

W 246
The

COMMUNIST

NOVEMBER



TWENTY-TWO YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

SOCIALISM AND PEACE VS. IMPERIALISM AND WAR

EARL BROWDER

ALEX BITTELMAN

V. J. JEROME

GIL GREEN

JAMES S. ALLEN

AMERICA AND THE INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

POLITICAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.



TWENTY CENTS

FREUDISM, by R. L. GLEY

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,
REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND
MARCH 3, 1933, OF THE COMMUNIST, published monthly at New York,
N. Y., for October 1, 1939.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

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

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

Publisher, Communist Party of U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
Editor, Earl Browder, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
Managing Editor, None
Business Manager, Joseph Fields, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Communist Party of U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
Earl Browder, General Secretary, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
A non-profit organization—political.

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

None.

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

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

JOSEPH FIELDS, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of October, 1939.

MAX KITZES, Notary Public.
(My Commission expires March 30, 1940.)

(Seal)

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME



CONTENTS

America and the International Situation	POLITICAL COMMITTEE, C.P.U.S.A.	995
Review of the Month	A. B.	1002
On the Twenty-Second Anniversary of the Socialist Revolution	EARL BROWDER	1016
Then—and Now	V. J. JEROME	1028
The Young Generation and the Imperialist War	GIL GREEN	1037
American Imperialism and the War	JAMES S. ALLEN	1046
Backward Europe and Progressive Asia	V. I. LENIN	1054
The Struggle of the Spanish People Con- tinues	MANUEL ROJAS	1057
Freudism—Psychology of a Dying Class	R. L. GLEY	1066
The Fundamental Distinction Between Dialectics and Eclectics	1080
From the World Communist Press	1084

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

WORLD ACCLAIM!

**THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

364 Pages. Cloth \$1.00

Over 16,000,000 copies of this great history have been printed in 31 languages! In the United States alone, over 95,000 copies have been sold in the last six months.

Of this book, Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, said:

"This is no ordinary book to be skimmed through and then laid aside on a bookshelf. It is a scientific textbook to be studied and mastered, not a collection of dogmas to be memorized, not for mechanical quotation of extracts, but to understand the essence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism so that it can be **applied to the most varied** and different problems and situations, so that this theory can be enriched with the new experiences of the revolutionary working class movement also of our country."

Now Ready Also in Jewish, Italian and Spanish

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

AMERICA AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED OCTOBER 13, 1939, BY THE
POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EVENTS since the outbreak of the present imperialist war have fully confirmed the correctness of the analysis and position of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. on the imperialist war as set forth in its declaration of September 18. On the basis of this declaration and in view of the latest developments internationally and within the country, the Political Committee wishes to re-emphasize and further develop the following central political conclusions and tasks flowing from the present political situation:

1. The present war is an imperialist war for which the bourgeoisie of all belligerent powers are equally guilty. With the invasion of Poland, predatory Nazi imperialism has continued to follow the path of armed conquest in its efforts for world domination. Reactionary British imperialism, together with the French monopolists, which helped bring German fascism to power, which initiated the policy of appeasement to the former Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis at the expense of the national integrity and existence of the peoples of China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain and Poland, and at the risk of the national

interests of Britain and France—strove and still endeavors to incite and divert Nazi armed forces eastward against the Soviet Union. Balked in this objective as a result of the peace policy and strength of the land of socialism which brought about the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, the British ruling class has entered the robber war against German imperialism in order to weaken the German bourgeoisie, to consolidate British imperialist hegemony in Europe and the world, and to try to bring to power in Germany that section of the bourgeoisie which will immediately engage in military intervention against the U.S.S.R.

Thus, the current imperialist war for world domination and the forcible redivision of empires, nations, colonies and spheres of influence is an imperialist war on both sides, expressing the deepest and sharpest crisis of world capitalism. This is deepening and accentuating to an unprecedented degree the rivalries and contradictions between and within all imperialist powers. This is also rendering more acute the struggle between the systems of decaying, predatory capitalism and victorious, liberating socialism. In short, the present imperialist war sig-

nifies that the crisis of disintegrating world capitalism is entering a new and more acute phase, marked by the opening of a new series of wars and revolutions of a protracted nature.

Therefore, the working class and exploited peoples of all countries should not and must not support either side of the predatory imperialist war which is being waged by the ruling classes of Germany and of Britain and France for the dismemberment and enslavement of nations and peoples, for monopoly profits and for greater class oppression of the working people in their own countries. Keep America out of the imperialist war must be the foremost slogan of the American people.

2. In sharp contradistinction to the imperialist policy carried out by the ruling classes and governments of all the belligerents, and of all the mercenary, "neutral" capitalist powers, is the firm policy of peace, national freedom and socialism pursued by the Soviet Union. Prior to the declaration of the imperialist war, the U.S.S.R. alone of all the world powers conducted an uncompromising struggle for peace, for collective security to prevent the spread of aggression and the outbreak of the existing war. When it met with final rejection by the Chamberlains and Daladiers in these efforts, it concluded a pact of non-aggression with Germany in order to limit the area of the threatening war and in order to frustrate British intrigue inciting Germany to attack the U.S.S.R.

Since the outbreak of the present war, the Soviet Union has continued to exert all of its mighty proletarian

influence in the cause of peace, democracy and liberty. When the fascist Polish government collapsed and abandoned its peoples to the fate at the hands of the imperialist robbers, the Soviet Union and its Red Army, in the interests of its own security and in order to protect the lives and welfare of the people, occupied Western Ukrainia and Byelo-Russia, related to the peoples of the Soviet Union by nationality, and forcibly torn away in 1920 by Polish militarism. The U.S.S.R. followed up this national liberation move with renewed efforts and successes in promoting mutual assistance pacts and closer peaceful relations with its Baltic and Balkan neighbors, thereby establishing additional guarantees for safeguarding the land of socialism and for checking the extension of imperialist aggression and war.

Furthermore, by its firm resistance and growing might it compelled the Japanese aggressors to enter into an armistice and to retreat on the Siberian-Mongolian front, creating the preconditions for important military victories for the Chinese people. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union utilized the conditions arising from the collapse of the Polish state and the establishment of peace in Eastern Europe, to renew its efforts to halt the imperialist war. This is why on September 28 it appealed to all nations and peoples to help bring the imperialist war to an end, to save mankind from further slaughter, destruction and chaos. Now, as in the past, the U.S.S.R. steadfastly strives to advance the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

Therefore, now more than ever, the

working class and people must support the peace policy and initiative of the U.S.S.R., must strive for American collaboration with the Soviet Union, whose socialist policies are identical with the interests of the working class of all countries, to bring about an immediate cessation of the war. Therefore, now especially, the working class and people must at all costs prevent the British and French ruling classes, aided by the reactionary monopolists of all countries, from transforming the present war between the two imperialist groups into a counter-revolutionary imperialist war against the Soviet Union.

3. The present war between two imperialist groups has *basically altered all international relations and is profoundly changing the class and political alignments within each capitalist nation.* It has at one blow wiped out the former division of the world between the camps of democracy and fascism. The distinction between fascist and non-fascist governments has lost its former significance as a determining factor in international relations. Today there are again two main camps, but these have changed. In a general way they may be characterized as follows: on one side there is the anti-imperialist, anti-war, anti-monopoly camp of the working class and its allies, including the oppressed peoples of all countries. This is the camp of democracy, of peace, of national liberation and social progress, the cornerstone of which is the Soviet Union. On the other side, there is the camp of the imperialist bourgeoisie of all capitalist countries, the camp of the war-makers, of monopoly capitalist reaction and oppression.

Therefore, the slogans of anti-fascism no longer give the main direction to the struggle of the working class and its allies, as they formerly did in the period of the struggle for the anti-fascist peace front and people's front; *these old slogans lose their significance and must be replaced by new ones which more accurately correspond to the new relations and tasks. The main slogans today must be directed against all forms of reactionary capitalist dictatorships, against capitalism, the source of all war; against capitalist exploitation and oppression; and against all forces supporting the imperialist war and its continuation. What is necessary today is the establishment of an alliance between the working class and its natural allies—the toiling farmers and exploited city middle classes—an alliance led by the working class.*

4. Under the cynical mask of "neutrality" the American bourgeoisie, despite certain inner tactical differences, is united in its greed for huge war profits and imperialist aggrandizement. It is preparing to involve the U.S.A. in the imperialist war under conditions most favorable to strengthening the world hegemony of American imperialism. Important sections of the American bourgeoisie are encouraging and stimulating hostility toward the Soviet Union, supporting the British plan of converting the present imperialist war into a counter-revolutionary war against the land of socialism. Pressed by the imperialist bourgeoisie, the Roosevelt government, despite its avowed intentions of "keeping America out of war," more and more takes a course which threatens to involve the U.S.A. in the imperialist war. But the overwhelming

mass of the people are definitely opposed to United States involvement in the imperialist war.

Therefore it is imperative for the American working class and toiling people to pursue an independent policy and to resist and defeat the policy and influence of the reactionary Wall Street monopolists and their agents upon the government's foreign and domestic policy. It is necessary to organize and register the people's opposition to America's involvement in the imperialist war.

5. In view of the political changes and realignments taking place within the country, bourgeois democrats are gravitating towards and being drawn into the imperialist camp, and not only the old division between the Republican and Democratic parties, but also that between the New Deal and anti-New Deal camps, is losing its former significance. Both are parties of the bourgeoisie and seek in various ways to realize and promote the predatory interests of American imperialism in the war and both are following policies which threaten to involve the U.S.A. in the present war. *The working class cannot support these policies.* But among the so-called progressive sections in and around both parties, especially the Democratic Party, there are elements who, because they reflect, even though distortedly, certain anti-war and anti-monopoly attitudes of farmers and middle classes, may offer to labor certain possibilities for effecting even temporary political understandings with such individuals and groups.

The working class must continue to make use of all contradictions in the

bourgeois camp, utilizing such temporary understandings for specific and limited objectives with such groups as: (1) will promote labor's alliance with other exploited groups and strengthen the leadership of the working class in this anti-imperialist, anti-war, anti-monopoly alliance; (2) will not hamper the development of the independent line and struggles of the working class against capitalist exploitation and reaction; (3) will not prevent the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party, from educating and winning the masses for opposing the imperialist war, to active support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and will not hamper the Communist Party from independently mobilizing the masses for daily struggle against the imperialist war, capitalist reaction and exploitation.

6. Since 1933, and especially since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the Communists have been seeking and fighting for a united working class front around the central issues of combatting fascism and war. Because of the changes resulting from the imperialist war, especially because of the treacherous role of international Social-Democracy in aiding the outbreak of the war and in supporting the imperialist bourgeoisie in the prosecution of the war, the united front tactic must be adjusted to the rapidly changing conditions. *United fronts are impossible with those tendencies and groups in the labor movement which follow the treacherous policy of Social-Democracy, support the imperialist war, seek to drag America into it, incite against the Soviet Union and hamper the*

struggle of the working class against imperialism, capitalism and intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation. These issues dominate all other considerations and therefore necessitate a major and systematic offensive against the treacherous policies of Social-Democracy, as well as against the counter-revolutionary Trotskyite-Lovestoneite agents of imperialism and capitalist reaction.

At the same time, we Communists will continue the broadest collaboration with all elements in the labor movement to advance the struggle for working class unity by educating, rallying and unifying the workers against capitalist reaction and exploitation and to keep America out of the imperialist war: by contributing our utmost to protect and improve the living standards and political rights of the workers, the Negro people and all toilers; to further organize the unorganized, strengthen the trade union movement and help it to develop along the lines of the class struggle, and by promoting trade union unity on this basis; by exposing and isolating the spokesmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie within the labor movement; by promoting working class initiative and leadership in the democratic alliance of the working class, toiling farmers and exploited city middle classes; by helping develop and strengthen the independent political role and influence of the working class in the life and affairs of the nation.

7. As part of the preparations for involving America in the imperialist war, the reactionaries are intensifying their attacks upon the democratic liberties of the working masses and

their organizations. This is why they have begun their offensive by launching the most vicious attack upon the Communist Party, with the object of restricting its civil rights and eventually outlawing the C.P.U.S.A. as the first step in preparing to destroy the trade unions and all progressive organizations. Reaction has singled out the C.P.U.S.A. as the main target of its developing anti-labor and anti-democratic campaign because the C.P. U.S.A., as the working class party of the socialist reorganization of society, speaks the truth, works to keep the U.S.A. out of the imperialist war, and strives to forge unity of action of the working class and its allies to combat and defeat all tendencies directed towards the full and immediate control of government by the most reactionary section of monopoly capital. *Therefore, as a vital means of self-defense, of safeguarding the Bill of Rights, and the future of democracy, it is the duty of the American working class and people to defeat the attacks of the reactionaries upon the Communists as the only way to protect the constitutional rights of all labor, anti-war and anti-imperialist adherents.*

8. Already the capitalists are utilizing the war propaganda and war preparations to launch new attacks on the labor movement, aiming to reduce the living standards of the masses and cripple their organizations, especially the trade unions. In the name of "national unity" and "emergency" they hope to increase their profits through wage reductions, speed up, profiteering prices, suspension of pro-labor legislation, prohibition of the right to strike. In this they are finding open or

tacit support among the most reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

Labor must oppose these attacks by safeguarding its wage standards, fight against war profiteering, through demands for increased wages to meet soaring prices, fight for shorter hours, by protecting all favorable legislation, by a new effort to organize the millions of unorganized, by militantly resisting all attacks on its hard-won working standards and rights.

Under the concerted and unprecedented attacks of the imperialist warmongers and their agents, the C.P.-U.S.A. has displayed great unity, loyalty and devotion to American democracy and the working class, to the cause of socialism, to the cause of working class internationalism. In the present situation the C.P.U.S.A. is faced with historic responsibilities as well as new opportunities for mobilizing, uniting and leading the working class and exploited peoples. To fulfill these historic tasks, we resolve now more than ever to apply to American conditions the principles of Marxism-Leninism, especially the experiences and lessons of the C.P.S.U. as embodied in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. In line with this we wish to stress:

The merciless enemy of the workers has always been, is, and will be: the capitalist class. This is so regardless of the particular political face with which the capitalist class appears, regardless of the political form in which it shields its domination, regardless of the lying and hypocritical slogans with which it masks its imperialist aims, whether in times of war or peace.

Therefore, all Party members should learn that the Communist Party, the Party of the working class, now more than ever must carry on an independent policy; must not lose sight of the great historical perspectives of the political situation and the labor movement; must determine all of its tactics by proceeding solely from the fundamental interests of the working class, which are the interests of all toiling humanity, and must reject all that is in conflict with these interests.

Therefore, today we must learn especially to organize our mass work in accordance with the new realignment of class forces internationally and within the country, and rapidly overcome the weight of obsolete tactical attitudes which have become a brake upon the labor movement. Therefore we must fully master the art of correctly pointing out the fundamental direction of the main strategical line of attack against the class enemy and gather all the forces of the labor movement and its allies so as to wage this struggle with uncompromising determination.

Therefore, we Communists must at all costs strengthen our political influence among, and our ties with, the working class and toiling people to prevent the involvement of the U.S.A. in the imperialist war and to protect the national and social security of the American working people. We must help fortify, safeguard and build the basic mass organizations of labor, of the toiling farmers, the progressive youth, the Negro people and all toilers, especially the labor unions, as well as the Communist Party. We must extend and more skilfully combine the propaganda and struggle for socialism

with systematic day to day activity in the shops, mills, farms and neighborhoods, for defending and championing the immediate economic and political demands of labor and the working people against the imperialist war-makers and war profiteers, against the economic royalists and monopoly capitalists.

Under the glorious banner of Marx-

Engels-Lenin-Stalin, acting like Bolsheviks under the most difficult conditions, avoiding "Leftist" sectarianism and Right opportunist deviations, we will strengthen our ranks and march forward to new struggles and new victories in the interests of the working class and the majority of the American people, in the interests of international working class solidarity.

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

The Twenty-Second Anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution. The Class Enemy and the Imperialist War. Soviet Policies Versus Imperialist Policies. The Baltic and the Caribbean. Economic Help Versus Economic Plunder. Liberals Slipping Into Imperialist Camp. Peace Perspectives Through Soviet Leadership. Sidney Hillman Proposes a Policy. Motives of Bourgeois Statesmen and Class Interests. Something Is Happening to Bourgeois Democrats. Mercenary Neutrality or Anti-Imperialism? Class Regroupings and Political Alignments. Labor's Leadership in Anti-Imperialist Camp. On Alliances and Temporary Understandings. Meaning of Anti-Communist "Crusade." Communist Critics. Bourgeois Democrats and Democracy Are Not Identical. Learning from Stalin the Art of Strategy and Tactics.

THIS is the twenty-second anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution. In celebrating the event this year, the working class and toiling people of all countries will have the right to say with greater confidence than ever before: socialism has won on one-sixth of the earth and has proved itself superior to capitalism in all respects; therefore, it will win inevitably and certainly in all countries.

Gripped by the second imperialist war, capitalism is passing through its sharpest and deepest crisis. Never before has it been so clear to millions of working people that capitalism has become the curse of humanity: the source of war, reaction, insecurity, poverty, misery and human degradation. And never before have these millions been learning so fast that the socialist Soviet Union—the center of the new and superior social system—points the way for the rest of the world to peace, freedom and happiness.

Capitalism, and its ruling class—

the bourgeoisie—have brought upon us the present war whose heavy consequences are already falling upon the shoulders of the working people in the belligerent countries. And in the United States, the imperialist bourgeoisie is making ready to aggrandize itself in wealth and power and to drag the people of this country into the predatory capitalist fight for world domination.

In the face of these facts and dangers, the working people cannot help but reach the conclusion that their merciless enemy always has been, is and will be the ruling capitalist class. The working people are bound to see that this is true regardless of the particular political face with which the bourgeoisie appears before the masses, regardless of the political form in which it embodies its domination, regardless of the lying and hypocritical slogans with which it masks its imperialist aims whether in war or in peace.

Twenty-two years ago, the working

class of old Russia, in alliance with all toilers and led by the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, overthrew the rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords, and established the true rule of the people headed by the proletariat. With this power, the working class proceeded to lay the basis for a new socialist society.

Many hard battles had to be fought and won by the people of the young socialist country, supported by the solidarity of the toiling masses everywhere, in order to secure the opportunity for peaceful socialist construction. Foreign military intervention by the imperialist states as well as internal counter-revolution had to be overcome and defeated. The agencies of the enemy in the labor movement—Trotskyism, Bukharinism, Zinovievism—had to be similarly exposed, defeated and uprooted. Many new fundamental problems had to be solved on the construction of socialism in a single country surrounded by capitalism and imperialism. All of these things had to be definitely accomplished to enable the Soviet Union, led by the Party of Lenin and Stalin, to carry through its triumphant march to the victory of the socialist system.

After the death of the immortal Lenin, it is the great Stalin who has led the Soviet people to progress and socialist victory. He has also been the teacher and guide of the liberating struggles of the exploited masses everywhere.

Through the historic Five-Year plans, realized by the proletarian dictatorship, the Soviet Union has achieved tremendous victories of socialist construction, unheard-of devel-

opments of socialist industry and collectivized agriculture. On this basis arose a magnificent moral and political unity of the Soviet people, something which petty bourgeois ideologists in the capitalist countries can only dream about but which socialism alone makes possible. On the same foundation is developing a rich and many-sided socialist democracy, the highest form of democracy, whose path has been so brilliantly outlined and whose achievements so firmly embodied in the great Stalinist Constitution.

This it was that made possible the establishment of the Soviet Union's defenses, that gave power and meaning to its Red Army, which secure the peaceful socialist labor of the Soviet people in the midst of the second imperialist war. This it is that now enables the Soviet Union to meet the twenty-second anniversary of the great socialist revolution with such tremendous strength and growing influence—influence for the peace and security and liberty of its neighbors, influence for a lasting peace in Eastern Europe, *influence that puts ever more effective obstacles to imperialist designs and serves the cause of world peace.*

While the capitalist world is being shaken to its foundations by war and crisis, the socialist Soviet Union advances mightily towards communism. According to the biennial report of the State Planning Commission, production for the first nine months of this year registered a gain of 15.5 per cent. Commenting on this meaningful fact, *Pravda* writes:

“During these nine months, socialist Russia produced more industrial goods than tsarist

Russia in ten years." (*New York Times*, October 13, 1939.)

Here is the measure of progress since the revolution. Contrast this advance with the economic retrogression of the biggest and richest capitalist country in the world, the United States. According to Barron's index of production and trade, which is based on 1923-25 as 100 but which allows for growth of population and needs, business in September this year stood at 78.6, that is, 21.4 points *below* the average of fourteen years ago and 30.8 points *below* 1929. Surely, one can't blame for this fact lack of resources or wealth, lack of labor power or technical ability. Nor can one place responsibility for this economic retrogression on the so-called lack of "living space." All of that the United States has aplenty. It is the system that is to blame, the capitalist system in crisis, the system which produced the present, the second, imperialist war.

The ruling classes of the capitalist countries seek a way out of the crisis of their system on the road of imperialist aggrandizement and war. This will not save the system, of course. But capitalism knows no other way. That is why we have the contrast between the predatory foreign policies of imperialism and the peace policies of the Soviet Union. Can there be any doubt today among fair and honest people, no matter where they live, that the Soviet policy is one of peace, good relations with neighbors (genuinely good relations) and friendship between nations generally? No doubt at all. This is attested to most conclusively by the recent peace victories of the Soviet Union in its treaties

with Germany and with the Baltic states. Only blind ones, or enemies, can fail to see that now.

* * *

YET we still find people who, while professing admiration for the socialist achievements of the Soviet Union within that country, at the same time voice disappointment with what they choose to call its "nationalist" policies externally, especially with respect to the Baltic states. Thus the *New Republic*:

"The most disconcerting development of recent Soviet policy is this tendency toward national aggrandizement as opposed to socialist action of the masses." (October 11, 1939.)

Assuming that the *New Republic* is genuinely and sincerely disconcerted, the first thing we must urge is a more honest effort *to understand*. Not even the writers of the *New Republic* can assume to understand at once new and far-reaching developments without honest and profound effort. Especially so as the makers of this journal are only petty bourgeois liberals, with a very limited vision, knowing little about socialism and still less about Marxist-Leninist theory. A little humility, therefore, in the face of such great events as the present unfolding of Soviet policy would be helpful to the *New Republic* and those similarly minded for a truer understanding of what is actually happening. The trouble here, it would seem, is an excessive readiness to measure Soviet foreign policy with imperialist yardsticks.

It is being reasoned like this. The Soviet Union secures military and naval bases in Esthonia, Latvia and Lith-

uania. The imperialist states have for decades been fighting for and getting "similar" bases for purposes of national aggrandizement. "Therefore," the Soviet Union is necessarily engaging in the same sort of thing. Why "necessarily"? And how does it follow? Simply because those who reason like this are almost completely enmeshed in imperialist "ideology" and thus cannot imagine any other relationship of a strong and powerful country and nation towards a small and weak one except "national aggrandizement."

But examine the thing a little closer. When a capitalist state secures military bases in a weaker country, even when it is accomplished peacefully (which happens very rarely), *that country inevitably becomes the victim of the imperialist exploitation and war designs of the stronger country*. As an example, take Cuba and the Philippines. To secure military bases in these countries, American imperialism waged a bloody war against Spain in 1898, an imperialist war. Following that, the ruling imperialist circles of this country—monopoly finance capital—waged a ruthless war of extermination against *the peoples* of Cuba and the Philippines who wanted national independence and freedom instead of the substitution of one foreign oppressor by another. Subsequently, with the establishment of "peace," American bankers and Big Business generally began to penetrate these two countries, setting up and cultivating reactionary dictatorial regimes, robbing their natural wealth, exploiting mercilessly their masses, retarding their progress, and subjecting their economic life to the interests

of American finance capital, a handful of big capitalists. And, finally, as a result of this imperialist penetration (economic, political and military), both Cuba and the Philippines, though their political relationships with the United States are not the same, have been continually exposed to the danger of being drawn into the war designs of American imperialism, of becoming actual fields of battle should such designs materialize.

This is an example, and not the worst one, of an imperialist capitalist state securing bases in neighboring and other smaller countries. It is not "national" aggrandizement; the real nation of this country, the toiling people who themselves are exploited by American Big Business, have gained nothing by these acquisitions. It is aggrandizement for the greater profits and power of Wall Street and the bourgeoisie. And this, in the final analysis, meant and means heavier exploitation and capitalist reaction for the American people themselves.

Now take the recent treaties between the Soviet Union and its Baltic neighbors. Here, the peoples of these countries themselves, and also their governments, wanted to strengthen good neighborly relations and friendship with the Soviet Union. Ever since they came into existence, these Baltic states have been objects of imperialist penetration and exploitation as well as potential jumping off grounds for war—pawns in the predatory game of the big imperialist powers. The security of these countries has been in continual danger and with it their national independence. But in the Soviet Union they have learned to see a reliable friend and the

most powerful fortress of peace. That's why they turned to the Soviet Union for closer friendship in this hour of danger. They granted to the Soviet Union the right to establish military bases in their countries *as a measure for their own peace and security* as well as that of the socialist state. How can that be compared with imperialist seizures of bases?

