that the Hohenzollern acquired them by bribery, commits a grievous error. He quite forgets that

Brandenburg as well, and Prussia, and the royal title were obtained purely by bribery. No doubt they possess Neuenburg by the same divine right as their other territory, and they cannot waive the former without risking the latter.

KARL MARX.

An Unusual Friendship

How Marx and Engels Worked

The victory of Marx's career was not only due to the man's enormous power. According to all human probability, he would have succumbed sooner or later, if he had not found in Engels a friend, of whose self-sacrificing fidelity we have had no accurate picture until the publication of the correspondence of the two men.

No other such spectacle is afforded in all recorded history. Couples of friends, of historical importance, are found throughout history, and German history has its examples also. Frequently their lifework is so closely interwoven that it is difficult to decide which accomplishment belongs to each one of them. But always there has been a persistent remnant of individual obstinacy or stubbornness, or perhaps only an instinctive reluctance to surrender one's own personality, which, in the words of the poet, "is the highest blessing of the children of men." After all, Luther saw in Melancthon only a chicken-livered scholar, while Melancthon regarded Luther as a coarse peasant. And in the correspondence of Goethe and Schiller, anyone with sound senses can discern the secret lack of attunement between the great privy councillor and the small court councillor. There is no trace of this ultimate human weakness in the friendship of Marx and Engels: the more their thoughts and labors become interwoven, the more each one of them remained a full man, complete in himself.

Their exteriors were quite different. Engels, a blond Teuton of tall stature, of English manners, as an observer once said of him, always well dressed, with a bearing that was rigid with the training not only of the barracks, but also of the counting-house. With six clerks, he said, he would organize a branch of the administration a thousand times more simple and efficient than with sixty government councillors, who cannot even write legibly and get your books all balled up, so that the Devil himself can make nothing of them. A member of the Manchester Stock Exchange, perfectly respectable in the business dealings and the amusements of the English bourgeoisie, its fox-hunts and its Christmas parties, he was yet a tireless mental worker and fighter, who, in a little house on the outskirts of the city, held his treasure concealed, his little Irish girl, in whose arms he would refresh himself whenever he tired of the human turmoil in the world without.

Marx, on the other hand, short, thick-set, with flashing eyes and a lion's mane of ebon hue, betraying his Semitic origin; of careless exterior, a father whose family cares alone would be sufficient to keep him away from the social life of the great city; so intensely devoted to consuming intellectual labor that he has hardly the time to gulp down a hasty dinner and uses up his bodily strength to all hours of the night; a tireless thinker, to whom thought is a supreme pleasure; in this respect a genuine successor of Kant, of Fichte, and particularly

of Hegel, whose sentence he loved to repeat: "Even the most criminal thought of a scoundrel is more sublime and more magnificent than the miracles of the celestial sphere," but differing from them in that his thoughts inexorably drive him to action; he was unpractical in small matters but very practical in large matters; far too helpless to arrange a petty household, but incomparably capable in the business of recruiting and leading an army that was to revolutionize the world.

How They Supplemented Each Other

If it is true that "the style is the man," we must also note their differences as writers. Each in his way was a master of language, a linguistic genius, with a mastery of many foreign languages and even of individual dialects. In this field Engels was even more remarkable than Marx, but whenever writing in his mother-tongue, even in his letters and of course in his writings, he exercises a most austere care to keep the language free from all foreign admixture of word and phrase, without falling, however, into the vagaries of the patriotic linguistic purists. He wrote with ease and lucidity, always in a style so pellucid that you looked right down to the bottom of the current of his animated speech.

Marx's style was at once more careless and more difficult. In his youthful letters there is still apparent, as in those of Heine, a condition of struggle with the language, and in the letters of his later years, particularly after his settlement in England, he began to make use of a picturesque jargon of German, English and French, all mixed up. In his published writings, also, there is an over-liberal use of foreign words, and there is no lack of Gallicisms and Anglicisms, yet he is so distinctly a master of the German language that he cannot be translated without serious loss. Once when Engels had read a chapter by Marx in a French translation, even after Marx had revised the translation, it seemed to Engels that the vigor and sap and life had disappeared. Goethe once wrote to Frau von Stein: "In metaphors I am ready to stand comparison with the proverbs of Sancho Panza." Marx could well bear comparison with the greatest of the world's adepts in figures of speech, with Lessing, Goethe, Hegel, so full of life and vigor is his language.