Furthermore, there are no monopoly finance capitalists in the Soviet Union to follow in the wake of its treaties with the Baltic states. And the peoples, as well as the governments, of those countries know this very well. There is no Oil Trust, or Fruit Trust, or Utility Trust or Shipping and Banking Trust, *owned and controlled by finance imperialist capital*, to penetrate from the Soviet Union into its neighbors to despoil them of their wealth, to oppress and rob their masses, to subjugate their economic life and retard its development. No. *The Soviet Union is a socialist state.* Its economy is owned by the people and is run for their use and not for the profit of a parasitic class of finance magnates. Therefore, the economic relationships of the Soviet Union with its neighbors rest on the principle of complete reciprocity, mutuality and equality. Not in words but in deeds. Therefore, a powerful socialist state can be to its weaker non-socialist neighbors, when freed from imperialist ties, *a real economic equal and helpful friend*, something which a powerful capitalist state can never be to its weaker and smaller neighbors. Despite all declarations to the contrary, a small state is always (actually or potentially) prey and victim to big imperialist states. How,

then, can one compare the policies of the socialist Soviet Union with those of the imperialist states?

Finally, the military bases secured by the Soviet Union in the Baltic states can never become a means for these states getting involved in imperialist wars for the aggrandizement of imperialist powers. One reason is, the Soviet Union does not follow imperialist policies and thus can never wage an imperialist war. Secondly, these military bases are *part of mutual assistance pacts against aggression* designed to protect the security of the Baltic states as well as of the Soviet Union. It follows, therefore, that the stronger the influence of the Soviet Union on international affairs, the greater will be its effectiveness in hampering imperialist designs and promoting the cause of world peace. Which is all to the interests of the Baltic states as well as of all peoples. Therefore, we ask again, how can one characterize the Soviet policies as "national aggrandizement" and "Communist imperialism"?

To do so, in the face of the sharp and radical difference between Soviet policy and imperialist policy is to be guilty of infantilism or perhaps of slipping into the camp of imperialism.

Apparently some of these liberal "critics" of Soviet policy have not yet grasped the fact that they *are* slipping into the imperialist camp. It may seem superficially that if these critics champion the idea of keeping America out of war and, in addition, attack fascism and advocate democracy, this makes them consistent progressives and anti-imperialists. But that is not necessarily so. And it is positively not so if this kind of advocacy of

peace and democracy is coupled with opposition to the peace policies of the Soviet Union. As a matter of plain fact—and this is becoming plainer every new day—opposition to the peace policies of the Soviet Union *is tantamount to opposition to peace and democracy*. It really means supporting the imperialist war and the imperialist policies of the German, French and English bourgeoisie. It means supporting American imperialism and the imperialist policies of the American bourgeoisie.

It is high time to wake up to the fact that to talk about peace and democracy and anti-fascism without supporting the struggles and policies of the true anti-imperialist camp, *the camp in which the Soviet Union is now more than ever the main stronghold and leader*, is, at best, engaging in liberal phrasemongering and, at worst, betraying both peace and democracy and slipping into the camp of imperialism and capitalist reaction.

Some of the liberal "critics" of Soviet policy pride themselves on being realists. But if that were so, the first thing they would understand, or try to understand, is that capitalism is now *in its deepest and sharpest crisis*. All its contradictions are reaching utmost acuteness: the contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie; the contradictions between the imperialist states and the colonial, semi-colonial and weaker countries; the contradictions between the imperialist states themselves—a war now taking place between German imperialism, on the one hand, and English and French imperialism, on the other, and Japan's war against China. And since this is occurring at

a time in human history when the world is divided into two diametrically opposed social systems—capitalism and socialism—*the perspective for peace and democracy is inseparably bound up with the struggles of the anti-imperialist camp led by the socialist Soviet Union*. There is no other way to true peace and democracy. It is, therefore, either the imperialist camp or the anti-imperialist camp. There is no "middle ground."

And herein lies the essence of the present world situation. That's why the working class and oppressed of all countries will celebrate the twenty-second anniversary of the great socialist revolution under the banner of: *Support the peace policy and leadership of the Soviet Union*. Around this banner will gather all true anti-imperialists—the working class, its allies and all genuine supporters of peace and democracy. Around this banner will gather, in ever increasing numbers, all those who oppose the intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation, who are determined to carry forward in the new situation the struggle for the social and national security of the American people.

Hail the twenty-second anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution! Support the peace policy and leadership of the Soviet Union! Hail the teacher and guide of all exploited and oppressed—Comrade Stalin!

* * *

AMERICAN labor and its progressive leaders have a good deal of thinking to do nowadays. Serious and deep thinking on the new situation and the new problems facing the country and

the people. That's why we liked the opening sentence in President Hillman's message to the membership of his union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (A.C.W.A.) It reads:

"In these stirring days all of us are giving serious thought to world events and to the position which we must take, as individuals and as members of a great labor organization, on the issues which face us today." (*The Advance*, October, 1939.)

But we cannot say that the *position* which President Hillman recommends to the membership is in accord with the fundamental interests of the working class. We refer especially to the position outlined on the imperialist war and on American foreign policy which is, of course, decisive in the situation.

President Hillman proceeds from the assumption that:

"In the field of foreign policy he [President Roosevelt] has no objectives and no motives which we do not fully share." (*Ibid.*)

Well, this is so vague and at the same time so sweeping an assumption that it can hardly serve as a safe guide to a correct working class position. And the members of the A.C.W.A. are interested in a position which should correspond to the *fundamental* interests of the American working class *as a class*, and not just in an expedient which may or may not meet some temporary or passing interest of one or another section of the workers. Considered from this standpoint, we must say at once that "motives" and "objectives" of bourgeois statesmen and politicians are a very unsafe guide for working class politics. And it is working class political positions that are here under discussion.

For the sake of argument, one can grant the best of motives, if by this is meant intention, although here also caution and restraint are the better part of wisdom. The American working class has had plenty of sad experiences with good-intentioned bourgeois spokesmen. But granting for a moment the "motives," is that the decisive thing? Of course not. *Politics is class struggle*, in the final analysis, not just a rivalry of motives and intentions that are detached from class positions and class interests. And in the present situation of imperialist war, involving now three of the biggest capitalist states in Europe, and Japan in the Far East, with capitalism in its deepest and sharpest crisis, it is precisely the *fundamental* interests of *classes* that are becoming ever more *decisive* for what their spokesmen say or do, whether these are individuals, parties or groups.

Of course, one must not oversimplify this to mean that passing and temporary attitudes and interests have no effect whatever and should therefore be discounted. Not at all. But it does mean that a fully correct evaluation and placing of such temporary interests—whether of the workers or their capitalist enemy—can be arrived at *only* in the light of fundamental interests of classes.

If the foregoing is true, then President Hillman is in error. The American bourgeoisie—the ruling class of the biggest and most advanced capitalist state—is *imperialist*. It cannot be anything else: And when confronted with an imperialist war for the redivision of the world—an imperialist struggle for markets and world domination—the American

bourgeoisie naturally and inevitably seeks to enter the struggle, in one way or another, *to strengthen its positions in the markets of the world and in the world's communications (seas, strategic bases, etc.)*. Its imperialist policies become activated. And with it comes an increase of reactionary tendencies in the bourgeoisie, greater anti-democratic and anti-labor militancy, and a more determined drive for intensified exploitation of the working class and its allies—a drive orientated on the establishment of a reactionary bourgeois dictatorship in the country.

Is this picture overdrawn? No, it is not. Sensing apparently precisely such developments, the report of President John L. Lewis to the Second Constitutional Convention of the C.I.O. says:

"In this hour of national trial and testing, the Congress of Industrial Organization is a mighty power for democracy, peace and prosperity. The millions of organized workers banded together in the C.I.O. are the main driving force of the progressive movement of workers, farmers, professional and small business people and of all other liberal elements in the community. *They are also the backbone of the resistance to all the forces that threaten our democratic institutions and the liberty and security that Americans hold dear.*" (Our emphasis—A. B.)

And who are the forces that threaten us? It is the class enemy of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie.

Yes, one might say, but isn't there a difference between reactionary capitalists and democratic-liberal ones? To which the answer is: whatever differences there still are, these should be exploited by labor to the utmost for the promotion of its *independent* position. But these differences have

ceased to be *decisive* for determining the tactical position of the working class on the fundamental issues of the new situation, which are the struggle against imperialism, for keeping America out of the imperialist war, against the intensified capitalist exploitation and reaction.

Bourgeois democrats too find themselves in a new situation. When America was confronted *with a world offensive of fascism*, an offensive which was reaching the Americas; and when the reactionary drive of Big Business in the United States against the social and national security of the people *was part of the world offensive of fascism*—then the immediate enemy was this world offensive of fascism and its American counterpart—the reactionary offensive of Big Business. This immediate enemy was threatening not only the working class and its allies, although them, in the first instance, but also sections of the so-called democratic bourgeoisie. And this tended to maintain a certain basis for collaboration between the anti-fascist camp of the *masses* and the bourgeois democrats, in a broad democratic front process. Although even then it was wrong and harmful to *identify* the independent position of the working class with that of the bourgeois democrats.

Furthermore, the independent struggle of the masses *themselves* against the reactionary pro-fascist offensive of Big Business, in which the C.I.O. and the progressive elements in the A. F. of L. had played a decisive part, tended to create such a relationship of class forces in the country as made it *imperative* for bourgeois democrats to seek the support of labor

and its allies, if these democrats wanted to continue to be political factors of importance. Consequently, bourgeois democrats in politics had to adapt their declarations and, in part, their policies to this need and in proportion to it.

Now, however, things are changing. The reactionary offensive of Big Business in the United States is no longer part of the world offensive of fascism. The question of fascism itself is taking a secondary place, and there is no longer a world offensive of fascism in the old sense. *It is a reactionary bourgeois imperialist offensive* that is developing in the country. This is not any less threatening to the working class and its allies than the previous Big Business offensive. On the contrary. It is *more* threatening to the masses, to their well being, to their peace because—for one reason—it threatens to drag the American people into imperialist adventures and war. But the changed *nature* of this reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie puts bourgeois democrats in a somewhat different position. While they may still try to occupy what has been called “a middle-of-the-road” position (never too stable a point), *they will continually be pushed off that road* by the very development of the struggle between the anti-imperialist and imperialist camps. Thus they will be forced *to choose* between these two main camps. And when forced to make *that kind* of a choice, which is very much different from the previous choice between democracy and fascism, would not bourgeois democrats tend to gravitate and be drawn into the *imperialist reactionary* camp? The answer is: yes, they will. More-

over, they already tend in that direction. And they already seek to orientate on new class alignments in the *bourgeoisie* while still claiming and demanding the support of labor and its allies.

It is clear, therefore, that President Hillman is in grave error when he says that “in the field of foreign policy he (President Roosevelt) has no objectives and no motives which we do not fully share.” The American working class is called upon to act not on “motives” and not merely on “objectives” but *on actual policy*. And this foreign policy is imperialist. It is determined in the main by the pressure of the imperialist bourgeoisie and serves its interests.

* * *

BUT President Hillman has also another reason for advocating support of the government’s foreign policy. He says:

“The neutrality issue will be seized upon by the forces of reaction to create disunity in the ranks of the progressives and thus weaken their resistance to attacks upon the domestic program of the New Deal. For this reason, also, it is important to give the united and wholehearted support of the labor and progressive movement to the President’s neutrality program.” (*Ibid.*)

First, what is this “neutrality issue”? Is there only *one* issue on this question? Obviously not; there are *many* issues and many camps. But *in the main* there are two issues, two divisions and two camps: the camp of imperialism and bourgeois reaction and the camp of anti-imperialism, peace and democracy. *And the chief issue is between these two camps*, and not simply, as before, between the New Deal and anti-New Deal. This is seen

by a mere reference to the fact that many (if not most) *anti-New Deal* Democrats and some Republicans in Congress support the President's neutrality program.

On the war question, *i.e.*, on foreign policy, the position of the anti-imperialist camp of the working class and its allies cannot be "neutrality." The fundamental interests of the proletariat demand opposition to imperialist war. Therefore, our position now must be one of struggle against American involvement in a war waged for imperialist interests.

Is this the same thing as the neutrality position of the American bourgeoisie? Not at all. Wall Street and the capitalist class seek to exploit the disaster of other peoples in order to make war profits and to strengthen American imperialism in the markets and communications of the world. It is a position of predatory and mercenary neutrality. It is against the fundamental interests of the working class and of all working people.

The fact that the bourgeoisie is not united on the exact character of this mercenary neutrality is important, of course. The fact that large sections of the plutocracy favor a neutrality "benevolent" to England while other sections of the bourgeoisie, moved more immediately by rivalries with British imperialism, favor a more "impartial" neutrality, this fact should be fully utilized by the anti-imperialist camp in its struggle to keep America out of the imperialist war. But in order to achieve this aim, the working class must follow an independent line and, *at the present moment*, must concentrate on defeating precisely that section of the plutocracy which

presses for a neutrality benevolent to England because that sort of neutrality is today the easiest way to drag America into the imperialist war.

How, then, can the working class support "the President's neutrality program"? It cannot. That is very obvious. The working class and the labor movement must have their own program, an anti-imperialist program of struggle to keep America out of war and to combat the intensified drive for capitalist reaction and exploitation.

Second, what does President Hillman mean when he says that "the neutrality issue will be seized upon by the forces of reaction to create disunity in the ranks of the progressives"? This is not exactly what is happening. What is really taking place now is that the American bourgeoisie *as a class* is seeking to attach labor and its allies to Wall Street's imperialist chariot. All sections of the capitalist class, regardless of their particular brand of neutrality, aim to weaken labor's class independence, to poison the workers with imperialism and chauvinism, in order to pursue more easily their mercenary imperialist aims. And in this, the bourgeoisie is helped by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., by the Social-Democratic Federation of Waldman & Co., by Norman Thomas in his own "special" way and, of course, by the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite agents of imperialism.

This is how capitalist reaction *today* seeks to create disunity in the ranks of labor and its allies—by preventing them from crystallizing a solid, consistent and independent anti-imperialist front. Hence, the way

to combat these reactionary efforts is to give support *to none* of the imperialist tendencies, *to none* of the brands of imperialist neutrality.

Third, about the attacks upon "the domestic program of the New Deal" and how to resist them. The attacks upon this program are already increasing. It is the attack for more intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation which is orientated on the establishment of an imperialist reactionary dictatorship in the country. *To resist and defeat these attacks is the major task of the American labor movement in alliance with the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes in the present situation.*

Big Business and monopoly finance capital is leading and promoting this attack upon the masses. And bourgeois democrats, formerly in conflict with the reactionary sections of finance capital, are in the process of ceasing to be in conflict. New Deal Democrats, who in the past tended to collaborate with labor and its allies—hesitatingly and inconsistently—for the promotion of progressive social measures, are beginning to tend in a different direction. They are pressed and pushed towards the camp of imperialist reaction. Hence, one can no longer speak of the New Deal and anti-New Deal camps in the old way. *The bourgeoisie is realigning itself.* Its so-called democratic sections are gravitating towards imperialist reaction. From which follows one central conclusion and many subsidiary ones.

The central conclusion is that labor, the working class, has to step forward with political initiative and leadership to rally around itself the toiling farmers and exploited middle

classes in a firm alliance against imperialism, against monopoly capital, against the intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation. This will be carrying forward, in the new situation and on a higher level, the struggle for the national and social security of the American people—for jobs, democracy, security and peace.

One must understand that political alignments are undergoing changes. The old division between the Democratic and Republican parties as well as the division between New Deal and anti-New Deal camps are losing their former meaning. Both major parties being parties of the bourgeoisie, they both seek in the new situation to realize the predatory interests and ambitions of American imperialism, even though in various ways and with crisscrossing of attitudes on the neutrality question within these parties. These policies the working class cannot support. It must follow its independent line in the building and leading of the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-capitalist alliance.

At the same time, it is also clear that among the so-called progressive sections in and around both major parties, especially the Democratic Party, there are elements and forces to which labor can have a special attitude. These are the elements which, because they reflect, even though inadequately and distortedly, certain anti-monopoly and anti-war attitudes of farmers and middle class groups, may offer to labor advantageous opportunities *for temporary political understandings in the attainment of specific and limited objectives.* These are some of the subsidiary conclusions to be made from the chang-

ing situation and political realignments.

Continuing to exploit to the full all the contradictions in the bourgeois camp, labor will do well also to make use of such temporary understandings with non-labor political groups, provided: (1) they promote the cementing of labor's alliance with all other exploited classes, bringing forth the working class as the leading force in the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-capitalist alliance; (2) they do not obstruct the development of the independent line of the proletariat and its daily struggles against the intensified capitalist reaction and exploitation; and (3) they do not prevent the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party, from educating and winning the masses to non-support of imperialism and imperialist war, to support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, independently to mobilize the masses for struggle against capitalist exploitation and reaction.

* * *

IT is very evident by now that the anti-Communist "crusade" in the country, which is still gathering momentum, is only the most spectacular expression (for the moment) of the gathering reactionary-imperialist offensive against the working class and all toiling people. Because the Communists are in the *vanguard* of the anti-war and anti-imperialist camp, because they can be most depended on to follow a consistent line of struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie, the class enemy attacks the Communists first and most bitterly. This is how the labor movement and

its allies have to understand the present anti-Communist "crusade."

Leaving aside for the moment the doings of the Dies Committee, whose anti-labor and imperialist-reactionary role in the situation is obvious to wide circles of workers and other exploited groups, the role of the Waldman Social-Democrats and their supporters should now also be clear. These are servants of Wall Street, warmongers and flunkies of American imperialism. And as such they must be exposed and fought.

But there are also other "critics" of the Communists, those who charge us with "betraying" democracy. We do not speak here of the uninformed. These are in error, confused by the imperialists and their servants. Hence, the uninformed must be made informed and clear. And this is the big job. But we do speak here of those who, while calling us traitors to democracy, are in the same breath apologizing for Dies and, though somewhat embarrassed, are anticipating the "necessity" of outlawing the Communist Party. Thus they demonstrate brilliantly how little they themselves think of democracy as they begin to feel that the bourgeoisie and its system are getting into a tight corner.

As to the Communist Party, which has been and is the most consistent fighter for democracy, it never recommended itself to anyone as a *bourgeois-democratic party*. While there have been opportunist distortions of our line (and this is *not* what our "critics" are crying about), Communists have been and are fighting for democracy *not as bourgeois democrats but as proletarian revolutionists*,

as *Marxists-Leninists, as disciples of the great Stalin*. And also: while there have been opportunist slips which we guarded against and combatted, Communists have been and are fighting for the national security of the American people *not as bourgeois nationalists but as proletarian internationalists*. And we have tried to do so in the best interests of the masses, and not without considerable success, by learning from the experiences of the Russian Bolsheviks.

The truth of the matter is that *the bourgeoisie* is betraying democracy, has been betraying it for many decades and, lately, it has done so through the Munich policy of the ruling imperialist circles of England, France and the United States. The truth is, furthermore, that since England and France entered the imperialist war against Germany and concurrently the Soviet Union's peace policy began more powerfully and effectively to *obstruct the criminal designs of all imperialists*, even bourgeois democrats started to gravitate towards the camp of imperialist reaction, *betraying democracy in the process*. Witness France, England and—at a somewhat slower tempo—the United States, which is not yet a belligerent.

When a "liberal" organ like *The Nation* begins to apologize for the Dies Committee; when it finds it possible to apologize for Daladier's outlawing of the Communist Party, saying that: "No French government waging a war can permit defeatist propaganda to be carried on behind the front lines, even if disguised as a desire for 'peace'"; when such things are beginning to happen, only blind

ones can fail to see that the traitors to democracy must be looked for not in the camp of the working class but among the bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois hangers-on. And it is precisely for this reason, among others, that the fate of democracy and its development to higher forms *rests only upon the working class* and its leadership of the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes. It is precisely for this reason that the old division between the camps of fascism and democracy no longer holds good, assuming new meanings. It is, finally, precisely for this reason that the Communist Party is *changing its tactics*, to meet these betrayals of democracy by the bourgeoisie, to assist the working class to fight in the new situation for its fundamental interests, for its *leadership* in the struggle for democracy and more democracy against the reactionary-imperialist offensive of the bourgeoisie.

Freda Kirchwey of *The Nation*, of the same "liberal" publication which condemns the heroic fight of the French Communists for peace while commending the flunkey of the 200 families, Daladier, for suppressing the Communist Party—Freda Kirchwey is willing to grant that the Communists "are sincere according to their lights"; but "Their mistake lies in trying to explain what can only be accepted on faith." (October 14.)

To this and similar "critics," the fundamental interests of the working class are a closed book. And if they do know something about these interests, they have little sympathy for them. As regards class relationships, the changes which these undergo, and the necessity for different tactics in dif-

ferent situations, mastery and understanding of which is an absolute condition for the successful work of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, such things are totally beyond these "critics." They seem to be doomed to continual *vacillation* between the proletariat and its class enemy.

But Communists know, and must learn much better, to overcome rapidly the weight of obsolete tactical attitudes which have become a brake upon the movement. They must learn to organize themselves and their work in accord with the *new regrouping* of class forces inside the country as well as on the world arena.

Communists know, and must learn much better, the art of correctly indicating the main direction of the

strategic blow against the class enemy, to bring together all forces for this blow, and to deliver it against the enemy with unswerving determination.

Communists are learning, and must learn much better, to be Bolsheviks under the most difficult circumstances, to hold aloft the banner of international proletarian solidarity, the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Only thus will we be able to contribute our best to the working class. Only thus will the Communist Party be functioning as a *true vanguard* of the American working class and of the American people, learning continually from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* and from our great teacher—Stalin.

A. B.

ON THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

BY EARL BROWDER

TWENTY-TWO years ago, on November 7, 1917, in the fires of the first World War, the working class of the former tsarist empire seized power under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, and inaugurated the first socialist revolution in history.

Today, we celebrate the successful construction of a socialist society in the Soviet Union, in the opening phase of the second imperialist world war, which may well place the socialist revolution as the order of the day in another or several other capitalist lands.

The Communists, the Bolsheviks, have always been the firm and uncompromising leaders and organizers of the struggle against imperialist war, against the slaughter of the peoples for the purpose of aggrandizement of a group of monopoly capitalists at the expense of another and at the expense of the working people of all lands. It was upon the basis of the struggle against the war that the Party of the socialist revolution first won the allegiance of the working class and the majority of the toiling people, in a great country, obtained state power in its hands, and proceeded to build a new society based upon common ownership and operation of the national

economy for the common good of all the people.

Since the imperialist ruling classes of Germany, England and France have again thrown the world into war, the lessons of the last war and its culmination in the first socialist revolution take on an immediacy and sharpness that demand deep study and application in the light of the new world situation, and of the particular situation in each country.

What was the relation of the war to the first socialist revolution? Comrade Stalin has stated this question with his own peculiar clarity and brevity, when he said:

"Three factors, external in nature, account for the comparative ease with which the proletarian revolution in Russia succeeded in breaking the chains of imperialism and thus overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

"First: the factor that the October Revolution began in a period of desperate struggle between the two principal imperialist groups, the Anglo-French and the Austro-German, at a time when, engaged in a life-and-death struggle, these two groups had neither the time nor the means to devote serious attention to the struggle against the October Revolution. This factor was of the utmost importance for the October Revolution, which was thereby enabled to take advantage of the fierce clash within the imperialist world to strengthen and organize its own forces.

"Second: the factor that the October Revolution began during the imperialist World War, at a time when the toiling masses, tormented by the war and thirsting for peace, were by the very logic of events being led to the proletarian revolution as the only way to escape from the war. This factor was of extreme importance for the October Revolution, since it put into its hands the mighty weapon of peace, made it easy for it to connect the Soviet revolution with the ending of the hated war and thus created mass sympathy for it both in the West, among the workers, and in the East among the oppressed peoples.

"Third: the powerful working class movement in Europe and the maturing of a revolutionary crisis in the West and in the East called forth by the long drawn-out imperialist war. This factor was of inestimable importance for the revolution in Russia, since it assured it of reliable allies outside Russia for the latter's struggle against world imperialism."*

Thus the struggle against imperialist war, the struggle for peace, was of the most decisive significance in the rise of the first land of socialism, the first realization of the teachings of Marx and Engels, which took place under the guidance of their great continuators, Lenin and Stalin.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE NEW IMPERIALIST WAR?

The capitalist newspapers of America, ably seconded by the Norman Thomas Socialists, the Social-Democratic Federation, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, have been shouting hysterically that the Soviet Union is responsible for the new imperialist war. Who is really responsible for the war? This is a crucial question, upon the answer to which depends our

judgment on the character of the war, and of how to fight against it.

First of all, it is clear that the forces bringing this war upon the world arose from within the capitalist nations, that it is correctly described as "a family affair" among them, to use the terms of that most intelligent Tory commentator, Dorothy Thompson. Capitalist Germany, imperialist Germany, is at war with capitalist-imperialist Britain and France. Even those who slander the Soviet Union admit by their very slanders that it is unreasonable to expect the imperialist powers to maintain peace, and by inference demand that the socialist Soviet Union should promote peace among them. Thus the very accusation against the Soviet Union, that it is responsible for the war, is found at the first critical examination to concede implicitly a higher moral stature to the land of socialism than to any capitalist country, not excepting the U.S.A. No one would think of saying that the U.S.A. is guilty for this war because it failed to prevent its outbreak, but the very ones who slander the Soviet Union the most unrestrainedly, unwittingly give the highest possible compliment when they assume that the Soviet Union had the moral responsibility to prevent the war.

Well, the Soviet Union itself, supported by the Communists of all lands, had a much keener and a conscious understanding of its role as the world leader in the organization of peace. It lived up to that role to the limit of the last possibilities. If the war finally broke upon the world, it was only after the Soviet Union had

* J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 115, International Publishers, New York.

exhausted every possibility to prevent it, but had failed due to the fact that not one single capitalist country could be found to support these efforts.

From 1931 to 1938, a long series of imperialist aggressions were committed by Japan, Germany and Italy, the so-called "have-not" imperialisms, those who felt "wronged" by the results of the last World War and set about a forcible redistribution of the world. At any time during that period, up to the great Munich debacle in September, 1938, it was easily within the power of Britain, France, and the United States, by a sincere cooperation, to have halted these aggressions without resort to arms. Especially was this possible, since the active collaboration of the Soviet Union was offered, indisputably so since its entry into the League of Nations in 1934. The Soviet Union, not at all interested in maintaining the *status quo* resulting from the last World War, was deeply interested in preventing it from being changed by resort to war which would only plunge the peoples into deeper misery and endanger the Soviet Union also, disturbing it in its peaceful construction of the new socialist society.

Why was this series of aggressions not halted? Because the ruling classes in Britain, France and the United States were not sufficiently interested in doing this, because they were more interested in maneuvering against one another and weakening one another, and above all because they cherished the ambition, not too secretly, to build up these aggressive powers, Germany, Japan and Italy, as a force to which they assigned the historic task of destruction of the Soviet Union. This

latter factor especially became the obsession of the British bourgeoisie, headed by Chamberlain, who swallowed hook, line and sinker the bait cunningly laid by Hitler in the so-called "Anti-Comintern Axis." World peace was not organized, because the British and French bourgeoisie, with the enthusiastic support of the "heroes" of the Second International, and the benevolent neutrality at best of the American ruling circles, were less interested in peace than they were in inciting a war against the Soviet Union.

It was for this ambition that Chamberlain and Daladier made the enormous sacrifices of both honor and power to Hitler at Munich, for this they joined in strangling the infant Spanish republic, for this they stoically endured both insult and injury from Japan. No price was too high to pay, thought these gentlemen and the ruling classes they represented, so long as they believed they were purchasing a deadly war for the destruction of the Soviet Union.

This is the policy which directly and immediately is responsible for the systematic undermining of world peace, and for the outbreak of the present imperialist war. And for this policy the ruling classes of all the capitalist countries are equally responsible. All other factors are secondary. This was the policy which, when it was openly exposed as bankrupt by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, led directly to the war.

HOW THE SOVIET UNION DEFEATED THE WAR PLOTS AGAINST IT

Why did Chamberlain fail in his

plots to embroil the Soviet Union in war, a war for which he had built up Hitler and the "Anti-Comintern" Axis at such a stupendous price?

Chamberlain's plots crashed on the rocks of the swiftly growing strength of the Soviet Union, and its consistent peace policy which won the support of millions upon millions of workers and toiling people in the capitalist and colonial lands.

First, let us examine the growing strength of the Soviet Union. In 1920, Lenin described the position of the Soviet power in the following terms:

"We are surrounded by imperialist states, which detest the Bolsheviks with all their heart and soul, which are spending vast sums of money, ideological forces, the forces of the press, and so on, and which yet were unable in three years to defeat us in war, although we are, from the military and economic standpoint, infinitely weak. We have not one-hundredth of the forces of the combined imperialist states, and yet they are unable to stifle us. They cannot stifle us because their soldiers will not obey; their workers and peasants, fatigued by the war, do not want a war against the Soviet Republic. Such is the position now, and on this position we must base ourselves. What it will be several years hence we do not know, since every year the Western powers are recuperating from the war."*

If the Soviet Union had been eighteen years later in such a position, with not one-hundredth of the combined forces of the imperialist states, then truly Chamberlain might have succeeded in the object of his plots. But while the imperialist powers were recuperating from the last war, the Soviet Union was rising in strength also; and from 1929 onward, when the

imperialist powers were going through the deepest economic crisis, from which they never fully recovered, the Soviet Union was making spectacular economic advances, multiplying its national income by more than nine times during the First and Second Five-Year Plans. From the last position in volume of economic production, among the great powers, it advanced to first position in Europe, and in the world second only to the United States.

This tremendous economic advance improved the relation of forces in favor of the Soviet Union in many respects. Due to its socialist system, which distributed the benefits of the economic achievements among the whole population, the Soviet Union was the only land which consistently raised the standard of living and the cultural level of its peoples throughout this period, in which even the United States suffered catastrophic setbacks. Through the elimination of class divisions and national oppression in the country, the Soviet Union alone among great nations secured an unexampled solidarity and moral unity of its population. And upon this solid foundation, it was possible for the Soviet Union to build such defensive powers, in the form of its Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet (tested by the Japanese militarists with catastrophic consequences to themselves), as adequately to guarantee the security of its borders against all enemies.

In this historic development, the world was presented with proof of the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist system. This was stated by Comrade Stalin, in his speech to the

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 282, International Publishers, New York.

conference of Stakhanovites, in the following words:

"Why was it that capitalism smashed and defeated feudalism? Because it created higher standards of labor productivity, it enabled society to produce an incomparably greater quantity of products than was the case under the feudal system. Because it made society richer. Why is it that socialism can, should and certainly will defeat the capitalist system of economy? Because it can furnish superior models of labor, a higher productivity of labor, than the capitalist system of economy. Because it can give society more products and can make society richer than the capitalist system of economy can."*

Add to all these factors, known to all realistic students of world affairs, and certainly pressing upon the attention of Hitler, the additional fact that the conspiratorial agents of world reaction and fascism that worked inside the Soviet Union to prepare its downfall when it should be attacked—the Trotskyites and Bukharinites—had been detected in their nefarious work, rounded up, and put out of business. Then we begin to understand the considerations that finally brought the Nazi dictatorship which acts for German imperialism and monopoly capital to the point where it was ready to cry quits to its much-touted ambitions to crush the Soviet Union, and to turn instead against those powers which, by their craven and dishonorable course of appeasement, had lost their moral force and cohesion, turned all honest stomachs, abandoned every consideration except their own selfish imperialist greed, and which conducted what amounted to a civil war against their own peoples.

* Joseph Stalin, *The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union*, pp. 4-5. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

Already a year ago, at the twenty-first anniversary celebration at Madison Square Garden, it was possible for the writer to answer the stupid propaganda of the Munichmen about the supposed "weakness of the Soviet Union" in the following words:

"If it were true that the Soviet Union is weak, perhaps the news might reach Adolph Hitler. And if Hitler heard it—and believed it—he might be tempted to seize those broad rich Ukrainian wheat fields, the thought of which has obsessed him for so many years. Hitler had always moved first against the points of least resistance; today he is much more busy in Latin America than in preparing to cross the Ukrainian borders much closer at hand. Can it be that Hitler has also heard about Soviet weakness? If so, his actions prove that he, at least, does not believe these fairy tales. . . . There could be no more conclusive testimony than this to the strength of the Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet, and of the socialist economy and culture which it defends."*

That last sentence contained an error. There could be more conclusive testimony, and the world received it when Von Ribbentrop flew to Moscow to sue for a Non-Aggression Pact on behalf of Hitler, who abandoned his Axis allies and his whole ideology merely for the formal assurance that the Soviet Union, always pledged to a policy of non-aggression, would not commit or be a party to any warlike act against Germany.

Such were the forces which brought Chamberlain's plots to ignominious collapse, and finally proved to the world that the Soviet Union had become one of the decisive powers, which could no longer be excluded

* Earl Browder, *Fighting for Peace*, p. 184. International Publishers, New York.

from world councils with impunity, whose voice must be heard in all decisions involving the destiny of peoples.

IN WHOSE INTERESTS DID THE
SOVIET UNION ACT?

The Soviet Union acted in the interests of its own one hundred and seventy million population, and of its new socialist society. That is so clear now that even the most inveterate enemies of the Soviet Union themselves proclaim that "Stalin is the only victor" in the world-shaking events of the past two months. It would therefore seem unnecessary to spend further words to establish that the government of the Soviet Union has truly represented and protected the interests of its own people. Can as much be said of any capitalist government in the world?

But that is not the end of the question. The Soviet Union has always declared that it has no interests that are in conflict with the true interests of any other people anywhere in the world, that on the contrary its own advancement can only be of help to other peoples. That this is true of the present world situation, as well as in the past, is a fact of which we can quickly assure ourselves by a brief review of confirmed developments.

First, consider China, a people numbering over four hundred million, the largest single national family in the world, which has been suffering from the most shameful and wanton aggressions since 1931, without serious help from anywhere but the Soviet Union. Our American newspaper scribes and pharisees raised a great outcry that the

Soviet Union had "betrayed China" by the Non-Aggression Pact, and especially by its truce in the hostilities with Japan on the Mongolian border, although they had never been able to arouse any excitement or indignation against the U.S. furnishing Japan with more than half of all her imports necessary to her war on the Chinese people. But already it has become clear that the Chinese people, precisely through the break-up of the Axis and the consequent increased help of the Soviet Union made possible thereby, have administered decisive military defeats to the Japanese invaders, and turned the tide of their long and heroic war of national liberation. Unquestionably, the Soviet Union acted also in the interests of the Chinese people, a population equal to that of all Europe.

Second, the eleven million Ukrainians, Byelo-Russians and Jews, formerly under the oppression of the corrupt and semi-fascist Polish "government of colonels," who had been completely abandoned by their British-French "guarantors" to the tender mercies of Nazidom, have been saved by the Red Army from the horrors of war, have received for the first time in history possession of their own land, with full national and cultural liberation, have been freed from capitalist exploitation and brought into the socialist system, have been freed from the nightmare of foreign enslavement.

Third, the small Baltic countries, which had been assigned the role, in the old Chamberlain-Hitler conspiracy, of military base from which the projected war against the Soviet Union should be conducted, have

been shown the error of their past ways, and by abandoning them have secured from the Soviet Union their first real guarantees of peaceful development, economic expansion and national independence.

Fourth, the Balkan countries, famous in history as the "cockpit of Europe," victims for generations of imperialist intrigues, have been given the opportunity, if they can free themselves of the imperialist entanglements of their governments, of keeping out of the present imperialist war from which they have nothing to gain but new burdens and oppressions.

Fifth, the United States, and all peoples of the Americas, have distinctly improved their international position as the direct result of the break-up of the "Anti-Comintern Axis," which had threatened their national interests and domestic tranquility. From the hysterical howlings of the U.S. capitalist press against the Soviet Union, one could never guess that precisely the acts against which they are most furious brought distinct benefit to America (even including American capitalists); but that is the undeniable truth. Shamefully enough, American imperialist circles already speculate openly about using their present stronger position in relation to Japan, not for helping the Chinese people, but to come to an agreement with their imperialist rivals for *joint* exploitation and oppression of China.

Sixth, when we consider the working class of all lands, and the toiling farmers, it is clear that the victories of the Soviet Union have furnished them with a tremendous moral stimulus and encouragement, which will greatly im-

prove their situation, whatever their country.

The world bourgeoisie, landlords, militarists, and exploiters generally, suffered a great defeat and setback. But the workers, farmers and oppressed peoples, of all lands, found their interests truly represented and advanced by the Soviet Union and its great victories.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE IMPERIALIST WAR

When the British and French governments rejected all effective proposals for collaboration with the Soviet Union to preserve peace, they had already stripped the impending conflict down to a fight for their imperialist interests as against German imperialism. In such a war the working class and toiling peoples have nothing to gain on either side, they cannot support it directly or indirectly, they must fight against the continuation of such a war, and must bring it to the earliest possible conclusion.

This war is a continuation of the last World War, with no difference in essence or principle. It is brought about by the fundamental contradictions of monopoly capitalism. It is an expression of the general crisis of the capitalist system, and in turn it deepens and intensifies that crisis. The whole capitalist world is being driven by the war into a phase of most acute and profound crisis.

As a consequence, one of the first developments is the rapid disappearance of the differences between the so-called democratic and fascist capitalist states, which become indistinguishable insofar as their dictatorial character is concerned, which is the

dictatorship of monopoly capital. The so-called democracies become even more hostile to the Soviet Union than the fascist states, all of them becoming quite vicious when the Soviet Union demonstrated that it could be dealt with only upon the basis of equality. The slogan of democracy against fascism, which directed the struggle for the erection of the real peace front that could have stopped the war, thus loses its objective foundation in the real situation of the world. The war has wiped out its reality, and requires that it be replaced with a new direction of the struggle. Where before the war it was a question of preserving peace and the remnants of bourgeois democracy, now both are already wrecked, the issue is raised of the very existence of the capitalist system.

This new situation is most sharply presented by the belligerent countries. But we cannot expect that the United States will be an exception, even though it has not entered the war. Already, even while remaining neutral, the bourgeoisie of the U.S. has moved sharply toward an extreme reactionary position. The former New Deal liberal bourgeoisie is fraternizing on the most cordial terms with the former anti-New Deal camp, and we can be absolutely certain the touching new friendships are based upon reactionary, not liberal, agreements. In the first weeks after the opening of the war, we were much too slow in seeing this profound regrouping in a reactionary direction, and in sounding the alarm against it. President Roosevelt has made most serious concessions to this trend, has shown no signs of tak-

ing up arms against it. While his role may continue equivocal, and much depends upon himself—if he could break with the reactionary trends of his class, and really fight for non-involvement in the war and for its speedy end, he could salvage something of his former role—it must be expected that the liberal bourgeoisie will rapidly shed its liberalism; on this we must have no illusions. That the labor movement has sensed this new development quickly is witnessed by the sudden subsidence of the formerly sweeping demand for the third term.

The American capitalists, large and small, have been swept into a frenzy of greedy expectation of a war boom, of war profits, from the furnishing of materials of all kinds to the belligerents, from capturing their foreign markets especially in Latin America, from dismantling the social security and labor legislation, and from raising a reactionary movement against labor and civil liberties for the people. They are eager to grow rich out of the catastrophes of other people and the oppression of the workers at home. That is why they rage so viciously against any suggestion that the war should stop; that is why the American newspapers are more enthusiastic for the war by a hundred times than the press of the belligerent countries, that is why they are even now, while the U.S. is officially neutral, proposing to outlaw the Communist Party, a step that Britain has not taken or even suggested after two months of actual war.

It is very instructive to see how, with military precision and promptness, the Norman Thomas Socialists,

the Social-Democratic Federation, the Lovestoneites, and the Trotskyites, and all the army of provocateurs and stool pigeons, have moved into the campaign of the American bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union and against the American Communist Party. The most solemnly-proclaimed "principles" are dumped overboard without a word of explanation, as witnessed in the obscene performance in the American Labor Party in New York, where Socialists and Lovestoneites voted without an instant's hesitation a pledge of aid to Britain and France, a denunciation of anyone who calls this an imperialist war as an "agent of Moscow," just so that they could help put over a condemnation of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. The counter-revolutionist Trotsky suddenly came out as the protagonist of the democratic peace front—after denouncing it for years when it was possible of achievement, he became converted at the moment when the bourgeoisie had destroyed it but wanted to exploit the sentiment against fascism for its own imperialist ends. With all the promptness and precision of an army marching to orders, all the enemies of socialism and the Soviet Union, the enemies of the Communist Party, sprang to the heel of the bourgeois reaction. Now, as in 1914, they are prepared to do their utmost to help the bourgeoisie overcome the crisis, and to prevent the working class from coming to power to achieve socialism.

THE REGROUPING OF CLASS FORCES IN THE U.S.

To get a clearer picture of what is happening in class relations in the

U.S., it is valuable to review the main outlines of the past few years. For several years up to 1929, when the great crisis broke out, American monopoly capital had been riding a high horse, unchallenged master and without serious opposition. From 1929 to 1933, it tried to ride through the storms of the crisis, under Herbert Hoover, without any serious change in policy whatever, placing the terrific burdens of the crisis squarely upon the masses without the slightest alleviation, and trampling popular rights underfoot. This aroused a great mass movement of protest and struggle, especially among the sixteen millions of unemployed and among the farmers, veterans, etc., and at the same time led to the complete paralysis at the beginning of 1933 which ushered Roosevelt into the Presidency.

The first two years of the New Deal was a period of "national unity" of all the bourgeoisie, mainly based upon the devaluation of the dollar and suspension of the anti-trust laws, with the organized labor movement brought into line with the concession of Section 7a of the N.I.R.A., and the edge taken off the unemployed movement by a growing measure of relief employment at bare subsistence wages. But as the monopolist bourgeoisie awoke to the fact that Roosevelt's measures had pulled them out of the hole, that their system could still continue to function even if haltingly, as they became more and more angry and frightened at the establishment of the principle that the government had the responsibility for furnishing jobs and social security to the people—they came out in a great campaign for a

return to the good old days of Herbert Hoover; this was the period of the Liberty League in which the bourgeoisie split sharply into a reactionary and a liberal camp, which led up to the 1936 election, and the overwhelming victory of the liberal camp with the support of the overwhelming mass of the labor movement.

By 1938, the reactionary bourgeoisie had gathered its forces sufficiently and fought with such tenacity, that it began to disintegrate the liberal bourgeois camp, which began to witness more and more desertion to the reaction, and which therefore had to lean more and more upon the labor movement. The trade unions had also been split, through the machinations of monopoly capital working through William Green and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., which had determined to halt at all costs the great organizing campaigns in the basic industries, and therefore expelled the unions of the C.I.O., which became the main labor base of the New Deal so far as leadership was concerned. The inner relationships within this alignment were already through the year 1939 becoming quite strained, due to the continued capitalist crisis which was driving the whole capitalist world toward war.

The outbreak of the war in Europe has broken down that alignment and started a new regrouping of forces. Roosevelt and the liberal bourgeoisie have immediately moved toward a reconciliation with their reactionary class brothers, from whom they have been estranged for several years, while the labor movement (excluding the top bureaucrats of the A. F. of L.) has

moved toward a more independent position, to the Left, and loosened its political ties with the liberal forces that move in the opposite direction. This is the general outline of the shifting class relations and the directions in which they move.

THE EMBARGO ISSUE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE WAR

The so-called Neutrality Act, adopted in 1935, did not reflect a foreign policy on the part of the U.S., but rather the absence of such a policy. It was applied to the Spanish Republic, in order to fall into line with Chamberlain's strangulation policy, misnamed "non-intervention"; while its application to the Far East was withheld. The repeal or fundamental revision of this Act became a necessary demand conditioning the fight for American support to efforts to organize world peace. Roosevelt's tentative efforts in this direction over two years, known as his "peace policy" although it was never a definite policy of the Administration as a whole, which was divided, secured the energetic support of the progressive and labor movement, and of the Communists, with but small results except the beginnings of a great shift in mass opinion away from isolationism.

With the outbreak of the imperialist war, however, this issue took on an entirely new aspect. It entirely lost its original significance, and became a confused and subordinate issue, on both sides of which are reactionary, profiteering and war-minded imperialist circles, and on both sides of which are masses of sincere peace-loving workers, farmers and middle classes

who are opposed to any involvement in the imperialist war. But as the issue approaches a decision in Congress, at the moment this is written, the character of the debates around it have already gone far to stamp the proposed revision as a conscious taking sides in the imperialist war, as a measure taken for the purpose of helping the British and French imperialists. All those who fully recognize the character of this war as an imperialist one, therefore, have more and more definitely thrown their influence for the retention of the embargo and the defeat of the revision.

This is the position the Communist Party has taken; but at the same time we have emphasized that the real fight for peace has not crystallized as yet, on this issue. It would be the greatest stupidity, for example, and extremely dangerous, to assume that the principal spokesmen for, and Congressional supporters of, the retention of the embargo, constitute the "peace party" in the U.S., while those on the side of revision are the "war party." That would be to assume that Hearst, Vandenberg, Coughlin, Lindbergh, Hoover, the *Chicago Tribune*, Henry Ford, etc., were heading the "peace party," instead of being, as they are in reality, the most hard-boiled reactionary imperialist spokesmen in the country. That would be to assume that the Republican Party, which furnishes the main body of anti-repeal votes in Congress, is really entitled to the label, which it is preparing for itself in the 1940 election campaign, for purely reactionary and imperialist purposes, of being the party which will "keep America out of war." It would be to

forget that, while the main body of the American bourgeoisie is hostile to the Soviet Union, the most vicious proponents of American participation in war against the Soviet Union are most of them in the pro-embargo camp.

No, the real "peace party" in the U.S., the real camp of struggle against the imperialist war, will be formed of the masses who are now seriously confused and divided on the immediate issue of the embargo law, just as the real war party consists of the reactionaries, profiteers, and monopolists, and their hangers-on and agents, who are on both sides of the immediate issue. Therefore, when we advocate maintaining the embargo (and even extending it to a much broader scope), it is with the sharpest differentiation between ourselves and the reactionaries who support the embargo, and the most serious warnings against misuse of this issue by the reactionary camp to confuse and mislead the masses in the 1940 elections.

THE NEW DECISIVE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Now as never before, the Soviet Union emerges before the world in its magnificent role of liberator and protector of the toiling masses against the catastrophes of capitalism, oppression and imperialist war. The capitalist world has proved its incapacity to maintain peace, and has demonstrated that its ruling classes and leaders do not want to maintain peace. The capitalist world is plunging into its deepest and most profound crisis. In sharpest contrast, the Soviet Union has maintained peace for its own people,

and has saved a series of small nations from the disasters of war; it has turned the tide for the liberation of the Chinese people from their invaders; and it has done this on the basis of its own great and growing moral force, inner strength and clear policy, without drawing the sword or shedding a drop of blood.

The Soviet Union arose, twenty-two years ago, on the basis of the struggle for peace and against imperialist war.

It registers its great achievements today in the same cause. It stands as a great shining light, the supreme example, showing the suffering masses of all lands that they are not fated to helpless disposal at the hands of their war-making rulers, that they can take their own destiny into their own hands, that given the will and the understanding they are an invincible power that can bring peace and socialism to the whole world.

THEN—AND NOW

By V. J. JEROME

THE outbreak of the World War was a lightning streak that bared the decay of a world system which had outlived its era.

The very cannon sounded the knell of a passing order.

Allies and Central Powers were locked in a grip from which neither, as imperialist states, would ever be released.

And out of the conflict, a contestant not officially in the lists, an army not of the generals and kings, rose victor.

When the bourgeois states put uniforms on the workers and peasants and put guns in their hands, they sent them forth in seven tongues "for the defense of the Fatherland." The Labor and Socialist leaders, in as many tongues, sped their going, "for the defense of the Fatherland." Only the Bolsheviks of Russia, the Party that Lenin and Stalin led, said to them: "Workers and peasants in uniform, toilers at machine and at plow, fight out for yourselves a Fatherland! Defeat your own rulers, and bring about a Fatherland for the people!"

The Labor and Socialist leaders were alien to the class in whose name they spoke. They represented, not the working people, but that top tier of higher-priced workers which imperial-

ism is able to bribe with morsels from its super-profits wrung from colonial slaves. This aristocracy of labor, serving as conductor of bourgeois ideas into the workers' ranks, was the economic base of the leaders who degraded Social-Democracy to social-chauvinism. In this war, like their imperialist masters, they were, in the sage words of von Clausewitz, continuing their political relations by other means. Their defense of imperialism in war time was but a variant of their apologias for imperialism in peace time.

Not so the Bolsheviks. They gave wing to the workers' aspirations and steel to their struggles. They drew their might from the arsenal of revolutionary Marxism. They threw open to the working class for guidance the vast heritage of revolutionary experiences of those that had come before—the high deeds of the Jacobins, the Chartists, the 'Forty-eighters, the Proletaires of the June Days, the Communards, the embattled people of 1905.

The Bolsheviks said to the peoples: This is not your war. The patriotism with which the war-makers and their "Socialist" helpmates surround their militarism is but tinsel to cover its imperialist repulsiveness. Democracy and justice are neither with the one camp nor with the other. The forces

contending express the convulsions of a dying system built on chaos and contradictions that make wars the norm and peace the rifts between. The epoch of the democratic national movements of the bourgeoisie is past, and past with them are the anti-feudal wars which that class, once historically progressive, waged for over eighty years. Now, in the monopolist stage of its order, the bourgeoisie has become imperialist and reactionary.

Lenin called to mind the words of Karl Marx uttered upon the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War, when the contending bourgeois forces combined to crush the Commune:

“That after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternize for the common massacre of the proletariat—this unparalleled event does indicate, not as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to deter the struggle of the classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out in civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national governments are *one* as against the proletariat!” *

Lenin, whose every motive and move proceeded from the historic interests of the working class, developed Marx's meaning and rendered it concrete for his day:

“One cannot be a Marxist without feeling the deepest respect for the great bourgeois revolutionists who had a worldwide historic right to speak in the name of ‘bourgeois’ fatherlands, who aroused tens of millions of people of new nations to a civilized life in

their struggle against feudalism. And one cannot be a Marxist without feeling contempt for the sophistry of Plekhanov and Kautsky who speak of the ‘defense of the fatherland’ in relation to the throttling of Belgium by the German imperialists, or in relation to the pact of the imperialists of England, France, Russia and Italy, concerning the plunder of Austria and Turkey.” *

In his classic work, *Imperialism*, written in the midst of the World War, Lenin laid bare the inner mechanism of the new, monopolist capitalism. The official economists and Social-Democratic glossers of imperialism, impressed by the superficial appearance of stability, were pointing to the powerful monopolies as a sign that capitalism was organized, harmonious and strengthened. Lenin dissected the system and brilliantly demonstrated that imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, is likewise the stage of its decay and inevitable collapse. The dominance of finance capital and the colossal export of capital compel the drive for new markets and widened sources of raw material.