He had fully absorbed Lessing's statement that a perfect representation requires a fusion of image and conception, as closely joined as man and woman, and the university pedants have gotten square with him for this, from Father Wilhelm Roscher down to the youngest fledgling of a *Privatdozent*, by accusing him of being incapable of making himself understood except in an extremely vague way, "patched up with a liberal use of figurative language." Marx never exhausted the questions which he attacked beyond the point of enabling

the reader to begin a fruitful train of thought; his speech is like the dancing of the waves over the purple depths of the sea.

Engels as Collaborator

Engels always saw in Marx a superior spirit; he never wished to play anything but second fiddle by his side. Yet he never was a mere interpreter and assistant, but always a collaborator of independent activity, a kindred spirit, though not of equal size. In the early days of their friendship, Engels played, in one important field, rather the rôle of a giver than of a receiver, and twenty years later Marx wrote to him: "You know that all ideas come to me too late, and that, in the second place, I always follow in your tracks." With his somewhat light equipment, Engels was able to move about more freely, and even though his glance was sharp enough to distinguish the decisive features of a question or of a situation, it did not penetrate far enough to review at once all the conditions and corollaries with which even the scantiest decision is often burdened. For a man of action this defect is even an advantage, and Marx never made a political decision without first calling upon Engels for advice, and Engels was usually able to hit the nail on the head.

Accordingly, the advice which Marx asked from Engels was not as satisfactory in questions of theory as in questions of politics. In theory Marx was usually the better of the two. And he was absolutely inattentive to such advice as Engels would often give him, in order to impel him to terminate his labors on his great scientific masterpiece: "Be a little less severe on yourself in the matter of your own productions; they are far too good for the public. The main thing is to have it finished and to get it out; the defects that you still see, the asses will never discover." It was a characteristic bit of Engels advice, and it was just as characteristic of Marx to ignore it.

It is clear from the above that Engels was better fitted for a journalistic career than Marx; "a real walking encyclopedia"—so Marx once described him to a mutual friend, "capable of work at any hour of the day or night, drunk or sober, swift with his pen and alert as the devil." It seems that both, after the cessation of the *Neue Rheinische Revue*, in the autumn of 1850, had still in mind the issuing of another journal in common, to be printed in London; at least, in December, 1853, Marx wrote to Engels: "If we—you and I—had started our business as English correspondents in time, you would not now be condemned to office-work in Manchester, nor I to my debts." Engels' choice of a position of clerk in his father's firm, in preference to the prospects of this "business," was probably due to his consideration for the hopeless situation of Marx, and to a hope of better times in the future, and certainly not with the object of devoting himself permanently to the "damned business." In the spring of 1854, Engels again considered the desirability of returning to London for literary work, but this was the last time; it must have been about this time that he made up his mind to assume the cursed burden for good, not merely in order to be of assistance to his friend, but in order thus to preserve the party's best mental asset. Only with this motivation could Engels make the great sacrifice, and Marx accept; both the offer and the acceptance required a great spirit.

And before Engels became a partner in the firm some years later, he cannot exactly be said to have trod a path of roses, but from the first day of his stay at Manchester he aided Marx and never ceased aiding him. An unending stream of one-pound, five-pound, ten-pound, later even hundred-pound

notes began to flow toward London. Engels never lost his patience, even though it was often sorely tried by Marx and his wife, who had no over-great supply of domestic wisdom. He forgot the amount of a note and appeared unpleasantly surprised to learn of it when the note fell due. Slight also was his concern when, on the occasion of another general clean-up of the domestic economy, Mrs. Marx, through misplaced considerateness, concealed a large item and began paying it off by stinting with her household money, thus starting the old trouble over again, with the best of all intentions; on this occasion Engels allowed his friend the rather pharasaical amusement of bewailing the "idiocy of women," who manifestly are "in constant need of guardianship," and contented himself with the gentle admonition: See it doesn't happen again.

But Engels did not alone slave away for his friend in office and exchange all day long, but he also gave to him most of his evening leisure hours, in fact, a great part of the night. Although the original reason for this added labor was the necessity of preparing an English version of Marx's articles for the *New York Tribune*, until Marx should be able to use the language well enough for literary purposes, the laborious coöperation continued for many years after the original reason had been overcome.

Everything for the Revolution

But all this seems a slight sacrifice as compared with the greatest service Engels rendered his friend, namely, his renunciation of his independent accomplishments as a thinker and investigator, which, in view of his incomparable energy and his rich talents, would have produced valuable results. A correct notion of this sacrifice can also be obtained from the correspondence of the two men, even if we note only the studies in linguistic and military science, which were carried on by Engels partly owing to an "old predilection" and partly with a view to the practical needs of the struggle for proletarian emancipation. For, much as he hated all "autodidacticism"—"it's all damn nonsense," he contemptuously said—and thorough as were his methods of scientific work, he was yet as little a mere closet-scholar as Marx, and every new piece of knowledge was doubly precious in his eyes, if it might aid at once in lightening the chains of the proletariat.