In an era when the development of capitalism in the rival countries proceeds with extreme unevenness and by leaps, on a globe that is already partitioned, the quest for markets and spheres of influence must inevitably turn into recurrent wars for the earth's redivision.

Lenin characterized the war then raging:

“In reality, this is a war between two groups of predatory great powers, and it is fought for the division of colonies, for the enslavement of other nations, for advantages and privileges in the world market. This is a most reactionary war, a war of modern

* Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 62, International Publishers, New York.

* V. I. Lenin, *The Imperialist War*, p. 286, International Publishers, New York.

slaveholders fought for the purpose of retaining and strengthening capitalist slavery. England and France are lying when they assert that they fight the war for the freedom of Belgium. In reality, they have long been preparing the war, and they wage it for the purpose of robbing Germany, taking away her colonies; they have made a treaty with Italy and Russia stipulating the pillage and division of Turkey and Austria. The tsarist monarchy in Russia is waging a predatory war in which it strives to seize Galicia, to take away territories from Turkey, to enslave Persia, Mongolia, etc. Germany wages a war for the purpose of robbing English, Belgian and French colonies. Whether Germany wins or Russia, or whether there is a 'draw,' in any case the war will bring humanity new oppression for hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in the colonies, in Persia, Turkey, China; new enslavement of nations, new chains for the working class of all countries." *

Having demonstrated the source of war to be inherent in capitalism, Lenin declared that the struggle against imperialist war can be waged effectively only when connected with the struggle for socialism. Capitalism in its decline, he taught, is likewise the transition to socialism. The collapse of capitalism, however, is not automatic. By its parasitism and its intense oppression, by the general crisis which soon comes to grip its system, by its colossal wars and increasingly recurring economic crises, declining capitalism prepares the conditions for revolutionary outbreak, both in the "mother countries" and in the colonies: "Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution."

Lenin made important deductions from the principle of capitalism's intensified, uneven development, enriching the Marxian teaching on proletarian revolution: He formulated

* *Ibid.*, p. 211.

the momentous theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country. In the autumn of 1916 he wrote:

"The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time."

And he elaborated his theory, so meaningful for us in our day!

"This must not only create friction, but a direct striving on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the socialist country. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie." *

This epochal teaching opened for the working classes in individual lands the revolutionary perspective of striking at the weakest link in the imperialist chain; it made clear to them, in the war situation, that victory for the proletariat presupposed defeat of its "own" bourgeoisie.

"A revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but 'wish the defeat of its government,'" Lenin proclaimed.

This slogan became the touchstone of sincerity for every one who claimed the name *Socialist*. By its adoption or rejection, Socialists ranged themselves either on the side of the proletariat or on the side of imperialism.

As far back as 1907, the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart re-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XIX, p. 325; cited in *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 169.

solved that in the event of war it becomes the duty of the workers and their parliamentary representatives in the involved countries "to intervene in favor of its speedy termination and with all their powers to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to rouse the masses and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule."

(The Stuttgart resolution in its final form represented a considerable strengthening of the original draft, under pressure of Lenin and the Bolsheviks.)

In 1912, the Basle Congress of the International, foreseeing the outbreak of war, endorsed the principles of the Stuttgart Resolution and accordingly assigned to each Social-Democratic Party its specific task, the most solemn duty devolving upon the British, French and German parties. "The proletarians," declared the Congress, "consider it a crime to fire at each other for the profits of the capitalists, the ambitions of dynasties, or the greater glory of secret diplomatic treaties."

Less than two years later, official Social-Democracy, flagrantly violating the spirit and letter of these resolutions, perpetrated the greatest collective betrayal that any working class in history had ever sustained. The Second International, in supporting the war, proved itself the social mainstay of imperialism. For Social-Democracy thenceforward the "Defeat" slogan was directed, not against one's own bourgeoisie, but against one's own proletariat.

In the quarter-century that has passed since then, Social-Democracy has assisted, spurred, and often headed the campaigns of reaction and the

carnage of counter-revolution. Germany and Austria would be today free sister republics of the Soviet Union, but for the Noskes and Scheidemanns, the Bauers and Renners. The Hungarian Soviets would not have been crushed by the White Terror, but for the Communists' fatal error in accepting the "cooperation" of the Social-Democratic Party. Labor would now be master in Great Britain and Chamberlainism would not have blighted Europe, but for the perfidies of the MacDonalds, the Snowdens, the Citrines, and the Greenwoods. And France, France of the Commune, would not now see her youth marshalled for a brigands' war, nor witness her Communist Party—labor's right hand—suppressed, but for the Renaudels of yesterday and the Blums of today. And Spain of Asturias, Guadalupe, Madrid!—confluence of the valorous blood of a hundred peoples in a hundred lands, you would have been today the tomb, not the triumph-arch, of Franco: but for the Second International authors and collaborators of "non-intervention"; but for the dividers and the betrayers, the Caballeros, the Prietos, the Besteiros, the Casados.

And in our own United States, did not the Gomperses and the Spargos, the slick "Centrism" of the Hillquits, help the Wilsonian demagogues send the sons of workers and farmers to irrigate with their blood fields in Flanders that bankers harvested? Do not the Greens and Wolls, the Waldmans and Thomases, spur Wall Street today to abrogate labor's gains and labor's rights in its drive for war? Without these aides-des-camp, would reaction dare to launch its attack upon labor's organizations, by first moving to out-

law the staunchest fighter against the imperialist war, the Communist Party?

Only in the land where the revolutionary working class, rallying to the Party of Lenin and Stalin, balked Social-Democracy, did the principles of socialism irrevocably prevail. The Kerenskys, Tseretellis and Dans are in the dust of history with the tsars, the Milyukovs and the Kolchaks. While the reigning "Socialists" of Weimar ushered in the Third Reich; while the Austro-Marxists in power culminated in Dollfuss, Schuschnigg and Hitler; while the Labor-Gentry's rule in England ended in imperialism's second war government, the socialist society in the Soviet Union, led by the Communist Party, has advanced, amid hostile capitalist encirclement, from victory to victory; has become the guardsman of peace and the inspirer of socialism for the peoples of the entire world.

* * *

From the moment the war broke out, Lenin branded it as imperialist in character and demanded that all Socialists carry out the Stuttgart resolution and its later amplification at the Copenhagen and Basle Congresses, *i.e.*, to take up their struggle against their own bourgeoisie, as expressed in the famous manifesto, "The War and Russian Social-Democracy," issued by the Bolsheviks in October, 1914.

In mid-February, 1915, there took place the London Conference of Socialists of the Entente countries, called by the British Section of the Second International. The design of the conference to help the allied imperialist powers conduct their war was evident from the start, when the Central Com-

mittee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party—the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin—was not invited.

In the name of the Central Committee, therefore, Lenin addressed a Declaration to the Conference placing before it demands of revolutionary Marxism upon all Socialists. These were:

"1. That Vandervelde, Guesde, and Sembat immediately quit the bourgeois cabinets of Belgium and France;

"2. That the Belgian and French Socialist parties sever the so-called 'national bloc' which is a renunciation of the socialist banner, and serves to cover up the orgies of chauvinism indulged in by the bourgeoisie;

"3. That all Socialist parties abandon their policy of ignoring the crimes of Russian tsarism, and renew their support of the struggle against tsarism, which is conducted by the Russian workers without fear of any sacrifices;

"4. That, in fulfillment of the resolutions of the Basle Congress, it be declared that we extend our hand to those revolutionary Social-Democrats of Germany and Austria who replied to the declaration of war by preparing propaganda in favor of revolutionary action. Votes for military appropriations must be absolutely condemned."

Two weeks later, at Berne, the important conference of the Bolshevik Sections Abroad took place, at which Lenin was present.

This gathering formulated concretely and definitively guiding lines of action for the working class in all lands against the imperialist war-makers and their social-chauvinist supporters. Against Social-Democracy's slogan of "civil peace" (*bloc national, Burgfrieden*), the Bolshevik Conference raised the slogan "Turn the present imperialist war into civil war." As first steps toward bringing about that revolutionary transformation, the

Conference urged, in addition to the demands put forth in the Central Committee's Declaration two weeks earlier:

"1. Creation of an illegal organization wherever the governments and the bourgeoisie abolish constitutional liberties by introducing martial law;

"2. Aid to fraternization of the soldiers of the belligerent nations in the trenches and on the battlefields in general;

"3. Support to every kind of revolutionary mass action of the proletariat in general."

These composite lines of action, if successfully followed, Lenin taught—and history confirmed that teaching—would, in conjunction with the maturing objective factors, lead inevitably to civil war. The Bolshevik program of action, by its resoluteness and its concreteness, by its connection of immediate issues with the struggle for socialism, guarded against the twofold danger of retarding the revolution and of adventuring into revolution.

* * *

To destroy the influence of the social-chauvinists and to promote concrete effective mass action against the war-makers, Lenin scathed the "middle-of-the-roaders," the Centrists, who sought by words or silence to deflect the wrath of the masses from the social-imperialists, substituting abstractions for program and sentimentalities for the socialist objective.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks came into fierce conflict with the Centrists at the International Socialist Conference held at Zimmerwald, September 5-8, 1915, attended by delegates from twelve European countries. Lenin rallied a considerable minority to the

Russian Bolsheviks in sharp struggle against the Kautskyan Centrist majority. This "Zimmerwald Left" submitted its own draft manifesto, registering direct condemnation of the treacherous Second International parties and naming their leaders.

"The ruthless struggle against social-imperialism," the declaration stated, *"constitutes the first condition for the revolutionary mobilization of the proletariat and the reconstruction of the International."*

The declaration was a call to the Socialist Parties to

". . . utilize all the struggles, all the reforms demanded by our minimum program for the purpose of sharpening this *war crisis* as well as every social and political crisis of capitalism, of extending them to an attack upon its very foundations."

The declaration was a call to prepare the laboring masses "for the conquest of political power for the socialist organization of society."

Although the "Zimmerwald Left" failed to get its draft manifesto accepted, it influenced the adopted manifesto, which embodied certain basic Marxian principles in characterizing the imperialist war. The manifesto was deficient, however, in voicing no outright condemnation of the Social-Democratic parties that had betrayed the working class, in failing to speak of the collapse of the Second International, and in presenting a weak program of action. Its preaching to "fight for peace," unconnected with any clear summons to fight against capitalism, could only serve to confuse the masses and prevent them from really fighting for peace.

Through the Zimmerwald Conference the Bolsheviks rallied around themselves the genuine international-

ists in a number of countries, and consolidated these groups by the formation of an International Left, which served as the main basis for the organization of the Communist International in 1919. Thus Lenin and the Bolsheviks organized the anti-imperialist forces of the international proletariat and prepared the advance nucleus for the vanguard world party of the working class.

Lenin mercilessly exposed and branded the conciliators of opportunism, those who employed revolutionary phrases to conceal support of social-chauvinism. He was unsparing in his criticism of Trotsky, "the inflated phraseology with which Trotsky always justifies opportunism."

Trotsky opposed defeat of the tsarist government in the war, demagogically raising the slogan "Neither victory nor defeat," and proposing in abstracts "a revolutionary struggle against war." With devastating refutation Lenin showed up Trotsky's deceitful "revolutionism":

"Revolution in war time is civil war. . . . The change from imperialist war to civil war cannot be 'made,' as it is impossible to 'make' a revolution—it grows out of a multiplicity of diverse phenomena, phases, traits, characteristics, consequences of the imperialist war. Such growth is *impossible* without a series of military reverses and defeats of those governments which received blows from *their own* oppressed classes.

"To repudiate the defeat slogan means to reduce one's revolutionary actions to an empty phrase or sheer hypocrisy."

Hence, Lenin concluded in regard to Trotsky *et al*:

"Whoever is in favor of the 'Neither victory nor defeat' slogan is a conscious or unconscious chauvinist, at best a petty-bourgeois pacifist, at all events an *enemy* of a

proletarian policy, a partisan of the existing governments, of the existing ruling classes."*

For the record be it stated that Trotsky is now in favor of defeating the government in Russia.

* * *

The proletariat came to victory in Russia, transforming the vast empire of the tsars into the world's first socialist segment. The proletariat took the course to victory by leading the toiling millions who returned from the battlefields weary of warring for their oppressors and demanding "Peace, Bread, and Land!" It rose to the position of ruling class through struggle to extend the March bourgeois-democratic revolution into the October socialist revolution. It achieved Soviet power, consolidated that power, and proceeded to build the socialist society, through indissoluble revolutionary alliance with the toiling peasantry. The proletariat was able to attain these victories and to safeguard them in the hearts and hands of a unified people, steeled with a new patriotism, because of the vanguard role of the Leninist-Stalinist Party.

* * *

The October Revolution was a turning point in the history of mankind. It confirmed the certain collapse of the capitalist system and the inevitable victory of the proletariat throughout the world. It represents the triumphant new social order, despite the fact that the decomposing capitalist system still prevails over five-sixths of the earth. In the words of Stalin:

* *The Imperialist War*, pp. 198-201.

"The dialectical method regards as important primarily not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may appear to be not durable; for the dialectical method considers invincible only that which is arising and developing."*

Brought about by the exploding internal contradictions of imperialism, the October Revolution was an inevitable phenomenon of the World War. It was the revolutionary nemesis of the violent efforts of finance capital, then as now, to redivide the earth whose division had already been completed. It was the first successful breach in the old world marked, then as now, by forcible land seizures and spoliation; by piracies for new markets, new colonies, new terrains for exploitation.

The war lords tried, then as now, to shackle the rising working class movement, to deceive the masses, with the aid of labor's misleaders, by shibboleths of "democracy" and "humanity," into slaughtering one another by the millions for the profiteers.

The socialist counteraction of October achieved for the war-torn world a symbol and force for peace. Its consistent policy in behalf of world peace prevented the outbreak of the second imperialist war, until British-French-Polish imperialism wrecked the peace front, bringing on the second imperialist war.

* * *

Now once again capitalism in de-

cline has unloosed a multi-armed war for the earth's redivision. Excepting China's just war for national independence, the current conflict is, on the part of all belligerent powers, a war for plunder and widened predatory domination.

German imperialism, laid low at Versailles, but for fifteen years artificially rehabilitated by British finance capital as the "Storm Trooper" against Bolshevism, has now like a Frankenstein raised retributive hands against its restorers. Under the lofty slogans of *Lebensraum* and *Germany's honor*, German Nazism seeks by means of war to widen its orbit of pillaged lands and subjugated nations.

British imperialism, in the war against Hitler, the "promise-breaker," opened war upon Germany when that power, finding it foolhardy in the face of Soviet might to proceed further with the *Drang nach Osten*, entered into a non-aggression pact with the U.S.S.R. Britain's is a war to force Germany onto the road against the Soviet Union, the road paved by years of financings and "appeasements"; to impose upon Germany a neo-Versailles from which there will be no resurrection for that land as a power to rival the "empire upon which the sun never sets."

France is no more than Britain waging war against fascism and aggression. France has now become an auxiliary power to British imperialism, in consequence of its systematic policy of reaction and treachery, at home and on the foreign-political field. Its acceptance of Austria's Anschluss, its betrayal of Spain and Czechoslovakia, its desertion of the Franco-Soviet bond, were part of the diabolic "non-

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 107.

intervention" and Munich policy designed to divert German imperialism's course from its own borders to the Soviet Ukraine and Urals. French imperialism, like its British counterpart, is hurling its people into a war to conquer Germany for the Two Hundred Families and in conjunction with the contemplated German puppet government to push the war onward against the land of socialism. French monopoly capital, like British Toryism, has, with the aid of Social-Democracy, systematically weakened and repressed the People's Front forces, and has outlawed the Communist Party, in order to gain a free hand to wage its reactionary war.

But this war, though in essential character alike to the first World War, differs from it in respects that cast a pall on the war-makers. If the war of 1914 ushered in the general crisis of capitalism, the war of 1939 besets a capitalist world, not only in the stage of decay, but in the grip of an unrelenting general crisis, with vast structural armies of unemployed, with an insoluble agrarian crisis, with inflated war industries, with the capacity for a protracted war greatly diminished, with many weak links in its chain, and—with a sixth of the world now socialist! Diminished, too, by its general debilitation is its base of labor

aristocracy, with the consequent decline in the influence of Social-Democracy. The working class in all lands has made great strides along the road of independent class affirmation. It has built up new trade unions, increased its strength in the old, signaling on the part of the organized masses a break with stand-pat reformism. And in every land, whether in legal status or underground, the Communist Party is preparing the workers for decisive struggle against capitalism.

Inspiring these struggles and giving perspective to their course is the great land of socialism, in whose very coming into being the peace-desiring people and all the oppressed of the world have attained their champion.

* * *

In October, 1917, history wrote in characters of fire the prophetic words of Karl Marx:

"THE BOURGEOISIE WILL TEACH THE PROLETARIAT HOW TO HANDLE ARMS."

The October outcome of their first World War now confronts the imperialists as the protagonist of world socialism and peace: A hundred and eighty million have come into their own, and the path is blazed. . . .

THE YOUNG GENERATION AND THE IMPERIALIST WAR

BY GIL GREEN

"Too often has it happened when history has taken a sharp turn that even the most advanced of Parties have been unable for a long time to adapt themselves to the new situation; they continued to repeat the slogans that were formerly true, but which now had no meaning, having lost that meaning as 'suddenly' as the turn in history was 'sudden'."—V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 167.

"These are war times. The youth decide the outcome of the struggle, first the working but also the student youth."—V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. VII (Russian Edition).

THAT our Party has been able to adapt itself to the new conditions created by the new sharp turn in world history is attested to by the October 13 Resolution of the Political Committee, "America and the International Situation." This resolution not only deepens our understanding as to the specific features of the present imperialist war, but shows how its outbreak has "basically altered all international relations and is profoundly changing the class and political alignments within each capitalist nation." Every phase of Party work must therefore be re-examined in the light of the new situation, so that we may "rapidly overcome the weight of obsolete tactical attitudes which have become a brake upon the labor movement."

It is the limited purpose of this article to treat some of the new problems which have arisen in the youth movement on the basis of the changed international situation.

I. NEW PROBLEMS OF YOUTH UNITY

Since 1934 the Communist youth have consciously worked to help unite the ranks of the young generation in behalf of its economic and social needs, against the menace of reaction, fascism and imperialist war. They recognized that as a result of the general decline of capitalism and the recent years of economic crisis and depression, the vast majority of the younger generation were growing to manhood and womanhood without prospect for future security and happiness. Capitalism could no longer offer even the limited opportunities of the past, not alone to the working class youth, but to increasingly larger sections of youth from the ranks of the farming population and the city middle classes.

This recognition of the youth problem as a *special* problem, that of an "unwanted generation, a surplus generation," does not mean that we glossed over the basic class divisions existing in society as a whole and in the ranks of the youth.

"We speak in the name of the young generation," we said, "in order to win the youth for common united action in behalf of their most burning needs, in order to make them more conscious of the main division in society—the division between the wealthy and the exploited . . . to make the youth conscious of the fact that at the head of all the toilers stands the working class to which all progressive forces must ally themselves in the interest not alone of the working class but of all toiling humanity."*

Such was our basic analysis of the youth problem and the need for and possibility of achieving youth unity.

How has the outbreak of European hostilities affected this estimate and to what extent must we change or alter our perspectives? This is the first major question we must answer.

* * *

The plight of the young generation which arises from the decline and decay of the capitalist system has not been mitigated by the new world situation and the changing class alignments in the United States. Why? Because the imperialist war has not removed the general crisis of world capitalism. It has, on the contrary, accentuated and deepened this crisis. We do not wish to deny that the economic upturn which is taking place on the basis of the promised war boom may enable a large number of young people to enter industry and the professions. But any idea that such a temporary pick-up will solve the youth problem is highly illusory and dangerous. In the first place, the imperialist war of 1914-18 has already proved that war "prosperity" exists

only for the monopolists and profiteers, not for the masses. Working class living standards *declined* from 1913 to 1918 by eight per cent!

Secondly, a war boom is the kind of shot-in-the-arm which, when it wears off, leaves the patient completely prostrate. The expansion of industry is purely artificial and when war orders cease, collapse is inevitable. In the wake of the war come greater unemployment and misery for the youth and the working people.

The third factor is the most important. America can supply the war market only at the risk of its own involvement. The greater the impetus towards feeding the war machine, the graver and closer the threat of our own direct participation.

The European war is therefore a sword of Damocles hanging over the heads of America's youth. If the United States enters the war, it will be the youth who will pay the price with their own young bodies. This is the new menace to the young generation. This is the new basis for unity. America's young people have nothing to gain and everything to lose from the continuation and prolongation of this war. They must want no part of it. They must fight every step towards involvement, every act of the monopolists and profiteers who hope to benefit from the destruction, death and misery of this new imperialist holocaust.

The issue of the war affects all young people, but it would be foolhardy to believe that this automatically means the unity of all youth. In fact, the obstacles confronting youth unity today are far more formidable

* Gil Green, *United We Stand for Peace and Socialism*, 1935.

than those of yesterday. The struggle for youth unity against involvement in the imperialist war takes on a new aspect, because it cuts across the unity which has existed these past years on a democratic front program and anti-fascist alignment.

Youth's fight these past few years, while meeting the most hostile opposition from the camp of the monopolists and economic royalists, received nevertheless a degree of support from some sections of the bourgeoisie itself. This came from those democratic sections of the bourgeoisie whose interests in the fight against the most reactionary, pro-fascist section of the bourgeoisie temporarily coincided with those of the broad masses of youth. The imperialist war has changed all this. The bourgeoisie as a class hopes to prolong the war to gain from it.

When it is borne in mind that America's largest and most important youth membership organizations, while democratic in character, are bourgeois in control, then the problem looms in all its significance. Will the bourgeois-controlled boards permit these organizations to take a stand hostile to their class interests? This depends, in the first place, upon how strong the anti-war sentiments of the youth are within these organizations, and upon how well they are organized. One can, however, be on the safe side in saying that the issue of the war will create all sorts of differences and difficulties within these organizations and their leaderships.

There is another important obstacle which stands in the way of uniting the masses of working class and

middle class youth against involvement in the war. That obstacle is the widespread illusion that this war is a just war, a war for democracy. This point of view is especially strong among middle class student youth and Jewish youth. These young people are ready to admit that Chamberlain and Daladier cannot be trusted and that they represent the predatory, imperialist interests of the British and French ruling classes. They argue, however, that the people of these countries are engaged in a just war, and that these people will determine the outcome of the war. What these youth ignore, and what the social patriots consciously hide from them, is the truth that Lenin patiently repeated during the last war.

"What is required is the *ability* to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined, not by the 'good intentions' of individuals or groups, or even of people, but by the position of the *class* which conducts the war, by the *class policy* of which the war is a continuation, by the *ties* of capital, which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the *imperialist character* of international capital. . . ."*

Certainly the working people of England, France and the United States did not fight for a Versailles Peace in 1914-18. They thought they were fighting a just war, a war for democracy. Woodrow Wilson promised them a peace without annexations based on the self-determination of nations. But when the war was over, the imperialist ruling classes determined the predatory character of

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 53, Imperialist Publishers, New York.

the "settlement" and turned their united strength against the young Soviet state and the revolutionary masses of Central and Eastern Europe. If the people want to determine the outcome of this new imperialist war, they can only do so by opposing the war and combatting the imperialist ruling classes responsible for it.

Most dangerous of all is the illusion that America can give aid to one side in the war (Anglo-French imperialism) and at the same time guarantee America's non-participation as a belligerent. Those who say they want America to keep out, yet advocating a policy of taking sides and giving material support to the allies, unwittingly or not are misleading young people and preparing them for cannon fodder in the European war. That is what makes the problem of youth unity so difficult.

Little difficulty would be encountered today in getting all organizations of young people to come out against America's involvement in the imperialist war. In fact, all the organizations affiliated with the American Youth Congress and the United Student Peace Committee have already agreed to making their leading slogan correspond with this thought. But the hitch comes in the concretization and application of this slogan. Those who see the war as a conflict for imperialist interests on the part of all belligerents, advocate, "Aid to neither side"; while those who favor British imperialism call for aid to that camp, continuation of the boycott on German goods, etc. Of course, the demand for a German boycott means little from the practical point of view, since

German ships cannot reach our shores, but it has significance in that it establishes Britain and France as the favored camp, a policy which can only mislead youth as to the character of the war and prepare them ideologically to accept America's entry into it.

* * *

The Young Communist League will continue to urge collaboration among the organizations of America's youth. It will continue to work in the American Youth Congress as one of its affiliated organizations. It will support every proposition, every issue and demand put forth that corresponds to the interests of the toiling youth. It will not, however, for the sake of temporary agreements and artificial unity, become a partner to the crime of giving support, whether direct or indirect, to American imperialism and the imperialist war. It will maintain for itself at all times complete freedom of action, explaining to the masses of youth the imperialist character of the present war and mobilizing them for a struggle against it.

If this policy means that the Y.C.L. may temporarily be in a position in which it cannot support all the proposals and demands of the Youth Congress and youth movement, this must not deter us. Every affiliate of the Youth Congress has the right to reserve action and even oppose action on those matters with which it is not in complete agreement. This has been true to date and should continue to be true in the future. Our basic policies will not be determined by temporary expediencies and opportunistic motives. We shall continue always to

act in a principled fashion, in the interests of the working class, the youth and the toiling masses.

The greatest danger that could threaten the Y.C.L. today would consist of an opportunist reluctance to come to grips with the new situation. To blur or conceal the basic disagreements that exist in the youth movement on the issue of the war would be to share in the betrayal of America's youth.

Once this danger is recognized and met, the Y.C.L. will have to be careful not to slip into the pitfalls of sectarian isolation from the masses of youth and their organizations. As long as it is granted the right of independent action (and this has been the case right along for all organizations) the Y.C.L. will continue in its support of the Youth Congress and will fight every attempt to split or destroy it. The Y.C.L. desires above all an all-inclusive youth movement, independently led by youth, in which each organization has the right of free expression and also the right to decide on which issues it can collaborate and cooperate.

* * *

As has already been shown by the recent meeting of the National Assembly of the American Youth Congress, there is at this time still ground for common action around many issues, despite fundamental disagreements on the character of the European War. There is complete agreement on the need for defending civil liberties, there is unanimous condemnation of the Dies witch-hunt, there is a recognition of the new eco-

nomie problems confronting youth and of the need for combating the militarization of young people. Consistent action on these matters can only rebound to the good of the young generation.

It is necessary however to warn the youth movement of storm clouds ahead. The reactionary enemies of youth unity will try to utilize the disagreements and differences on the war issue to incite one section of the youth movement against the other and in that manner to disperse and destroy the movement as a whole. American imperialism does not relish a democratic youth movement, in which youth do their own thinking and acting. It wants a docile controlled youth movement, one which can easily be harnessed to the chariot of war. Civil liberty and increased social security stand in the way of greater profits and further involvement in the war. Monopoly capital will, therefore, fight these more ruthlessly than ever, but this time in the name of "patriotism" and "national unity." Intrigues are being hatched both within and without to destroy the Youth Congress and to replace it with a new "youth unity" based on the destruction of the independence of the youth movement. Some people even dream of using the N.Y.A. set-up to initiate and carry through such a maneuver. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty—and youth unity.

II. NEW PERSPECTIVES FOR THE Y.C.L.

Although still a small organization of approximately 25,000 members, the Y.C.L. has made its greatest progress in the past five years, growing, not

only in membership, but even more so in influence among the youth. Whatever successes it can record are due to its consistent struggle for the unity of youth for peace and around their immediate economic and social needs and to the fact that it has been learning how to build the Y.C.L. as a non-Party organization, a broader educational youth organization, training its members and the youth in the spirit of socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.

Progress was made by the Y.C.L. to the extent that it carried out the advice of Lenin and Stalin that the tasks of the youth in general and of the Y.C.L. in particular can be summed up in one word: *Learn*. The great significance of this advice stands out today.

If a change is to be made, it is not in this basic concept, but in the *content* of our work and education. An approach was made in this direction at the time of the Ninth National Convention of the Y.C.L. last May. Comrade Browder at that time summed up the main task of the Y.C.L. in one slogan: *Character Building and Education in the Spirit of Socialism*. This high emphasis on education in socialism has today a paramount meaning for the Y.C.L.

Why? Because "the distinction between fascist and non-fascist governments has lost its former significance as a determining factor in international relations," therefore "the slogans of anti-fascism no longer give the main direction to the struggle of the working class and its allies."* If this

* *Resolution of the Political Committee, C.P.U.S.A., October 13, 1939.* See p. 993 of this issue.

is true, and it is, League education must become intensively imbued with an *anti-imperialist*, anti-capitalist content. It should aim at giving young people a firm grasp of the class divisions in modern society and a basic understanding of imperialism and the imperialist nature of the present war. To continue to base our agitation, propaganda and education on anti-fascist slogans in the old sense would be to use slogans that were valid yesterday but have lost their former significance as " 'suddenly' as the sharp turn in history was 'sudden.'" It would be tantamount to aiding the reactionary bourgeoisie and the social chauvinists in their pro-war endeavors. Slogans of "anti-fascism" have already become the stock-in-trade of the worst warmongers and jingoists.

How is this to be accomplished if not by an even greater stress upon the need for Marxist-Leninist study? Nor should this be difficult to achieve. A great and absorbing interest in Marxist theory has been manifest these past weeks not only in the ranks of the Y.C.L. but among other youth as well. This is only natural. At times of profound political disturbances, when rapid, sudden changes become normal commonplace occurrences, people seek fundamental answers and are ready to probe beneath the surface of things in order to find them. We are living through such times. Now therefore is also the time to organize the most widespread study of the Marxist-Leninist classics, primarily of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*.

Above all else the Y.C.L. has the responsibility of transmitting to youth

a fundamental understanding of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union and the advance to the achievement of the communist society. Too little attention has been concentrated upon patiently explaining to the masses of youth the meaning of the capitalist encirclement of the U.S.S.R. and the complex difficulties and problems arising from the co-existence of the two mutually antagonistic social systems. And yet without this background, how can one understand even the simplest development in world politics?

The whole history of the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party and the world Communist movement for the attainment of the workers' historic objectives is intimately associated with the struggle against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism-Bukharinism and opportunistic Social-Democracy. The Communist movement was born, developed and became strong in the struggle against opportunism and social chauvinism. Yet, many young people, because they did not live through the rich political experiences of the past quarter of a century, lack a comprehensive and historical understanding of these sinister forces. Today, this understanding becomes absolutely essential, as Social-Democracy once again plays its traitorous social chauvinist role and, together with Trotskyism, feverishly endeavors to turn the imperialist war into a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

With war hysteria and warmongering on the increase, the League has the duty of instilling among the youth both a love for their native land—

America—as well as a deep bond of fraternity and solidarity with the working classes and oppressed masses of other lands. To us, love of country has nothing in common with jingoism. We are proletarian internationalists in our ideology. Our job is one of combating race and national chauvinism, of fighting for Negro equality and against anti-Semitism, and of giving practical assistance to the struggling masses of other countries, especially to the Chinese and the Latin American peoples.

Stressing book study is not enough; less so today than heretofore. Only a proper combination between book study and *participation* in the class struggle can train youth in the true socialist spirit. In the words of Lenin:

“Without work, without struggle, a book knowledge of Communism obtained from Communist books and pamphlets is worthless. . . .” *

This means that the Y.C.L. must be an active, militant, class youth organization, fighting energetically for the interests of the toiling youth and the working class.

On all basic questions the League must prove its fighting mettle in the coming period. Of especial import are the issues of militarism, and the economic struggle.

On the first of these. The League must henceforth oppose all measures aimed at the militarization of the youth. It must oppose the militarization of the C.C.C. camps; the extension of R.O.T.C., especially on a compulsory basis; the proposed increase

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 469, International Publishers, New York.

in the Army and National Guard, the M-Day Plans, etc. Its guiding slogan must be: *Not a man, not a cent, not a gun for imperialist war preparations!*

Care must be taken in this struggle to keep from slipping into a pacifist position. Our opposition to the militarization of youth stems, not from the fact that young people will learn the use of arms, but from the fact that these are steps being taken today to draw America into the imperialist war. Our fight therefore is directed against every measure aimed at involving America in the war, not against military measures as such. Our support of the Spanish people's struggle and of the participation of the American boys in that struggle, as well as our ardent support of the struggle of the Chinese people should be popularized more fully than even in the past, so as to distinguish our position from that of petty-bourgeois pacifism.

Now as to the economic problems. The perspective of production for the war market and the consequent increase in the employment of young workers bring a whole series of new problems to the fore. (1) It becomes obvious that far greater attention will have to be given to the needs and problems of *working* youth: speed-up, wages, hours, apprenticeship, night work and overtime. (2) A major task of the League becomes that of helping to organize the millions of unskilled and unorganized young workers, especially those in the mass production industries, into the trade unions. (3) Special emphasis must be placed upon the role of young women

in industry. This is especially necessary if the trend towards America's involvement in the war continues. (4) Child labor will once again increase, especially in agriculture and Southern textile. The fight for the Child Labor Amendment should therefore be extended. (5) As industry picks up there will be an increasing reactionary pressure upon the government to cease giving aid to needy students and unemployed youth. A sharp struggle will have to be waged to continue and extend N.Y.A. benefits and to give W.P.A. jobs to unemployed young people.

If attention to these vital economic problems is tied up with a systematic strengthening of the League among the young workers, especially those in the basic industries, the League will be able to anchor itself to the decisive strata of working class youth and be better prepared to meet its tasks. Work among industrial youth takes on a new significance as a result of the changed perspectives.

* * *

Not a single one of the above-stated tasks can be fulfilled if constant vigilance is not exercised against the dangers of Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism. Right opportunism has its roots in the failure to grasp the deep-going nature of the turn in world history and expresses itself in a reluctance or inability rapidly and decisively to change our perspectives, slogans and methods of work. This tendency is most dangerous at this particular moment. But in the very process of making the turn,

even before it has taken complete effect, the familiar and old malady of sectarianism is bound to show itself in our midst. We must be prepared to meet it. It expresses itself in the mouthing of Left phrases, in the separation of the Y.C.L. from the non-League youth and their organizations, and logically leads to the narrowing of the League to a small vanguard group isolated from the masses.

If the Y.C.L. is to be America's most advanced and progressive youth organization, it must be able to find its *special* role under *every and all con-*

ditions. This means that the new forms developed in the past period, such as social, cultural and athletic activities, must be used even more than in the past; but these should be built around the new content of League education. We cannot too often repeat that the special role of the League has nothing in common with a mechanical copying of the Communist Party, but presupposes the building of the League as a *broader educational youth organization*—a training school for communism and the Party of communism.

EDITORS' NOTE

Through a technical oversight there was omitted in the heading of the article, "The Path of Labor's United Action," by Roy Hudson, in the October issue, the explanatory line: "Excerpts from a report to the National Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., held on September 1-3, 1939."

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND THE WAR

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

DRAPING themselves in the Keep-America-Out-of-War toga, all the war forces and their agents are plunging headlong into the drive to prepare the ground for American participation. That the warmongers must seek this protective cloak demonstrates how strong is the sentiment against war involvement. Attempting to undermine and destroy this sentiment are those forces working for the imperialist aggrandizement of the United States, at first as a non-combatant participant and then, if necessary and *possible*, as a belligerent.

The course of the American imperialist bourgeoisie is determined first and foremost by its own interests, as affected by changes in the relationship between the various imperialist powers and by the strength of the anti-imperialist front both at home and abroad. It is necessary to evaluate those imperialist forces which are driving the United States to war, and on the basis of which finance capital will seek to impose its foreign policy upon the country. This article limits itself to this aspect of the question.

THE DIRECTION OF IMPERIALIST EXPANSION

It would be erroneous to try to estimate the relationship among the imperialist powers and the role of the United States entirely on the pattern

of the first imperialist war of 1914-18. The nature of imperialism remains essentially the same, but the world conditions within which it operates have changed radically during the last two decades. Important qualitative changes have also taken place within the imperialist structure. The great difference between the present situation and the first World War is that the imperialist conflict is unfolding in the advanced stages of the general crisis of capitalism. Imperialism is fighting for its very existence. The long periods of severe economic crisis, the partial redivisions of the world which have already resulted from the previous series of fascist aggressions, have sharpened the main antagonisms between the imperialist powers — British-French imperialism versus German imperialism, United States versus British, United States versus Japanese. Intertwined and running through these inter-imperialist antagonisms is the deep contradiction between socialism and imperialism. The main, most profound and far-reaching factor in the present situation is the great strength of socialism in the Soviet Union and the high stage of development of the anti-imperialist forces within the capitalist countries as well as in the colonial world. The anti-imperialist front, which during the first world war was in its initial,

formative stages, is today a powerful universal reality, based upon socialist working class power in the Soviet Union and the experiences and advances of over two decades of serious anti-imperialist struggles throughout the world.

The first world war broke the world front of imperialism. During the last twenty years this break could not be repaired, despite renewed efforts at intervention in the Soviet Union, encirclement of the land of socialism, and efforts at overcoming the contradictions of the imperialist world. Capitalism never recovered from its state of chronic crisis; the Soviet Union became a powerful socialist state. Capitalism now enters a new imperialist conflict confronted with a powerful, well established anti-imperialist array of forces. These forces cramp the "normal" procedure of imperialism, obstruct the predatory looting of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and operate to convert the imperialist war into a struggle against imperialism.

It is for these reasons that the ruling classes of England, France and Germany are forced to ponder the question of peace, and are nervous, uneasy and indecisive about embarking upon a large-scale imperialist war of exhaustion. Torn asunder by inter-imperialist contradictions, they nevertheless strive to turn the present imperialist war into a war against the Soviet Union.

It is against this general background that the American imperialist bourgeoisie seeks to participate in the redivision of the world on conditions most favorable to itself. The British-French ruling circles would like to have the United States as an imme-

diately ally, shouldering the main brunt of the conflict. But Wall Street seems to think that for the time being it has most to gain from the continuation of the war in Europe, without the participation of the United States as a combatant. For the time being, Wall Street is willing to limit its direct participation in the war to the supply of materials to France and England, thus assuring the prolongation of the conflict and the best conditions for its own participation.

At the same time, American finance capital is feasting its eyes upon the rich pickings within its reach. It seeks to repeat, in a similar cycle, the experiences of the first World War from which the United States emerged as the chief beneficiary. While the chief imperialist jackals of Europe fall out among themselves, Wall Street hopes to take the opportunity to strengthen itself at the expense both of British and German imperialism, particularly the former.

These aspirations of American finance capital reach first of all towards consolidating its complete hegemony over Latin America. During the first world war the American finance capitalists were able to oust the British from many of their strong positions in the trade and economy of Latin America and emerge as the dominant power. Since then, while the British have been able to retain some strong positions, German, Japanese and Italian monopolies have begun to penetrate. As an outcome of the present war the North American monopolists are looking forward to clearing the field of all competitors, and are already taking energetic steps in that direction.

Can the successes of American imperialism in this respect during the first World War be repeated under present conditions? The biggest obstacle against American imperialist hegemony on the Western Hemisphere is to be found, not in resistance of rival imperialisms but in the high level of the anti-imperialist movement in the countries of Latin America. Working along well-tried lines, the imperialist bourgeoisie of the United States will offer increasing benefits to the commercial and large landlord interests of these countries in return for American monopoly control of trade, key raw materials, public utilities, etc. The action of the Panama Conference in establishing a permanent advisory committee of experts to sit in Washington to deal, not only with questions of neutrality but with economic and financial measures, has created a potential instrument for this purpose. Sumner Welles, delegate of the U. S. State Department at the Panama Conference, offered to place easy shipping facilities, favorable credit terms and large government loans at the disposal of Latin America. The Wall Street monopolists will with increasing stubbornness insist that the United States government serve as an instrument, through these economic measures, for assuring the extension of imperialist control. They will seek to bolster all the reactionary tendencies within Latin America, basing themselves upon the commercial and semi-feudal interests in these countries.

However, in at least three countries—Mexico, Chile and Cuba—the reactionary forces are not in control, and in other countries the anti-imperialist democratic movement is becoming

stronger. Any renewed drive by American finance capital in Latin America will have the effect of further antagonizing the native industrial interests, the national-revolutionary sections of the middle classes and the masses of peasants and workers, setting into motion a new wave of the anti-imperialist movement on the continent. The imperialist bourgeoisie will attempt to transform the Good Neighbor policy into a weapon to be used against the peoples of Latin America; while the anti-imperialist forces, which have ripened throughout the hemisphere, will give real content to the Good Neighbor policy by turning it into an alliance between themselves and the working class and its allies in the United States. It must not be forgotten that the Good Neighbor policy, as enunciated by President Roosevelt during the recent period, was an attempt to meet the new situation created by the maturing of the national-revolutionary forces of Latin America, which have come distinctly to the fore and are well prepared to meet any new onslaughts by finance capital.

The efforts of the imperialist bourgeoisie to establish an unchallenged hegemony on the Western Hemisphere are an important part of the war preparations. Proposing to act as gendarme for all the Americas, Welles promised the Panama Conference that the United States will undertake joint measures against "subversive forces." The United States policy, as indicated by Welles at Panama, is to attempt to assure the united action of all the American republics. For the present this is limited to a neutrality benevolent to the Allies and the drawing of

a United States three-hundred-mile-wide cordon around the hemisphere. The longer range program of the imperialist bourgeoisie is to attempt, once it embarks on war, to drag all the American republics with it, or failing this, to assure the "benevolent neutrality" of as many as possible, while at the same time safeguarding for itself all the resources of the Western Hemisphere in the war for world domination.

Here, too, matters are quite different than in 1914-1918. Any effort to extend imperialist penetration will further arouse the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Latin America, which now has a firmer working class and socialist content and, although developing unevenly, already has reached high levels in a number of countries.

IMPERIALIST CONFLICT IN THE FAR EAST

Another sphere in which the United States will attempt to strengthen itself during the imperialist conflict is the Far East. The traditional American "open-door" position in China, based upon the old division of spheres of influence between British, Japanese and French imperialisms, has been destroyed by the Japanese invasion and by the greatly weakened status of the British and French interests. American imperialist circles are torn between the desire to see Japan eliminated as their principal rival in the Far East and the desire to see Japan play the role of the spearhead of the imperialist offensive against the Soviet Union at the expense of China.

Before the present phase of the war in Europe, when Japan was still orientated upon the fascist axis, it was en-

couraged in its attempted encirclement of the Soviet Union, not only by Chamberlain's Munichism in China, but by the direct aid received from the United States in the form of war supplies. The American-Japanese imperialist antagonism, expressed in the diplomatic moves of the U. S. State Department, and even the abrogation of the 1911 trade treaty means little when in practice Japan continues to obtain the bulk of its vital war supplies in the United States. At best, during the whole period of Japan's aggression against China, the United States exerted pressure only as a potential obstacle and never as a practical opponent.

When the Soviet Union shattered the fascist axis by the non-aggression pact with Germany, it not only halted the threatened imperialist attack on its European frontiers, but put an end to the Japanese provocations in the East. The Chamberlain policy, which was to synchronize the attack in the East and the West by sacrificing China and the small nations of Eastern Europe, was defeated. Already seriously strained by long and sharp resistance in China and by the military defeats suffered on the Mongolian and Siberian frontiers, Japan is being forced to seek a peace on the basis of a puppet "central government" in China, which she is now attempting to set up, and to make new overtures to Britain and the United States. Japan hopes to obtain a peace which would recognize her claims to the occupied Chinese territory and would provide for the joint exploitation of the rest of China. Such a "peace" the Nationalist government of China cannot accept.

While the Japanese imperialists

may be seeking to reestablish the British-Japanese alliance, they are also playing with the hope that the United States can be induced to undertake a "peace offensive" in China based upon the division of the spoils and privileges. In other words, the United States may be invited to take over the role of Britain in the Far East.

Such a role the American imperialist bourgeoisie may find very palatable to an appetite which has already been quickened by the new prospects for aggrandizement offered by the imperialist war. But in China it encounters a more advanced, stronger anti-imperialist liberation movement than any predatory power has yet had to contend with in the Far East. Nor can it afford to ignore the heightened independence movement in India and other countries of the East, including the Philippines, which has been spurred by the imperialist war, which draws new encouragement from the weakened position of British and Japanese imperialism, and which is inspired by the independent policy of the Soviet Union. If the United States once sets foot on the path opened by Japan it can only become the spearhead of the imperialist drive against the colonial peoples and the Soviet Union—with all the consequences. Yet, this is the direction the United States would be obliged to take once its imperialist bourgeoisie gets involved in the war and dons the mantle of British imperialism.

THE NARROWING BASE OF SOCIAL- CHAUVINISM

Whether the imperialist bourgeoisie will be able with any important successes to enter upon a course of large-

scale aggrandizement depends, not only upon the resistance it faces in the colonial and semi-colonial world, but also upon the increasing obstacles at home. To a large measure finance capital depends upon huge profits anticipated from the war and from expansion in the colonial world to overcome internal difficulties. It leans heavily upon one of the basic methods of imperialism—the buying off of a small section of the working class out of the large reservoir of super-profits which it hopes to build up—to create social support for its policies. The question is whether this can be done on the same scale and with the same successes as during the first world war.

American finance capital, basing itself upon the experiences of 1914-1918, is looking forward to an era of tremendous war profits. The war profits hysteria which already pervades all of big industry and finance is itself becoming a force for war. In these circles peace talk is even more unpopular and "treasonable" than among the war crowd in London and Paris. The first boom reaction in the stock market and the continued rise in the business indices are for the time being running according to their expectations. The index of industrial production is fast approaching the high mark of December 1936, on the eve of the 1937-38 slump, and will probably exceed it. Steel production rose in a month from 63 per cent to 83 per cent of capacity; the textile and other industries are exhausting their inventories and are getting more orders than they can handle. Big business is anticipating an era of unexcelled war "prosperity."

There are a number of factors, how-

ever, arising from the long periods of crisis since the last war, which may alter the prosperity picture considerably. All the major powers have already for some years been gearing their economy for war. Aiming at national self-sufficiency, they have been building up the capacity of war industry and preparing to shift peacetime industries to a war basis; they have been storing huge quantities of raw materials and foodstuffs. This makes it unlikely that at least during the first stages of conflict the United States will be called upon to supply commodities on a large scale.

While an extended war may act as a stimulus for American industry, this in itself cannot eradicate the deep wounds left by the devastating economic crisis. The reemployment of only a small part of the over 12,000,000 jobless can be expected due to the great rationalization of industry and the resulting technological unemployment. Since the last war great masses of the farm population have been impoverished. Indirect wage-cuts resulting from increasing commodity prices will further contribute to reducing standards of living, while finance capital will utilize the war situation to attempt direct onslaughts upon wages, hours and conditions of labor. These factors all tend to keep the purchasing power of the masses at a low level, thus undermining the basis for any general "prosperity" resulting from the war.

The imperialist bourgeoisie will seek to overcome these obstacles by further attacks upon labor and by direct participation in the war. But this will not be so easy. It will be much more difficult than during the

last war to "buy off" large sections of the working class. *The economic basis for social chauvinism has been drastically narrowed.* It has been reduced as a result of the process of rationalization in industry and the extended periods of severe economic crises which have destroyed whole sectors of the labor aristocracy. This development finds expression in the great strides made by industrial unionism during the last period in the organization of the basic and mass production industries chiefly through the C.I.O. but also through certain sectors of the A. F. of L. It may be possible to restore some of the former positions of the labor aristocracy even on the basis of a limited war stimulus and super-profits obtained from imperialist expansion in South America, but never again on the scale of the last world war and of the era of post-war "prosperity."

To a large measure, it is this aspiration on the part of reactionary labor leaders to regain lost positions which leads their ideological spokesmen already to put forth with such haste and thoroughness all the arguments for labor's support for war. However, social chauvinism cannot be expected to follow in all important aspects the pattern set by the social patriots of the Second International during the first World War. Not only is the economic base of social chauvinism reduced, but its political effectiveness has been seriously delimited. The independent political force of the working class internationally is greatly matured and finds organizational expression in the Communist Parties.

In 1914 the Social-Democratic Parties were already corrupted by op-

portunism whose natural offspring was social-chauvinism. Only the Russian Bolsheviks led by Lenin and a number of small groups in the Socialist Parties of the West opposed the imperialist war, favored the defeat of their "own" bourgeoisie, and raised the perspective of turning the imperialist war into a civil war against capitalism. It was as a *result* of the struggle against the first world imperialist war and the social-imperialists of the Second International that the Marxist-Leninist parties were formed and the first socialist state created. The correct policy towards imperialist war, gained as a result of the long and bitter struggle against opportunism and social chauvinism, is now the cornerstone of Communist policy, at the very outset of the new imperialist slaughter. The unanimity with which the Communist Parties, not only of the neutral but also of the belligerent countries, characterized the present war as an imperialist war shows how completely the situation has changed since 1914-1918. These are serious forces, having wide influence among the working class and its allies in the countries of imperialism as well as in the colonial world, which cannot be stilled by repressive measures and the lies of social-patriotism, and from the start offer great obstacles to the further prosecution of the war.

The deeds and declarations of Blum in France, of the Labor Party leadership in England, of Waldman-O'Neal-Thomas in the United States, show how social-chauvinism takes a full-blown course from the start. These agents of imperialism within the working class, in unison with the

Trotsky-Lovestone camp, become immediately the spokesmen for the most reactionary circles of finance capital and the spearhead of the imperialist policy. Not only do they take over lock-stock-and-barrel the ideological trimmings of the present imperialist war—"liberation of oppressed peoples" (only of the peoples oppressed by the enemy imperialism, of course), the demagogic use of anti-fascist slogans, etc., etc. They are the first to cry treason whenever a voice is raised against the imperialist war or for peace, they prepare the way for fascism within each country by their denunciations of the Communists, they are in the forefront of those seeking to convert the present war into a war against the Soviet Union.