He therefore undertook the study of the Slavic languages because of the "consideration" that in the next great clash of national interests, "at least one of us" should be acquainted with the language, history, literature, social institutions of those nations with whom there was some likelihood of immediate conflict. Oriental troubles led him to the oriental languages; he steered clear of Arabic, with its 4,000 roots; but "Persian is a veritable child's play of a language"; he would be through with it in three weeks. Then came the turn of the Germanic languages: "I am now buried in Ulfilas: I simply had to get rid of this damned Gothic: I have been so long carrying it on in a rather desultory manner. I am surprised to find that I know much more than I expected. I need one more book, and then I'll be absolutely done with it in two weeks. And then for Old Norse and Old Saxon, with which I have long been on terms of half-acquaintance. As yet I have absolutely no paraphernalia, not even a lexicon: nothing but the Gothic text and old Grimm, but the old fellow is really a brick." In the sixties, when the Schleswig-Holstein question came up, Engels undertook "some Frisian-English-Jutian-Scandinavian philology and archaeology," and when the Irish

question blazed up, "some Celto-Irish," and so on. In the General Council of the International his comprehensive linguistic accomplishments were of great value to him; "Engels can stammer in twenty languages," was said of him, because in moments of excitement he displayed a slight lisp.

Another epithet of his was that of the "General," which he earned by his still more assiduous devotion to the military sciences. Here also he was satisfying an "old predilection" at the same time he was preparing for the practical needs of the revolutionary policy. Engels was counting on "the enormous importance which the *parti militaire* would attain in the next commotion." The experiences with the officers who had joined the revolution in the years of rebellion had not been very satisfactory, and Engels declared that "the military rabble has an incredibly dirty caste spirit. They hate each other worse than poison, envy each other like schoolboys at the slightest mark of distinction, but they show a united front against all civilians." Engels wanted to arrive at a point at which his theoretical remarks might have some weight and might not merely expose his ignorance.

He had hardly gotten established in Manchester when he began to "plug up military science." He began with the "simplest and most rudimentary things, such as are asked in an ensign's or lieutenant's examination, and are therefore assumed by all authors as already known." He studied everything about army administration, down to the most technical details: elementary tactics, Vanban's system of fortification, and all other systems, including the modern system of detached forts, bridge construction and field works, fighting tools, down to the varying construction of carriages for field guns, the ravitaillement of hospitals, and other matters; finally he passed on to the general history of war, in which connection he paid particular attention to the English authority Napier, the French Jomini, and the German Clausewitz.

Far removed from any shallow attacks on the moral folly

of warfare, Engels sought rather to recognize its historic justification, by which effort he more than once aroused the violent rage of declamatory democracy. Byron once poured the vials of his scorching rage over the two generals who, at the Battle of Waterloo, in the character of champions of feudal Europe, inflicted a deathblow on the heir of the Revolution; it was an interesting accident that made Engels, in his letters to Marx, outline historic portraits both of Wellington and Blucher, which in their small compass, are so complete and so distinct, that they hardly need to be altered in a single respect to make them fully acceptable to the present state of advancement of military science.

In a third field, too, in which Engels also labored much and with pleasure, namely, in that of the natural sciences, he was not to have the opportunity, during the decades in which he accepted the bondage of commerce in order to afford free rein to the scientific investigations of another man—to put the finishing touches to his own labors.

And this was really a tragic lot. But Engels never wailed about it, for sentimentality was as foreign to his nature as to his friend's. He always held it to be the great good fortune of his life, to have stood by Marx's side for forty years, even at the price of being overshadowed by Marx's gigantic form. Nor did he consider it to be a belated form of satisfaction to be permitted, after the death of his friend, to be the first man of the international workers' movement, to play the first violin, as it were, undisputed, in this movement; on the contrary, he considered this to be an honor that was too great for his merits.

As each of the two men was completely absorbed in the common cause, and each made an equally great sacrifice to it, although not an identical sacrifice, without any disagreeable reservation of objection or of boast, their friendship became an alliance which has no parallel in human history.

FRANZ MEHRING.

FOR THE RECORD!

The Bound Volume Bargain of the Century!

NOW AVAILABLE!

THE YEAR 1942

LABOR ACTION

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Both Together for \$4.00

or \$2.50 for each Volume separately

(Including Mailing)

Send Orders to: THE WORKERS PARTY, . . . 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.