In this respect the Social-Democratic leaders in the United States are by no means backward. They are to be found in the vanguard of the war party, shouting "treason" and "betrayal of democracy," as if the United States were already at war. Their resolution foisted upon the American Labor Party of New York identifies them with Martin Dies in the drive against all opponents of the imperialist war and the attempt to incite war against the Soviet Union.

The rebuff which this move is meeting in New York and the failure of their war incitement to "catch" in the ranks of labor should forewarn these gentlemen. They have overplayed their hand, misled by their trust in the pattern of the last war. The Dies-Waldman witch hunt has failed to light the fires of war hysteria. Despite serious efforts, their campaign did not take root in the A. F. of L. Convention; the A. F. of L. Executive Coun-

cil has its ears too close to the ground and knows the immediate resistance that would arise from the workers against such war resolutions as presented in the A.L.P. Social chauvinism is the other face of opportunism and class collaboration—and the workers have had their taste of these. They know that they are facing a new drive against hard-won union standards and social legislation and know that this drive can be defeated not in the manner of the Greens, Wolls and Waldmans, but along the tried and true methods of militant trade unionism. The C.I.O. convention in San Francisco has made this clear.

* * *

For the time, the position of the American imperialist bourgeoisie is strengthened by the outbreak of war in Europe and it will take full advantage of this war to further entrench and extend itself at the expense of the masses at home and the colonial peoples. The war has unleashed all the predatory forces of Wall Street and the resources at the disposal of the imperialist bourgeoisie must not be

underestimated. The war is already resulting in the forceful reassertion of the most reactionary tendencies of finance capital, and the Roosevelt Administration, including the liberal bourgeois-democratic circles it primarily represents, is succumbing to the pressure of monopoly capital. The forces dominant in American political life are embarked on a course leading to war. With the aid of social chauvinists of all types, they are adapting anti-fascist sentiments to serve as an "ideological" base of social support for imperialist war.

Every step of the imperialist bourgeoisie towards aggrandizement at home and abroad will be met by resistance and struggle on the part of the masses on a scale never experienced before. Because the situation is radically different in so many important aspects than in 1914-18, these struggles lead to the fatal weakening of world imperialism. The imperialist bourgeoisie must contend with a new relationship of forces, at home as well as internationally, which will turn the second world imperialist war into a struggle for world socialism.

BACKWARD EUROPE AND PROGRESSIVE ASIA

BY V. I. LENIN

[*This brilliant and penetrating article of Lenin, written twenty-six years ago, assumes a special timeliness today, and should be made accessible to all for the valuable lessons it contains.*

The main strategy of Anglo-French imperialism is the transformation of the imperialist war into a combined counter-revolutionary attack against the Soviet Union.

The hirelings and apologists of imperialism, the Lindberghs, Lippmanns and Dorothy Thompsons, are already busily engaged in preparing the ideological justification for this designed war upon the Soviet Union, and for American participation in it.

While reactionary newspaper headlines cynically refer to the mighty liberating Red Army as an "Asiatic horde," Colonel Lindbergh sounds hollow warnings of the dangers to "the white race" of an "Asiatic Ghengis Khan" and anticipates "the time for us . . . to fight side by side with the British, French, Germans. . . ." Against whom, may we ask, Colonel Lindbergh?

Walter Lippmann joins the parade in his column in the New York Herald Tribune of October 13 with the following: "There can be no safety for Germany or Europe except through a Germany capable of becom-

ing the protector of the European border line."

And Dorothy Thompson enters the lists in her column of the same issue of the Herald Tribune with the most extended and consistent expression of this program:

"Russia, Asia and Africa have never produced a society which is a synthesis of the Christian ethic. . . ."

"This war is a war to force Germany back into Western civilization, and then to reorganize and strengthen that civilization by cooperative effort. . . . It is a war to enforce unity.

"The cry of Europe to Germany is, 'Come back to us, be one of us, work with us for a new Europe. Come back, come back, come home.'"

Thus the real "war aims" of British-French imperialism are clearly revealed to mean the inclusion of German imperialism, in its present or perhaps in slightly altered form of rule, for a concerted attack upon the Soviet Union, and to win America for that war if possible.

Meanwhile the ideological and moral "justification" for this criminal conspiracy against all humanity is being cooked up in the form of a witch's brew of hypocritical appeals to "preserve Western culture, art, science, religion and law" against encroachments by "Asiatic backwardness and

barbarism." In this wise is the campaign for the destruction of the Soviet Union, fortress of socialism and beacon light of progress for all toiling humanity, being prepared.

Lenin's keen analysis, showing which class is the bearer of progress and which the bearer of reaction, savagery, and degradation, gives us a weapon to dispel the smokescreen of the spokesmen of imperialism.—THE EDITORS.]

BACKWARD EUROPE AND PROGRESSIVE ASIA

THE juxtaposition of the above words would seem to be a paradox. Who doesn't know that Europe is progressive, and Asia backward? But there is a bitter truth in the words we have taken as title of the present article.

In civilized and progressive Europe, with its brilliantly developed technique, its rich, highly-varied culture and constitution, an historical moment has arrived in which, in its fear of the growing and increasingly strong proletariat, the bourgeoisie in command is giving its support to all backward, declining, medieval elements. The dying bourgeoisie is uniting with all dead and dying forces in order to preserve its crumbling system of wage slavery.

In progressive Europe the bourgeoisie, supporting all backward elements, is in command. In our day Europe is progressive, not *because* of the bourgeoisie, but *despite* it; for the proletariat alone is continually increasing its army of millions of fighters for a better future, it alone is preserving and spreading ruthless hatred

for all backwardness, savagery, privilege, slavery and the degradation of man by man.

In "progressive" Europe *only* the proletariat is a *progressive* class. But the living bourgeoisie is ready to resort to any savagery, bestiality and crime in order to defend the rotting capitalist slavery.

And it is hardly possible to cite a more striking example of this rotting state of *all* the European bourgeoisie than its support of the *reaction* in Asia for the mercenary ends of the financiers and swindler capitalists.

Everywhere in Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, extending, and increasing in strength. There the bourgeoisie is *still* marching with the people against reaction. Hundreds of millions of people are awakening to life, to light, to freedom. What exultation this world movement arouses in the hearts of all class-conscious workers, who know that the road to collectivism lies through democracy. With what sympathy for young Asia are all honest democrats imbued.

But "progressive" Europe? It is pillaging China and assisting the enemies of democracy, the enemies of freedom in China!

Here is a simple, but instructive little story. The new Chinese loan has been concluded *against* the Chinese democracy: "Europe" is for Yuan Shi-kai,* who is preparing a military dictatorship. Why is it for him? Because of an advantageous business transaction. The loan has been concluded for

* Yuan Shi-kai—First president of the Chinese Republic, 1912-1916. He first fought to save the Manchu dynasty, then sought to found a new dynasty in his own person. The Japanese intervention in 1916 checked his plans.

a sum of about two hundred and fifty million rubles at a rate of 84 to par. This means that the bourgeoisie of "Europe" will *pay* the Chinese two hundred and ten millions, while it will take two hundred and twenty-five million rubles from the public. So that in the course of a few weeks you get a pure profit of *fifteen million rubles!* And that in reality is a fine "pure" profit, isn't it?

But supposing the Chinese people do not recognize the loan? For there is a republic in China, and if the majority of those in the parliament are *against* the loan?

Oh, then "progressive" Europe will begin to cry out about "civilization," "order," "culture," and the "father-

land"! Then it will move up the *cannon* and crush the republic of "backward" Asia in alliance with the adventurist, traitor and friend of reaction, Yuan Shi-kai!

All in command in Europe, all the European bourgeoisie are in *alliance* with all the forces of reaction and medievalism in China.

But, on the other hand, all youthful Asia, *i.e.*, the hundreds of millions of toilers in Asia, have a trustworthy ally in the form of the proletariat of all civilized countries. No force in the world can restrain its victory, which will free both the peoples of Europe and the peoples of Asia.

(Unsigned.)

Pravda No. 113 for May 18, 1913.

THE STRUGGLE OF THE SPANISH PEOPLE CONTINUES

BY MANUEL ROJAS

THREE years have passed since the outbreak of the fascist insurrection in Spain, prepared and carried out by Italo-German fascism. For almost three years the Spanish people were engaged in a national liberation war for the independence of their country, for democracy, for progress and civilization. The unity of the Spanish people was established and consolidated in the course of this struggle.

It was precisely the Communist Party which was the organizing and guiding force of the People's Front, the force that cemented and rallied the entire Spanish people in the struggle against fascist intervention. Only thanks to the efforts of the Communist Party were the Spanish people able to surprise the world by their miracle of almost three years of heroic resistance against the open intervention of the two major fascist states who were armed to the teeth, and against the covert intervention of world reaction. The Communist Party had to conduct a stubborn struggle on all important issues (the formation of a regular, disciplined People's Army, the establishment of a single army command, centralization of industry, particularly the war industries, the pursual of a correct agrarian policy, the inclusion of all parties and organ-

izations of the People's Front, including the anarchists, into the government).

On all basic and decisive issues the Communist Party was compelled to wage a struggle against the anarchists, the Caballero-ists-Trotskyites and Right opportunists, as well as the capitulationist elements in the Socialist Party. It had to overcome the wavering of the petty-bourgeois parties and the separatist tendencies of certain groups among the Basques and Catalonians. As a result of this struggle, the People's Front was able to develop a uniform political line on all fundamental issues. Errors committed by the individual organizations were rectified, but frequently rather late, resulting in great loss of time and forces.

Despite the heroic efforts and sacrifices, the Spanish people have suffered a temporary defeat in the present stage of the struggle. This defeat is the result of the "non-intervention," *i. e.*, the policy of concealed intervention, which led to the blockade of the legitimate Republican government, causing hunger among the population and an acute shortage of armaments. It is the result of the Munich policy of British and French imperialism, the going over of world reaction to open intervention. Lastly, the decisive blow

in the back of the Spanish people was inflicted by the contemptible traitors Besteiro, Casado, and Co. who broke the unity of the people and the army, disarmed the troops and opened the gates of impregnable Madrid to Franco and his masters, the Italo-German interventionists. The Spanish people did not surrender, they were victims of vile betrayal and deceit.

Today the Spanish people are living through one of the most difficult periods in the history of their country. But the struggle is not over, it will continue. What the fascist dictatorship of Franco and his masters means to the Spanish people may be judged by the reign of terror, poverty, starvation and arbitrariness which has ruled for three long years in the districts occupied by the fascist armies. After the capture of Republican Spain the Franco regime has become still more brutal, barbarian, and detestable.

FRANCO'S TERRORIST DICTATORSHIP

An open terrorist fascist dictatorship has been instituted in Spain. The country has been turned back to the darkest days of inquisition and despotism. The semi-feudal castes, the church and the militarists have not only restored their privileges of old, but have even extended them.

Franco has embarked on the destruction of all the social gains of the working people. His aim is to wipe out the entire "heritage" of the People's Front government. All the laws enacted by the People's Front government have been repealed, including even the marriage regulations. All factories and other industrial establishments confiscated or collectivized by the republic have been returned to

their former owners. The newspaper *Espana* (May 8, 1939), reports that arrangements have been made for the return of all industrial and commercial enterprises, all the property of the monasteries, the palaces, etc., to their former owners. Institutes of National Reconstruction, now being organized throughout the country, issue advance payments to industrialists who have suffered losses as a result of the war. The funds of these institutes are made up of "donations from all Spaniards"; but in actual practice these sums are derived from the enforcement of the decree on "political responsibility" which provides for various fines and special levies and the confiscation of all property belonging to anti-fascists.

Another source of revenue is the so-called "compulsory personal labor" (*prestaciones personales*) which in essence is tantamount to forced labor for the benefit of the big capitalists. In the past only prisoners and prisoners of war were compelled to work without remuneration, but now forced labor is being extended to the widest sections of the population.

The Spanish fascists, copying the demagogy of Italian and German fascism, speak of eliminating classes and the class struggle in Spain. They claim that the whole population of the country is being transformed into working people and call for the organization of unions embracing both workers and employers. "We do not recognize classes in Spain. The employer and the worker are regarded by the state as producers with definite rights and obligations" (*Solidaridad Nacional*, May 31, 1939).

A system of syndicates subordinated

to a special "Ministry for the Organization of Syndicate Action" is being introduced. These syndicates will be organized by industries and membership will be compulsory for all workers and employers, the latter being appointed "directors" and accountable to the government for the management of the given enterprise. A syndicate will be organized in each industrial establishment with a special governing body headed by the employer ("director"). This body will examine individual grievances, regulate working conditions, etc. Each province will have its own provincial syndicate leader working in conjunction with provincial authorities and subordinated to the "Ministry for the Organization of Syndicate Action."

"Syndicalization" means the organization of corporations in accordance with Italian models. This involves the prohibition of strikes and conflicts between workers and employers, which is tantamount to the complete enslavement of the working class by the fascist regime. This becomes particularly clear when regarded in the light of the recently published labor law. In practice this law merely provides for the establishment of a system of fines and punishment for the working class. The law, for example, forbids the employer to exceed his authority with regard to the worker and forbids any action of the workers which may be detrimental to the rights and interests of the employer, breach of discipline, disrespect for the authorities and failure to attain a definite standard of labor productivity.

The law especially emphasizes that each and every worker "is in duty bound to display a maximum of effi-

ciency and activity at work in accordance with his physical ability and professional skill. . . ." Failure to do so leads to the following punitive measures prescribed by the law: *for employers*—a small fine not exceeding 1,000 peseta; *for workers*—a fine, loss of skill category and standing in industry, dismissal and the loss of all rights connected with the job. In addition to this, a worker is required to make good the losses suffered by the employer and the latter can demand that this be effected by overtime work. Should the worker leave the factory or be discharged, his new employer is compelled to deduct the appropriate sum from his earnings and turn it over to his former employer. Thus, this law is directed exclusively against the workers, and the "punishment" it prescribes for the employers is sheer demagoguery.

Among the numerous forms of repression, mention should be made of the decree which gives the employer the right to dismiss any number of workers, or even all workers, should they be accused of even the slightest participation in political, trade union or military activities under the republic. Special punishment is meted out to those who performed control functions in industry, who came out against the nationalist movement, etc. Employers are required to report to the local authorities the names of all workers thus dismissed, stating the definite charges against them. Apparently this is necessary for drawing up black lists and for the enforcement of the law on "political responsibility."

As a result of these measures a large number of workers have been discharged from industry and left to

their own resources. Obviously they cannot find work and are doomed to starvation. At the same time the employers have been given the opportunity of utilizing prison labor on a large scale. Thus, it is obvious that the fascist legislation, as well as the judicial system, present the employers with wide possibilities for the utilization of forced, unpaid labor. The punitive organs of Franco and his masters are able to increase their funds out of the special payments made by industrialists for the work of prisoners. Franco has forbidden the population freely to move about the country. No Spaniard is allowed to leave his native city or village even for a short period, be it only a month, without special permission of the authorities. This indeed is actual enslavement of the Spanish people.

The economic life of the country is at a standstill. Industrial output has fallen to 20 per cent of what it was before the war, and in the main industry of Catalonia, textiles, it is only 15 per cent. Unemployment has grown to enormous dimensions. The average daily wage is two to four peseta, the price of a kilogram of beans. The working day has been lengthened to ten to twelve hours. On the whole, the present standard of living of the Spanish worker is the lowest in Europe.

In the national regions of Catalonia and the Basque country all the political, economic and cultural gains of the population, as well as national culture, are being eradicated. The use of the native language in public and government institutions as well as in all public places is forbidden. Tuition in all Catalonian and Basque schools

is in the Spanish language. In Catalonia all signs in the native language have been removed and Spanish signs substituted.

FRANCO'S AGRARIAN PROGRAM

In the first days of the fascist insurrection Franco's agrarian program consisted only of very vague promises "to raise the role of the family and increase its prosperity," to increase crops, and to consolidate the position of private property. The actual aim of Franco's agrarian policy, however, was to save the property of the landlords, to maintain all semi-feudal forms of exploitation of the peasantry and agricultural laborers, and crush the forces of the agrarian revolution.

Prior to the insurrection, the program of Gil Robles called for agrarian reform based on the purchase of part of the landed estates "at a just price" (for the landlord). Today, however, there is no mention of this. On the contrary, all measures previously adopted by the Republican government to put the agrarian reform into operation have been revoked. The agricultural laborers have now been deprived of the land they received after the victory of the People's Front.

In accordance with Franco's decree, the estates, which under the Left Republican government had been divided among the peasants, have been taken away from the peasants and returned to the landlords.

An example of how the land which the peasants had received from the Republican Institute of Agrarian Reform was "returned" to the landowners can be seen by the slaughter perpetrated by Phalangist pickets in

Salamanca. The fascists killed 119 men and 32 women, all they could lay their hands on. Their bodies were thrown into a ravine at the roadside as a lesson to all who dare encroach on "what does not belong to them." (*Claridad*, April 5, 1938.)

But the peasants were deprived not only of the land they received as a result of the republic's agrarian reform. Many small peasants who were known to harbor anti-fascist tendencies have been deprived of farms which had belonged to them for many years. This land has now been turned over to Italian colonists. The *Journal des Nation* of February 6, 1939, published the following data on the amount of land taken from the peasants and placed at the disposal of Italian colonists: in Malaga Province—284,000 hectares; in Cordova—180,000 hectares; in Sevilla—254,000 hectares. In Cadiz Province several thousand poor peasants have been driven from their farms, while in Grenada a tremendous amount of land was set for confiscation (*Servicio Español de Información*, February 7, 1938). The interventionists have set themselves the aim of building up a base in the Spanish countryside. For this purpose they have begun to implant Italian settlers on the land. Spanish farmhands are forced to work for them and suffer severe treatment.

The wide masses of the Spanish people are doomed to poverty and starvation. The area under crops and the number of livestock have declined sharply. The numerous fines and taxes levied on the peasants and agricultural laborers are steadily increasing. Rents are climbing rapidly, resulting in mass poverty among tenant farm-

ers. On June 8, 1939, Franco issued a law regulating the position of tenant farmers and sharecroppers in the zone occupied by his troops after September 30, 1938. This new law repeals all the measures introduced by the Republican government.

The sharecroppers and tenant farmers, who received the land they tilled from the Republican government in perpetuity, are no longer regarded as masters of their farms and can cultivate them only on the basis of agreements with the landlords. Moreover, they are compelled to pay rent for the entire period of the war, these payments to be deposited within definitely fixed terms. All people sentenced by the Franco tribunals for participation in the struggle against Franco, all peasants who were members of collective farm organizations, are completely deprived of the right to rent land.

An acute shortage of labor still exists in the villages, although hostilities have ceased. Over 60 per cent of the male population have not returned after the war. The shortage of labor makes it impossible to carry out all necessary farming work, and this is fraught with grave consequences for the fascists. "One more year with a poor harvest will be fatal for the economy of the country. . . ."

According to fascist statistics, undoubtedly exaggerated, this year's cereal crop is no more than 50 per cent of the normal crop. The peasants are not disposed to grow cereals for the fascists and their foreign masters.

THE POPULATION IS HUNGRY

The situation is aggravated by the fact that the export to Germany, not

only of mining products, but also of foodstuffs, has not ceased, despite the food shortage in the country. Throughout Spain a system of food ration cards has been introduced. The population is hungry, it has no work, nor money, nor provisions. In Guipuzcoa every inhabitant is allowed to buy no more than one quarter of a liter of vegetable oil and one kilogram of potatoes in seventeen days. In the Biscay area the monthly ration consists of 250 grams of sugar, one kilogram of potatoes, 100 grams of sausage and 100 grams of coffee. Meat, butter, and tea have disappeared entirely. But even if they could be had, the price would be prohibitive for the vast majority of the population.

Food prices have increased several-fold as compared with 1936. Thus, the price of cabbage has increased four-fold, potatoes—threefold, tomatoes—ninefold, apples—fifteenfold.

This starvation, poverty, enslavement, forced labor, national oppression, all find proper political forms under the new fascist "state system" which makes vile barbarity and sanguinary terror the keynote of its program.

FRANCO'S "ORGANIZED DEMOCRACY"

The fascists have destroyed all the gains of democracy achieved under the republic.

The correspondent of *Popolo d'Italiano* was told by Franco that the Spanish nation would no longer expose itself to the "danger of universal suffrage" and that all its institutions will be subordinated to the "supreme national interests within the framework of an organized democracy."

The nature of the "organized democracy" may be judged by the slaughters organized by the Franco authorities, by the bestial terror and repression against the Spanish people. Not only have free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of organization and assembly been abolished completely, but all Republicans and anti-fascists have been virtually outlawed by the decree on "political responsibility." All members of People's Front parties and separatist organizations and all those "who enjoyed the confidence of People's Front organizations, all persons who participated in the organization of the 1936 elections and who, by their actions facilitated the introduction of the ideals of the People's Front," come under this law. All of them are threatened with arrest, exile, confiscation of property, deprivation of citizenship and, in the majority of cases, with the death sentence. This law is directed against 90 per cent of the Spanish population.

During the war Franco declared that there would be no amnesty after his victory. The fascist authorities, on the day following the seizure of Catalonia, compiled lists of two million "suspicious Spaniards living in the red zone" who were doomed to physical annihilation. This is the tested practice of the executioner, for Franco has exercised mass annihilation of democratic elements throughout the entire course of the war. The horrible figures are known to all—50,000 killed and tortured in Galicia; 18,000 in Badajos; 25,000 in Sevilla; 10,000 in Asturias.

Franco himself places the number of killed in Spain during the war at 1,200,000, of whom 450,000 were killed in action and 750,000 were non-

combatants. To this must be added the barbaric bombing of peaceful cities and villages, of thousands of towns and hamlets wiped off the face of the earth together with their populations. Mass executions took place in numerous villages. For example, in Puente Jenil, a village in Cordova Province, 1,800 people were shot during the first week after its occupation by the fascists. Particularly brutal has been the treatment meted out in those villages where partisan warfare had existed or where assistance was rendered to the Republican partisans. After the seizure of Catalonia and Madrid the fascists instituted a merciless reign of terror against the population. During the first month of Franco rule in Madrid over 35,000 people were put to death; the number in Barcelona was 25,000 and 15,000 in Valencia. These figures demonstrate the scope of the slaughter perpetrated by the fascists throughout the country.

There is not a city in Spain but where dozens of military tribunals sit in session day and night. In Madrid alone from 400 to 500 death sentences are passed every day. According to statistics published in the official fascist press, half a million people were in prison and concentration camps in May, 1939; they are subjected to torture and menaced by death, unless the movement of international solidarity comes to their rescue. Actually, the number of victims of fascist terror can well be placed at one million, of whom approximately 800,000 are men of the Republican Army and 200,000 civilians. Such is the grim reality of the fascist rule.

As a result of the terror the hatred

for the fascist regime is growing in the hearts of the Spanish people.

THE STRUGGLE IS TAKING NEW FORMS

The Spanish people have been deprived of their democracy and the rights they won under the republic. The Spanish peasantry has been deprived of the land it won. The Basques, Catalonians and Galicians have again been reduced to nations doubly oppressed. On numerous occasions in the past the Spanish people have heroically fought against their oppressors. For centuries the peasantry of Spain has fought for land and liberty, and it will continue its tenacious struggle.

The Catalonians and Basques have for hundreds of years fought for their independence and they will never be reconciled to the oppression of the fascist regime of executioner Franco.

Ever since the victory of the People's Front three years ago the people of republican Spain held the factories and land, learned the use of arms, actively participated in political life, and went through a rich schooling of political training.

In Andalusia, Estremadura and Galicia, Franco found it easier to establish his sanguinary dictatorship, since these districts were in his hands from the very first days of the war, and the peasantry was not able to make use of all the advantages accruing from the victory of the People's Front. But it is a fact, none the less, that the peasants of these provinces waged a hard struggle against the forces of foreign intervention, a struggle which took on various forms and culminated in widespread armed partisan warfare.

The struggle will inevitably con-

tinue. World reaction will never succeed in bringing the freedom-loving Spanish people to their knees.

"In spite of all the support of world reaction, neither kings nor dictators, neither Alfonsos nor Primo de Riveras have succeeded in staying on the backs of the Spanish people. How then can this monster who has destroyed Spanish cities and villages with German artillery, who has slaughtered thousands of Spanish women and children with Italian bombs, this butcher who has drenched Spain with blood and who has been spurned and anathemized by the Spanish people, expect to stay on their backs?"*

The wrath of the people will sweep away the fascist tyranny. The struggle continues. The "conquerors" themselves are constrained to admit this. At the time of the "Victory Parade" in Madrid, Franco betrayed a lack of confidence in the stability of his rule. He was compelled to declare: "Today I cannot hide from you the danger which threatens our fatherland. Battlefronts have disappeared, but the struggle continues in other spheres. . . . Let us create no illusions." (*L'Humanité*, May 21, 1939.)

The fascist *Diario Vasco*, in reporting a meeting of Falangists in San Sebastian, quotes the governor of that province as declaring: "Our bitterest enemies are among us, a thousand times more dangerous than those we faced at the battlefronts."

The fascist leaders openly declare that the war is not over, that it continues on the invisible battlefronts.

Contradictions and friction within the fascist camp itself are increasing, at times assuming the character of open clashes resulting in bloodshed.

* D. Manuilsky, *The World Communist Movement*, pp. 27-28. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

Despite the monstrous terror, repression and espionage, the Republicans continue to develop their underground activities. The fascists have coined a new phrase, the "Sixth Column," giving this name to the Republicans who continue the struggle. Despite the fierce censorship and the expulsion of anti-fascist foreign correspondents, news leaks out from the country describing instances of public protests against Italo-German colonization and the Franco regime. The slogan "Spain for the Spaniards" is gaining popularity among the wide masses of town and country. To this very day clashes between Falangists and Republicans have not ceased. Fascists are frequently attacked and the foreign interventionists meet with determined resistance. The workers reduce their labor productivity and peasants do not sow their fields. Guerilla warfare continues in the mountain districts of Asturias. Many thousands of people, chiefly Republican soldiers, outlawed by the Franco government, have fled to the hills. They have found shelter in numerous caves and canyons, successfully evade the Franco forces and attack fascist punitive expeditions. In June a Republican insurrection broke out in Mieres, the center of the Asturian mountains country, which was the scene of the glorious battles in October, 1934, and of a revolutionary insurrection movement during the entire period of struggle against Italo-German invaders. The news of this revolt facilitated the outbreak of mutinies and unrest in other parts of the country. Franco was compelled to dispatch a whole army division to suppress this movement.

Despite the brutal treatment of prisoners, the movement of protest and resistance to the fascist regime has spread to the concentration camps. Recently a revolt flared up in the Albaterra concentration camp and Franco succeeded in suppressing it only by resorting to unprecedented terror. The Franco regime is sitting on a volcano.

At the recent international conference for the defense of peace and democracy, Cesar Falcon, reviewing the position in Spain, drew the following conclusion:

"The tremendous patriotic upsurge is gaining new strength and driving force with every passing day. And the time is not distant when it will overflow its banks, as it has done previously, with ever increasing might."
(*Voz de los Espanoles*, May 27, 1939.)

The history of the struggle of the Spanish people shows that every time

reaction came to power in Spain, the people arose anew to fight with increased force and were victorious. The Spanish people remember that they have overthrown the fascist dictatorship of Primo de Rivera. They know that the republic conquered after the defeat of the heroic movement in Jaca. They know that the temporary defeat, suffered in the glorious October days of 1934, was followed by the victory of the People's Front. The Spanish people know the power of unity and have seen its decisive significance in practice. The Spanish people have a strong and glorious Communist Party, steeled in the fire of battle. This imbues them with confidence in their own forces and urges them on to further struggle. The struggle in Spain will continue in new forms. The great Spanish people will emerge victorious.

FREUDISM—PSYCHOLOGY OF A DYING CLASS

BY R. L. GLEY

ONE of the major spheres for the application of psychological science, and hence a principal source for influences on the development of psychology, is the field of mental disease. Sigmund Freud is the outstanding figure among those whose work has been founded primarily on observations in this field.

Freud's practical work as a physician determined that the materials with which he built his theories should be drawn from his experience with neurotics—persons who fail to make proper adjustments to life problems because of the interference of seemingly unaccountable and sometimes unrecognized fears. Freud is the first great figure in the history of psychology whose vision has been narrowed down to the *failings* of human behavior, giving no attention whatever to its successes in meeting the practical demands of life.

The class structure of society determined that those who came to him for help, prepared to pay, came almost exclusively from the wealthier strata of society. Their anxieties, therefore, did not arise from immediate economic insecurity, and whoever should treat their ills would have his attention turned toward the investigation of remote causes of personality disorder,

and would tend to depreciate the importance of immediate economic difficulties. This is one of the important factors which determined the direction of Freud's work.

It is without any intent of disparagement, therefore, but simply as an historical appraisal, that we characterize Freud as a psychologist of the dying bourgeois class. The class character of his patients, as is evident from the case histories, was important in leading Freud to his real, positive contributions to psychology. It was also, we shall see, an important factor in determining his errors.

FREUD'S MAIN DOCTRINES

Freud was responsible, more than anyone else, for winning recognition of the importance of non-intellectual factors in behavior. He showed that it is not possible to explain our actions and our conscious thoughts without reference to motivations of which we are not aware, but which nevertheless exercise influence over us. He showed that often the effect of social disapproval is to check conscious thought about a line of action, while permitting the underlying motivation to continue in operation. Finally, he showed that when a course of action has thus been barred by social restraints, other

fields of behavior may be disturbed or stimulated as a result.

It has sometimes been said that these principles (unconscious motivation, repression, transference), which undoubtedly contain large elements of truth, represent all the essentials of psychoanalysis. Such a definition is very misleading. Freud and his followers have built up an involved system of theories about the *nature* of unconscious motives, and the *forms* of repression and transference. These theories constitute psychoanalysis, and it is with the analysis of these specific theories that we are concerned.

Let us state some of the salient points of these theories, as briefly as possible, as a basis for discussion. It will not be possible to give them fully, or to consider the many variants that have been put forth by others than Freud.

(A) THEORY OF INSTINCTS

According to Freud, our actions are ultimately controlled by two types of instinctive desire: sex, which he defines very broadly, and native aggression or the "destructive instinct" or "death instinct."

Sex had a dominating, exclusive position in Freud's early work. It is a fact that severe disturbances of the personality are always accompanied by disturbances in the sphere of sex behavior. Freud pointed out this fact, and stressed its importance. He interpreted it to mean that sex was the root of all neurotic difficulties. (This is not a necessary conclusion, since other causes, such as an exaggerated emphasis on individual competition, may cause inability to enter honestly and confidently into any close social

relationships, including the intimate relations of normal sex behavior.) He developed an elaborate theory of sex, tracing its development from early infancy through various stages to maturity. The passage to maturity involves the "repression" of earlier, infantile forms of sexual desire. And the source of our adult difficulties lies, according to Freud, in persistence of the infantile desires, in unconscious form. The central core of the psychological development of every individual is the *Oedipus complex*—the passionate attachment of the child to the parent of opposite sex, along with resentment toward the other parent, and the whole course of emotional development involved in overcoming these sentiments, successfully or unsuccessfully (*i.e.*, their repression and transference.)

"Native aggression" or the "instinct of destruction" did not appear as an independent factor in Freud's work until the time of the World War. Before then, he had explained the frequent anti-social tendencies in neurotic behavior as simply a distorted expression of sexual impulses. The spectacle of well-nigh universal destruction and hate led him (because he lacked any understanding of the real causes of war) to assume that this was the expression of a primal instinct, a "natural instinct of aggressiveness in man, the hostility of each one against all and of all against each one, (which) opposes the program of civilization."*

This "instinct of aggression" was slow to take hold. Most analysts ignored it at first, and a few still reject it. However, in the current historical

* *Civilization and Its Discontents*, p. 102.

epoch of unrestrained imperialist aggression it has come to take a prominent place in analytic practice and writings. A reason for this is that with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, analysts find it increasingly difficult to deal with their patients' problems on a wholly individual plane, but are forced more and more to relate them to the position of these patients in society, in order to get the necessary confidence.

Today, psychoanalysis is a system in which "hate" occupies a position of equal eminence with "love." Both are supposed to be instincts, rooted in man's biological constitution. Together, they constitute what Freud calls the "id"—a deep, impersonal self of which we are seldom aware, but which ultimately controls all our acts.

(B) REPRESSION AND TRANSFERENCE

The uncontrolled gratification of these primitive instincts, says Freud, would bring men into constant conflict with one another. For this reason, society establishes certain prohibitions. It is in the process of yielding to these social regulations that we carry out the "repression" of our instinctive desires, driving them "into the unconscious." In part, these social restrictions only reinforce nature, by helping to carry out the repressions of early forms of sexuality which are necessary in order to reach maturity. The most decisive of these repressions take place in childhood, within the family. Of special importance is the son's love for his mother, or the daughter's love for her father, which must be repressed because of the prohibition against incest.

However, these "repressed" desires do not become inactive. They are the source of lasting emotional conflicts. They pop up again and again, to attain their objectives under various subtle disguises. All through life, according to psychoanalysis, we go on seeking symbolic gratifications for these desires, which we are not permitted to satisfy directly or even to recognize as existing. Not only the symptoms of the neurotic, but the imaginative work of the artist and the inventions of the scientist are interpreted in this light.

The use to which this theory of "transference" is put, whether in explaining the vagaries of individual behavior or in interpreting large-scale social phenomena, is summed up nicely in Roheim's phrase, that "Life consists of finding a series of substitutes for the things we really want to do." *

INSTINCT OR HISTORY?

Let us begin our analysis by comparing the Freudian and the Marxian viewpoints on the relation of society and human nature. Freud and Engels have both written about the forms of restriction placed upon marriage in primitive societies. Engels (in *The Origin of the Family*) asserts that in the earliest human societies men must have been quite free of jealousy. Otherwise, these groups could not have come together, for peaceful cooperation in hunting, to share dwelling places, etc. Marriage forms arose later as the result of the development of property relations, and "if anything is certain it is that jealousy is developed

* "Psychoanalysis and Anthropology," in *Psychoanalysis Today*, edited by S. Lorand, 1933, p. 316.

at a comparatively late stage."*

Freud (in *Totem and Tabu*) presents an exactly opposite picture. For him, the beginning of all social history is the imposition of restrictions on sex activity, because of the necessity to control *native* jealousy. The first, "natural" form of society is a horde in which the oldest male tyrannizes over the others, keeping all the women for himself. The younger males do away with this tyrant father (the first "revolution"), but later they impose voluntary restrictions on themselves, starting the history of social institutions.

Engels sees human nature as a social product (jealousy as the outcome of institutions based on production relations); Freud sees society as the expression of a static human nature (native jealousy leads to institutionalized forms of living). The one is materialistic; the other, idealistic.

Psychoanalysis ignores the reality of culturally developed motives, ignores the material conditions which give rise to them, and hunts only to discover the instinctive urges which it assumes to lie behind them. Applied in this way, the theory of transference is a license for unlimited imagination of loose analogies. A good illustration of the method is Ferenczi's "discovery" that the quest for profit is an expression of repressed anal eroticism—gold being a symbol for the feces with which we were forbidden to play as children. After all, we are told quite soberly, what other reason could there be for calling money "filthy"?*

* Frederick Engels, *Origin of the Family*, p. 43.

** However, the very conception of this analogy was only possible because its author had certain confused "socialist" ideas.

To sum up, psychoanalysis considers that the most important determinants of human actions are certain fixed, immutable instincts, which find distorted expressions in life and history. This Freudian conception is utterly irreconcilable with the Marxian view, which is more and more becoming the accepted view of science, that "human nature" is a social product, an evolving product of history.

Freud's position is not very different, logically, from that which Marx criticized in his famous *Theses on Feuerbach*:

"Feuerbach resolves the essence of religion into the essence of *man*. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each separate individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of social relations.

"Feuerbach, who does not enter more deeply into the criticism of this real essence, is therefore forced:

"1. To abstract from the process of history and to establish the religious temperament as something independent, and to postulate an abstract—*isolated*—human individual.

"2. The essence of man can therefore be understood only as 'genus,' the inward, dumb generality which *naturally* unites the many individuals.

"Feuerbach therefore does not see that the 'religious temperament' itself is a social product and that the abstract individual whom he analyzes belongs to a particular form of society."

It is in just this way that Freud deals with abstract, isolated individuals, whose instinctive "essence" he arrives at by abstracting from the process of history.

A THEORY FOR "STATUS QUO"

In order to understand what kind of thinking is used in the formation of the theories of psychoanalysis, it may be of some help to examine another example of the same sort of thinking

in the history of science. Before the time of modern embryology (the science of the development of individual organisms), it used to be assumed that all the parts of the grown animal were already present in the fertilized egg, and that they only had to grow to their full size. This belief rested upon a religious conception about the divine creation of life. If God created the animal, then it had to be all there, a finished job from the start. In contrast to this, modern scientific embryology recognizes the *continued determination of form* throughout the process of growth. This dialectic growth, which includes qualitative as well as quantitative changes, gives much greater significance to environmental forces.

In a similar way, psychoanalysis assumes that the most important forms of behavior must be present in the individual as "instincts," before cropping out into action. It is unwilling to admit the appearance of genuinely new qualities of behavior. Its scheme of "repression" and "transference" explains away all apparent transformations as really illusory manifestations of an unalterable instinctive disposition.

This undialectic conception of psychological development has its basis in the uncritical acceptance of the bourgeois theory of society. According to this theory, society has only one "true" form, the capitalist form, corresponding to "human nature." All other forms of society are unnatural, therefore unable to survive. Such a static view of society (whether bourgeois or pre-bourgeois) is the ultimate basis of every static psychological theory. It leads to ab-

stracting one or several aspects of social life, and setting them up as "fundamental human nature."

Those aspects which Freud, the psychologist of a decadent class, selects as paramount, are the characteristics of disease in society. We have seen that in the early period of his work, the major rôle was accorded to sex. However, Freud's sex is not the healthy, extraverted sex of procreative mankind, but a sex of jealousy, hyper-self-analysis, and discouragement. He studies sex in the distorted forms which class society has created, then assumes that these distortions are the reality behind all of society's faults.

In Freud's post-war works (with the theory of the destructive instinct), capitalism's dying orgy of destruction is still regarded as an unchanging eternity. A theory of "human nature" is advanced to prove that society always has been, always will be thus. In the midst of the conflicts unleashed by capitalism in its general crisis, the only explanation offered is a pious declaration: In the beginning was Hatel! Such a theory readily lends itself as an apology for imperialist wars, reactionary terror, and exploitation.

FREUD'S SOCIAL VIEWS

It is a fact scarcely open to debate that Freud himself, and most of his followers, have used his theories to support very reactionary conclusions. Let us give a few illustrations of this, from Freud's writings, without any attempt to develop the point completely.

Repeatedly, Freud ascribes the evils of society to the inner nature of men. The following passage is from *Civilization and Its Discontents*:

"Civilized society is perpetually menaced with disintegration through the primary hostility of men towards one another. Their interests in their common work would not hold them together; the passions of instinct are stronger than reasoned interests. Culture has to call up every possible reinforcement in order to erect barriers against the aggressive instincts of men and hold their manifestations in check. . . ."

He slips readily into the usual ruling class assumption that the "evil" features of human nature are represented by the masses, and reason by the rulers: In the modern state, he writes, "the masses thirsting for pleasure and destruction must be held in check by the power of an enlightened upper stratum."*

He is just as quick to reject the argument that the masses may have some justice on their side, in addition to appetite:

"Social justice means that one denies oneself many things, in order that others also must do without them, or, what amounts to the same thing, cannot ask for them."**

This is an obvious echo of the stale demagoguery that Communists are simply envious persons who want to make everyone "equal in poverty."

Freud was himself the victim of a widespread form of social injustice, anti-Semitism, the effect of which he felt throughout his life, and not only in his recent exile. Our sympathy for him, however, should not blind us to the fact that his explanation of this phenomenon is no more than an uncritical acceptance of it. He lacks insight into the social forces behind the persecution of minorities. His "ex-

planation" might be adopted by apologists for lynching and pogroms:

"There is an advantage, not to be undervalued, in the existence of smaller communities, through which the aggressive instinct can find an outlet in enmity towards those outside the group. It is always possible to unite considerable numbers of men in love towards one another, so long as there are still some remaining as objects for aggressive manifestations."*

In his last written work, *Moses and Monotheism*,** Freud has added to the literature of anti-Semitism a work which, in its full implications, can compete in the wildness of its speculations and in its generally reactionary character with the worst examples in this field.

For example, applying the overworked Oedipus complex to the legend of the death of Moses in the desert, he decides that there is really some basis to the accusation that the Jewish people were the murderers of God!

"The poor Jewish people, who with its usual stiff-necked obduracy continued to deny the murder of their 'father,' has dearly expiated this over the course of centuries. Over and over again they have heard the reproach: 'You killed our God.' And this reproach is true, if rightly interpreted" (p. 142).

These examples could be multiplied endlessly. Despite this thoroughgoing reaction, Freud has often been hailed as a world-shatterer, by persons who have only a superficial knowledge of his writings. They point especially to his position on the prudishness of bourgeois family life, and to his interpretation of religion.

The part that psychoanalysis has

* *Gesammelte Schriften*, XII, p. 417.

** *Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego*.

* *Civilization and Its Discontents*, p. 90.

** See the review in *The Communist* for August.

played in the general movement for more liberal attitudes with respect to sex has been greatly exaggerated. It is sheer nonsense to credit psychoanalysis with initiating this movement and providing its principal driving force, as has often been done. While Freud simply accepted the bourgeois family as the fundament of history, history itself has been at work changing it. Fifty years before Freud started his work, Engels showed how the industrial revolution was revising the relations existing between men, women and children.* Not psychoanalysis, but the opening to women of a variety of occupations where they could attain economic independence (factory work, clerical work, teaching, social work, etc.), gave rise to a strong movement for woman's social emancipation. Sex became a matter for public discussion when women entered into public action. But confused Bohemians, who did not understand at all the nature of these material forces, and who thought that a "liberation" was being wrought by the strength of an "idea," hailed Freud as a revolutionary Messiah. Thus, the popular acceptance of Freud became possible as the result of a broad social movement, within which psychoanalysis was a current.

Freud has attacked religion repeatedly, but never with any understanding of religion as a social institution, shaped by class forces. Rather, he raises it for consideration only as an example of how mankind is condemned by "human nature."

"The whole thing is so patently infantile,

* Frederick Engels, *Conditions of the Working Class in England*.

so incongruous with reality, that to one whose attitude to humanity is friendly it is painful to think that the great majority of mortals will never be able to rise above this view of life." *

This pessimistic paternalism is far from deserving to be called revolutionary. It has been so called, but only by those petty bourgeois "radicals" who share Freud's contempt and class conceit. As in all of Freud's work, his judgment of religion is completely non-historical. Disregarding all the known facts about the social origins of religious institutions, he indulges in speculation about the frailties which make mankind susceptible to this particular form of "neurosis," and he closes the door firmly (though with a humane sigh) on every perspective of a scientifically regulated society.

CLINICAL EFFECTIVENESS

The psychoanalytic method of treatment consists of painstakingly exploring the patient's memories and dream-fantasies, in an effort to discover and make clear to the patient what particular "repression" was the ultimate source of his difficulty. This procedure has probably been more effective than any other in the treatment of neurosis. Its success is offered as a proof of the general correctness of psychoanalytic theory.

It should be noted, however, that the record of success is far from overwhelming. Cures are rarely complete, and they are often temporary. This uncertainty of results has been one reason for the rise of many offshoots of psychoanalysis. Such a veteran analyst as Karen Horney declares:

* *Civilization and Its Discontents*, p. 23.

"My desire to make a critical re-evaluation of psychoanalytical theory had its origin in a dissatisfaction with therapeutic results. I found that almost every patient offered problems for which our accepted psychoanalytical knowledge offered no means of solution, and which therefore remained unsolved. . . . The resistance which many psychiatrists as well as laymen feel toward orthodox psychoanalysis is due not only to emotional sources, as is assumed, but also to the debatable character of many theories." *

It would be misleading to assume that psychoanalysis "must be true because it works." Freud himself recognizes that success is not necessarily proof of scientific validity.

"I may say that I do not think our successes can compete with those of Lourdes. There are so many more people who believe in the miracles of the Blessed Virgin than in the existence of the unconscious. But if we disregard supernatural competition . . . compared with other therapeutic methods, psychoanalysis is far and away the most powerful." **

It is altogether possible for the psychoanalytic method to be helpful in the treatment of neurosis, even though the theories of psychoanalysis do not correctly state the causes. The cures which it effects depend to a great extent on the strong emotional influence which the analyst gains over the patient in the course of repeated intimate interviews over a long period of time. It is the hardest task of the analyst to break this dependence.

It is not difficult to understand why the psychoanalytic method might be successful, even though many of its tenets were erroneous. The process of analysis leads the patient into detailed examination of his relationships with

other persons, particularly other members of the same family. The recognition of hitherto unsuspected emotional dependence upon, and resentments toward, these individuals creates the possibility not only of recasting these relationships, but also of entering into new social relationships with more independence. This possibility exists even though the origin of such dependence and resentment is mistakenly explained. It would be greater, of course, if the *objective* social relations were correctly understood at the same time. For this reason, the idealistic theories of psychoanalysis, which prevent a correct understanding of the objective relations, stand in the way of a completely healthy attitude. Psychoanalysis, which emphasizes that the source of the neurotic's difficulties is "within himself," does not remove his exaggerated subjectivism.

Insofar as psychoanalytic practice is successful, this indicates that it embodies certain correct statements of important human relationships. The features of psychoanalysis which are responsible for the success that it does attain are deserving of serious scientific study. They will undoubtedly provide important clues to a fuller materialistic account of personality development and its disorders than has yet been given.

"MARXIST" TRENDS

From time to time, in the history of psychoanalysis, followers of Freud have departed more or less from his teachings to form rival movements or little "heretic" groups. One of the reasons for such secessions has been

* *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, p. 7 f.

** *New Introductory Lectures*, p. 208 f.

Freud's openly reactionary position. First of those who broke away "toward the Left" was Alfred Adler, who became something of an official psychologist to the Viennese Social-Democrats (the Austro-Marxists).

Unlike Freud, Adler gave much attention to the positive achievements of individuals and the growth of their capabilities. He laid special emphasis on the effect of insecurity (the "inferiority complex"), particularly through the development of compensatory ambitions. His real contributions along these lines were drawn from such contact as he had with the working class movement. Philosophically, however, Adler was an idealist. The forces he dealt with were always subjective forces. This idealism fitted well with his reformist attitude. The class struggle did not enter as a factor in his analyses. For him, the road to socialism was through instilling "social feeling" through proper (Adlerian) education of children.

He actually believed that the popularizing of his views was capable of "transforming the world." In the end, this idealist position led him into outright opportunism, as when he steadfastly opposed a strong tendency among his German followers to come out flatly for support of the Soviet Union and Communism. He argued at that time that to introduce political issues into Individual Psychology would narrow his following and hamper the development of his school. Having once attained popularity in bourgeois circles, his opportunism prevented him from developing his system further, along lines which would have forced him to seek his social basis in the working class. This, however,

was the only way to realize the full potentialities of his early emphasis on the social determination of behavior.

The quite recent period has seen the rise of a number of dissident groups within the camp of psychoanalysis, each of which points to social forces as important contributing factors in the formation of neuroses, with a consequent loss of stress on supposed ineradicable biological traits. The question of insecurity, in particular, has been brought to the fore again by the course of economic and political events, and it assumes special prominence in the work of all the more progressive analysts.

Karen Horney's recent books, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* and *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, are outstanding examples of this trend. It is difficult to say whether Horney is still to be regarded as a psychoanalyst. She clings to the name, yet she attacks each of Freud's principal theories, and declares that she has found them inadequate to cope with the problems of her patients during her long practice as an analyst. She renounces the entire method of approach from "instincts," and points toward the need for appreciating historical aspects of personality. It is clear, therefore, that the movement of her thought is not only away from Freud, but away from all forms of psychoanalysis, which is ahistorical in essence.

Such efforts to show the influence of present-day economic and cultural institutions on our personality development, and to modify the original Freudian theories of parent-child relationships by showing that the form of these relations as we know them is determined partly by the competitive

economy of our society, very plainly reflect the growing influence of Marxism, as well as an increased attention to contemporary events.

Despite these developments, psychoanalysis shows no signs of becoming, even in the hands of would-be "Marxo-Freudians," an adequate guide to the understanding of human behavior. Its subject matter continues to be solely the irrational behavior of men (that is, behavior which they perform without conscious knowledge of their own purposes), and its method remains such that every type of behavior studied is sure to be reduced to this form.

The conservative analysts invoke "native aggression" as the explanation for wars* and sit-down strikes, while the "radical" analysts invoke it to explain reaction and strike-breaking. The conservative analysts condemn the revolutionary behavior of the working class as irrational, by stating that the revolt against the ruling class is just a form of expression for the Oedipus complex, with the rulers serving as a symbol for the hated father. The "radical" analysts, on the other hand, declare that the failure of the working class to rise in revolt is due to the operation of irrational factors, such as too great dependence on the father's authority, which provides the basis for fascism.**

* An example: "War is a spontaneous form of mental defense, and defends mainly against the individual destructive instincts of man. It has had survival value, and despite all commonsense arguments to the contrary, must still retain psychological value." E. Glover, "War and Pacifism," in *Character & Personality*, 1936. (Vol. 4, p. 314.)

** Thus the "Marxo-Freudian" Osborn, in his *Psychology of Reaction*: "Millions of German people have found in Hitler the father for whom they have been seeking" (p. 111).

The principal difference between the conservatives and the "radicals" is therefore not in their method, but simply in the problems they select. They both concur in the basic idealistic orientation, which traces the evils of society to the shortcomings of "human nature." The arguments of one group form a perfect complement to the arguments of the other, and together they form a unified, and, in the final analysis, a reactionary picture of the world scene. However, it is not a complete picture. The preoccupation of both groups with irrational aspects of behavior is a limitation which disqualifies psychoanalysis from any claim to be a comprehensive theory of behavior.

Psychoanalysis has been compelled to recede from the position it once took, of completely ignoring the power of social forces to influence human lives in any significant way. But the fundamental method of psychoanalysis makes any real recognition of social forces impossible for it. What has taken place is not so much a forward development of psychoanalysis, to include the historical factors which it is no longer possible to ignore, but the effort of individual analysts to accommodate themselves to these factors. The trends and movements within the field of psychoanalysis which are associated with this process reflect at times a considerable degree of progressivism on the part of individual analysts, but these movements will be confined by the general framework of psychoanalysis only as long as the psychologists involved in them remain relatively isolated from the real struggle of the masses for democracy, peace, and well-being.

ATTITUDES TOWARD RATIONAL
BEHAVIOR

Both conservative and "radical" psychoanalysts talk about the need for rational behavior, although they are in agreement that "man only reasons or is reasonable under the most favorable circumstances." * By this they mean, in effect, that the possibility of being reasonable is reserved for those who have been freed from emotional conflicts by the experience of an analysis. Wittels once wrote that "while Marxism foresees as certainties murder and slaughter, psychoanalysis is a peaceful force which has hope of overcoming the resistance between classes if the leaders of both classes will be analyzed." **

Glover and others have more recently recommended that the way to overcome our international war crisis is to have the leading statesmen analyzed, in order to insure that their behavior will be rational, and not determined by personal conflicts. In the same class with such suggestions lies the doctrine of Wilhelm Reich, that the proletariat would be revolutionary if it had proper sex education.

These notions only express the analyst's feeling of his own supreme importance, and they must be interpreted along the lines of Marx's comment on ideologists in general, that every craftsman is impressed with the importance of his own product, including those whose craft is law or religion—or psychoanalysis.

Every analyst necessarily transmits to his patient his own standard of what rational behavior is. The ortho-

dox conception, and the only one consistent with psychoanalytic theory, is that rational behavior means fitting oneself docilely to the world exactly as one finds it. The analyst tries to convince his patient that the source of his difficulties is primarily "within himself." Logically, therefore, any dissatisfaction with the outside world and any effort to alter it represent irrational attempts to disguise this basic fact. This attitude toward the problem of individual adjustment is the starting point of bourgeois psychiatry, to which its theories must therefore conform.

We have seen that the "radical" analyst regards as irrational the same conforming behavior which his conservative colleague endorses as rational. Often he is a sincere ally of the working class, who has become convinced of the truth of Marxism, and who tries earnestly to find a scientific political application for his professional knowledge. But, because he does not understand the fundamental incompatibility of Freudism and Marxism, he tends to interpret activity in the movement by invalid, idealistic arguments. The coincidence which exists at points between his views and those of Marxism does not mean that he has set psychoanalysis "right side up" and thus rendered it materialistic. As an analyst, he still retains a subjective orientation, reflected in the petty bourgeois individualistic conception that the desirability of "revolutionary behavior" rests on its value as a form of "self-expression." This attitude leads to minimizing of the struggle for immediate objectives, and to all kinds of Leftism, with the attendant instability.

* Glover, "War and Fascism," *loc. cit.*, p. 306.

** Fritz Wittels, *Freud and His Time*, p. 324.

The fundamental healthiness and rationality of revolutionary behavior is not demonstrated by the subjective method of psychoanalysis, but by objective observation of men striving for, and attaining, conscious goals.

A DOCTRINE OF PESSIMISM

No sound theory of human behavior can take its starting point, as psychoanalysis does, in man's frustration. The principal place must belong to the healthy, rational aspects of human behavior. The vision of the psychiatrist is narrowed by the endless spectacle of human ineffectiveness which his practice brings to him. He should look, as well, at the record of human achievement.

"The history of industry and the concrete existence of industry which has come about is the open book of human essential powers. . . . A psychology for which this book, and hence just the most sensibly present, the most accessible part of history, is closed, cannot become a really concrete and pregnant science." *

The pessimism of psychoanalysis, which has its deepest roots in the decay of our present society which can make men blind to all the advances of history, has no place in science. Nor does it have any place in the working class movement. Within this movement, Freudism is always a symptom of distrust of the power of the proletariat to fulfill its historic task, to rescue our civilization from the forces of unreason.

In the present world situation, the insight and forward vision necessary for constructing a theory of man's

rational and constructive behavior can exist only on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist understanding of the advance toward realization of a communist society in the Soviet Union, and the struggles of the oppressed classes and nationalities throughout the capitalist world.

PSYCHOLOGY AND DIALECTIC MATERIALISM

Many years ago, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels developed such a viewpoint — dialectical materialism. They left no extended work devoted primarily to psychological problems. However, at an early stage in the development of their own thought they found it necessary to criticize the psychologistic arguments of their opponents. Their monumental criticism, *The German Ideology*, as well as other writings of this period, contain many hints about the path which must be taken by a sound, scientific study of social behavior. In much later writings,* Engels elucidated many of these points.

The German Ideology deserves a prominent place in the history of psychology, because (written in 1846) it contains the first call ever issued for a psychology of action, of behavior, to replace the sterile psychology of "consciousness." These passages contain much that is as vital today, as principles upon which a scientific psychology can be based, as at the time when they were written:

"The first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of living human individuals. Thus the first fact to be established is the physical organization of these individ-

* From an early manuscript of Marx, called "Private Property and Communism," *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe*, Teil I, Bd. 3, p. 121 f.

* E.g., *Anti-Duehring, Origin of the Family*, Ludwig Feuerbach.

uals and their consequent relation to the rest of nature. . . .

"We do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life-process. . . .

"This method of approach is not devoid of premises. . . . Its premises are men, not in any fantastic isolation or abstract definition, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions. . . .

"Where speculation ends—in real life—there real, positive science begins; the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men. Empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. . . .

"But life involves before everything else eating and drinking, a habitation, clothing and many other things. The first historical act is therefore the production of the means to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself. . . . The first necessity therefore in any historical conception is to observe this fundamental fact in all its significance and all its implications and to accord it its due importance. . . .

"The second point is that the satisfied initial need, the act of satisfaction and the acquired instrument of satisfaction, lead to new needs—and this creation of new needs is the first historical act. . . . The third circumstance which, from the very first, enters into historical development, is that men, who daily remake their own life, begin to make other men, to propagate their kind: the relation between man and woman, parents and children, the *family*." *

Marx and Engels distinguished clearly between two different types of social institutions. First, there are the necessary social relationships which are the direct consequence of the production-roles men occupy.

"Definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way enter into these definite social and political relations. . . . The social structure and the state are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals not as they may appear in their own or other people's imaginations, but as they really are. . . ." *

Beyond these, there are the cultural institutions which are a form of reflection of these primary relations, and are therefore still ultimately dependent on the production-relations, but may vary within wide limits, so that this ultimate foundation is often very difficult to trace. They constitute a "superstructure" erected on the basis of the economic structure of society.

"The fantasies in man's brain are also necessary sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. . . . Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life." **

This distinction represents a historic contribution to social psychology. Much of the confusion in contemporary social psychology arises from the customary failure to distinguish between those social class relationships which have a direct and necessary connection with the economic forms of existence, and those which are merely their reflections, and often survivals that are already in conflict with new forms of economic life.

Along these lines, the science of behavior will move forward, dealing with concrete men in their actual, historical relationships. It will recognize

* *The German Ideology*, New York, International Publishers, 1939; pp. 7, 14ff.

* *Ibid.*, p. 13.

** *Ibid.*, p. 14 f.

no abstract "human nature," but only the specific human natures and human abilities which are molded in each time and place by the concrete circumstances under which men live. This is the path which psychology is taking today in the Soviet Union, where a synthesis is being effected which will embrace the studies in the physiological foundations of behavior and the Marxist-Leninist science of society itself. There, the planned reconstruction of society presents unparalleled opportunities for observation of how human nature is, in fact, being remade. As we have already shown in our discussions above, this task is one that can be carried forward only by investigators who are not afraid to face objective social realities. For good reason, therefore, we believe that the future of American social psychology, and therefore of American psychology as a whole,

rests in the hands of those who, as scientists, will stand shoulder to shoulder with the working class in the struggle for preservation and extension of the people's democratic gains, in the basic struggle for socialism. The power of Marxist-Leninist theory in judgment of historical events appears in every day's newspapers, as the brilliant correctness of the Communist analysis of the world situation is demonstrated. No earnest social scientist can permit himself to be frightened away by a Red scare from serious study of the theoretical foundations of this analysis, as well as its application to the present world-scene.

[This is the third and final article in a series on Current Trends in American Psychology by Comrade Gley. The other articles have appeared in THE COMMUNIST for June and July.—The Editors.]

THE FUNDAMENTAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN DIALECTICS AND ECLECTICS

MATERIAL FOR STUDYING THE "HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION"

ECLECTICISM is the trend in philosophy which endeavors to reconcile diverse philosophic systems. The eclectic selects from various systems without scruples that which seems to him to be acceptable practically, unsuccessfully attempting to combine different elements that are directly contrary to one another.

A clear example is provided by the Roman writer Cicero, who artificially combined individual principles from different philosophical systems of his day.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the bourgeois philosopher, Victor Cousin, came forward in defense of eclecticism. He asserted that all philosophical systems contain within themselves a mixture of truth and confusion and that the full truth will be achieved if "part of the truth contained in one system is assimilated by part of the truth contained in another."

The justification in principle of eclecticism as a definite philosophic school has been connected with few names in philosophy and with unimportant ones at that. However, manifestations of eclecticism are to be met with in the history of philosophy far more frequently. In varying degrees, we find manifestations of eclecticism

in every inconsistent philosophical system which wavers between the two basic positions in philosophy—materialism and idealism.

Even with that foremost thinker of ancient times, Aristotle (384—322 B. C.), whose philosophy suffered from inconsistency, we find manifestations of eclecticism, as is shown in Aristotle's vacillations between materialism and idealism. Lenin remarked about Aristotle:

"Aristotle so pitifully sets God *against* the materialist Leucippus and the idealist Plato. There we see eclecticism in Aristotle."*

A clearer example of eclecticism is provided by the doctrine of the German philosopher Kant (1724—1804). The basic feature of his philosophy is the attempt at reconciliation of materialism with idealism, a compromise between the one and the other, the combination in one system of heterogeneous, contrary, philosophic trends.

Kant's philosophy bore a dual character. But, as Plekhanov wrote, dualism is always eclectic.

In bourgeois philosophy, eclecticism became particularly widespread in the second half of last century in the writings of the so-called neo-Kantians,

* Lenin, *Miscellany*, Vol. XII, p. 235, Russian edition.

the followers of Kant who drove all concessions to materialism out of his philosophy and strove to reconcile the materialist conclusions of science with idealism.

An example of miserable eclecticism is provided by the theoreticians of the Second International (the opportunist Bernstein and others) who strove to unite Marxism with Kantianism, and by the Russian degenerates of the Bogdanov type who strove to unite Marxism with the reactionary philosophy of Mach and Avenarius.

Eclecticism goes far beyond the bounds of philosophy as a definite mode of thinking and behavior, and has its social roots mainly in the petty bourgeoisie, who occupy in the capitalist society a dual position. Marx, in criticizing Proudhon and his eclectic system of views, pointed out that it was connected with Proudhon's petty-bourgeois point of view:

"... the petty-bourgeois is composed of On The One Hand and On The Other Hand. This is so in his economic interests and *therefore* in his politics, in his scientific, religious and artistic views. It is so in his morals, in everything. He is a living contradiction. If, like Proudhon, he is, in addition, a gifted man, he will soon learn to play with his own contradictions and develop them, according to circumstances, into striking, ostentatious, now scandalous, now brilliant paradoxes. Charlatanism in science and accommodation in politics are inseparable from such a point of view." *

On more than one occasion, eclecticism has attempted to pass itself off as dialectics. The opportunist conciliators have usually resorted to this trick, in order to render it easy for

them to deceive the masses. The opportunists have attempted to justify their so-called "theory," which is torn by inner contradictions, with references to dialectics, which they deliberately distort for these purposes.

* * *

Dialectics teaches that (1) all phenomena both in nature and society are mutually connected and inter-act one on the other; (2) everything in nature and society is in constant motion, change and development; motion is a transition from quantitative to qualitative changes; the contradiction inherent in things and processes constitutes the source of motion and development, and the struggle between the new and the old constitutes the inner content of the process of transition from a previous qualitative condition to a new qualitative condition.

* * *

All these basic features of the Marxist dialectical method must be taken into account in examining the contrary principles of dialectics and eclectics. In the light of these basic features of dialectics, it can be clearly seen that there is a gulf between dialectics and eclectics. A definite mode of examining things and a corresponding mode of action follow from the basic features of Marxist dialectics.

Dialectical logic demands, as Lenin teaches, that when we study an object we do so from all angles, that we study all its interconnections, that we take the object in its development and change.

"... The whole of human practice must enter into the complete 'definition' of the object, both as a criterion of truth and as a

* "Letter to Schweitzer," *Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, p. 176. International Publishers, New York.

practical determinant of the connection between the object and that which man needs."*

Dialectics demands that an objective account be taken of the entire concretely-given sum of conditions; for there is no abstract truth, truth always being concrete. Dialectics, which regards development as taking place through inner contradictions, requires that the contradictions be not glossed over, but that they be disclosed and overcome.

Eclecticism has nothing in common with all this. Contrary to dialectics, the characteristic feature of eclecticism is above all that, instead of dialectically *overcoming* the contradictions by means of struggle, it preaches the *reconciliation* of contradictions, covers them up.

The fundamental distinction between dialectics and eclecticism can be clearly illustrated from the example of the development of the Bolshevik Party in contrast to the development of the Social-Democratic parties in the West. Comrade Stalin, in disclosing the lack of principle and the rottenness of the parties of the Second International, shows that their policy is an opportunist one, a policy of the "half-way" line on questions of principle. Comrade Stalin once wrote:

"How do the Social-Democratic parties in the West now live and develop? Do they have contradictions, disagreements on principle within their parties? Of course they do. Do they expose these contradictions and attempt to overcome them honestly and openly before the party membership? No, of course they do not. The practice of Social-Democracy consists in their covering up, hid-

ing these contradictions and disagreements."*

Contrary to this unprincipled policy of the withering and degenerating parties of the Second International, the Bolshevik Party has always conducted a policy *based on principle*, has always overcome inner-party contradictions by means of struggle.

"The entire past of our Party," says Comrade Stalin, "is confirmation of the thesis that the history of our Party is one of overcoming inner-Party contradictions and of the steadfast consolidation of our party's ranks on the basis of this overcoming of contradictions."**

The overcoming of inner-Party contradictions by means of struggle is the law of the development of the Bolshevik Party. Dialectics teaches adherence to principle, while eclectics means lack of principle. Eclectics attempts to pass itself off as dialectics in that it endeavors in a mechanical and unprincipled manner to link together heterogeneous, contradictory elements. The world is the division of the whole into contrary parts, the unity of fighting opposites. But this unity of opposites in a phenomenon is internal and indissoluble, so that without one of the opposite sides, the phenomenon itself is impossible. Comrade Stalin, in disclosing the dialectics of N.E.P. (New Economic Policy) pointed out that N.E.P. had two indissoluble sides: the first side was directed against the regime of War Communism, and had as its object to ensure a *certain* freedom of trade; the second side was

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 134-35, Russian edition.

* J. V. Stalin, *About the Opposition*, p. 440, Russian edition.

** *Ibid.*

directed against *complete* freedom of trade and had as its purpose to ensure the regulating role of the State on the market. "Destroy one of these sides," said Comrade Stalin, "and N.E.P. disappears." (*Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 132.) Here we see a clear example of the dialectical unity of opposites. On the other hand, the eclectic "unification" of opposites is a mechanical, fortuitous unification that does not follow from the nature of the thing, a unification that is directly contrary to this nature.

Lenin, when speaking of the antithesis between dialectics and eclectics, pointed out that the unification of opposites, when applied objectively, is equal to dialectics, whereas if applied subjectively it is equal to eclectics and sophistics.

The eclectic, being a person without principles, agrees with both the one and the other side, takes a bit from one of the contending parties, and a bit from the other, mechanically sticks these bits together, and attempts to pass them off as something "new." Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, on more than one occasion, exposed this deception practiced by eclectics, which passes itself off as a sort of "third" force. Marx, in exposing the eclectics of Proudhon, who took a bit from

the economists and a bit from the Socialists, wrote:

"He agrees with them both. . . . Mr. Proudhon accordingly flatters himself that he has made a criticism both of political economy and of communism—he stands far below both. . . . He wants to soar as the man of science above the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; he remains nothing but the petty-bourgeois perpetually tossed about between capital and labor, between political economy and communism." *

The history of thought and the history of the class struggle show that eclectics has always only served to cover up and mask reaction and counter-revolution. Lenin exposed Judas-Trotsky, who with the aid of "Left" phrases masked his treacherous nature. Lenin exposed the degenerates and double-dealers of the type of Bogdanov and other empirio-critics who boasted of their new "ism" which, they alleged, stood above materialism and idealism, but in actual fact was only masked clericalism. Lenin exposed the traitor Bukharin, who, while bringing forward an eclectic dish in the shape of a so-called "buffer" (the trade union discussion of 1921), was in actual fact a loyal hound serving Trotsky in the struggle against Lenin, against the Bolsheviki.

* "Letter to Schweitzer," *Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, pp. 172-173.

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

PEACE OR WAR?

*(Manifesto of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of Great
Britain to the British people)*

Daily Worker, London, October 7, 1939

IN THE coming days fateful decisions will be taken which will determine the issue of life or death for millions.

The anger of the people is rising against the reactionary statesmen, the Chamberlains, Simons and Hoares, who involved us in this war by the help they gave to fascism and by their refusal of a peace front with the socialist Soviet Union.

The anger of the people is rising against the reactionaries and profiteers, who are using this war to fill their pockets and plunder the people.

The anger of the people is rising against the enemies of democracy, who now parade as champions of democracy against fascism and clamor for the continuance of the war for their reactionary aims.

The Communist Party, which has always stood in the forefront of the struggle for peace and against fascism, declares:

The continuance of this war is not in the interests of the people of Britain, France or Germany.

End this war before it has brought death and destruction upon millions and millions of people, before the flower of our youth is slaughtered.

* * *

The truth about this war must be

told. This war is not a war for democracy against fascism. It is not a war for the liberties of small nations. It is not a war for the defense of peace against aggression.

These phrases on the lips of the enemies of democracy, the Chamberlains and the Churchills, the Daladiers and Bonnets, the oppressors of the colonial peoples, are hypocrisy and deception of the people.

The British and French ruling class are seeking to use the anti-fascist sentiments of the people for their own imperialist aims. By their deeds they have shown that they do not stand for democracy against fascism. If they did, they would have stood by democracy in Spain and Czechoslovakia. If they did, the British ruling class would have granted the demand of India for democracy.

By their deeds the British and French ruling class have shown that they do not stand for the defense of peace against aggression. If they did they would have agreed to the peace front, which would have prevented this war.

The responsibility for the present imperialist war lies equally on all the warring powers.

This war is a fight between imperialist powers over profits, colonies and world domination.

This war will bring only great suffering and boundless misery to millions of working class homes.

* * *

It is a piece of colossal humbug and hypocrisy of Chamberlain to pose as the man who will "overthrow Hitlerism." Chamberlain and the British reactionaries helped to create Hitler fascism.

So long as they hoped that Hitler's aggression would be directed against the Soviet Union, against democracy and socialism, they helped Hitler. They financed Hitler. They armed Hitler. They assisted him to strangle the small nations. They cleared the path for his aggression.

There is nothing the British and French ruling class would fear more than the defeat of reaction in Germany. They fear the triumph of the German people. When they speak of the "overthrow of Hitlerism," they mean the setting up of some other kind of reactionary government which will be their servant and carry out their anti-Soviet aims.

The British people will not allow themselves to be used as the tool of Chamberlain's reactionary aims.

The struggle of the British people against the Chamberlains and Churchill is the best help to the struggle of the Germans against Hitler.

* * *

When Chamberlain speaks of continuing the war for the purpose of the "restoration of Poland," he means the re-establishment of the semi-fascist regime of Colonel Beck and General Sikorski, of the landlords and militarists, to oppress the Polish workers and peasants and the national minorities.

Whilst the British and French workers have deep fraternal sympathy for all the sections of the Polish people

now suffering under the jackboot of the brutal Nazi invaders they will not allow themselves to be used as the instruments of Chamberlain's and Daladier's reactionary aims.

The British workers will condemn the despicable action of Chamberlain in giving public guarantees to Poland which he had no intention of fulfilling.

Chamberlain hoped that an easy Nazi victory in Poland would lead to Germany and the Soviet Union embroiling themselves in war.

Instead the Red Army marched and Soviet power advanced.

All this was accomplished without conflict between Germany and Russia. Hitler had no other choice but to agree.

The Soviet Union, which has brought peace and liberation to the peoples of Western Byelo-Russia and Western Ukraine, has thereby strengthened the conditions for the future liberation of the workers and peasants of Western Poland.

The British and French workers will never be parties in helping Chamberlain and Sikorski to shackle anew the semi-fascist regime of the Polish landlords and militarists on the Polish people.

* * *

Only the socialist state, the Soviet Union, in this war crisis has taken action on behalf of the peoples and of peace.

The Soviet Union has kept the one hundred and seventy millions of its population out of this imperialist war. The Soviet Union has worked for peace in Eastern Europe and is now

consolidating that peace by its strength and initiative.

The Soviet Union is now exerting its influence to promote peace in Western Europe.

The conclusion of peace under these conditions is in the interests of all the peoples of Europe.

The Soviet Union is leading the world fight for peace.

Let a peace conference of the powers be called immediately.

* * *

Nazi aggression has been checked and limited by the power of the Soviet Union and today the Nazi leader is suing for peace. It is the ruling class of Britain and France who demand the continuation of the war. The workers of the world need peace and the opportunity is now before them to stop the bloodshed and to clear the way for the advance of the peoples.

If the workers of Britain, if all democrats fight the Chamberlains and Churchills and elect a new government which will carry on peace negotiations in the interests of the people and in cooperation with the Soviet Union, it will be possible to lay the basis for a peace that will bind the warmongers of all countries and strengthen democracy everywhere.

The people must take a hand. The immediate issue is the cessation of hostilities and the calling of a peace conference.

Stop the war! The people must enforce the terms of a lasting peace.

* * *

The millionaire rulers of Britain and France are using this war to de-

liver heavy blows against their own peoples.

In France they have suppressed the French Communist Party, the majority party of the French working class and the leader of the fight through all these years for democracy and against fascism.

In this country the employers have launched a sweeping attack on the workers' standards and conditions.

Chamberlain's war budget means the robbery of the masses in the interests of the profiteers. Rising prices are accompanied by soaring profits. Wages have been cut in many industries and nowhere keep pace with the steep rise in food prices. Hours and overtime have been heavily increased; mass dismissals are taking place. Laws attacking democratic rights have been hurried through Parliament.

And this has happened in the course of the first month of the war, and if not resisted now the capitalists will go to new lengths in order to further enrich themselves at the expense of the workers and their families, and to strengthen still more their dictatorial powers over the lives of the people.

The workers must organize resistance to this combined attack of the employers and the government.

The leaders of the Labor Party and trade union movement have sided fully with the government of Chamberlain and Churchill and are attempting to get the whole working class movement to support their imperialist war aims.

This policy, if not challenged, will disorganize the labor movement and render it defenseless in the face of the attacks of the employers and the

government and will hand over enormous numbers of young people to become cannon fodder in an unjust war.

The workers must offer the greatest resistance to these attacks.

Success will come if in the factories and in the localities unity in action of all sections of the working class movement is brought about.

The Communist Party, which has always striven to bring about the unity of the working class forces, declares that the British workers have already paid a heavy penalty for the absence of unity. Let it never be forgotten that this unity was prevented by those very leaders who have now united themselves with the Chamberlains and Churchills. The Communist Party will direct its full energies to the encouragement and organization of united action for the demands of the workers.

The Communist Party calls upon the members of the Labor Party, active trade unionists and shop stewards, and all those genuinely prepared to fight now for peace and the interests of the people against the reactionary Chamberlain government to join with it in a great effort to bring about a renewal of the inde-

pendence and militant struggle of the working class movement.

The Communist Party calls upon the workers to unite their ranks and to lead the people of Britain forward in the fight for the following demands:

Immediate measures against the profiteers to bring down prices.

For immediate increases in wages, pensions and unemployment benefits to meet the rise in cost of living.

For the restriction of hours and overtime in accordance with existing trade union agreements.

Stop the mass dismissals.

Hands off democratic rights and social services.

For the immediate granting of India's claim to self-determination and the extension of democratic rights to all colonial people.

Down with the Chamberlain government.

For the formation of a new government which will carry out these demands, begin peace negotiations and represent the interests of the people against the armament kings and plundering millionaires.

Banish the specter of war and open the road towards a new, free socialist life.

THE LAND OF SOCIALISM TODAY AND TOMORROW

REPORTS AND SPEECHES AT THE 18th CONGRESS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION (BOLSHEVIKS)

By

Joseph Stalin
A. A. Zhdanov
L. Kaganovich
N. Shvernik

D. Z. Manuilsky
K. Voroshilov
Mikhail Kalinin
A. Mikoyan

V. M. Molotov
A. Andreyev
L. Beria
N. Krushchev

The full record of the great congress of the transition from socialism to communism in the U.S.S.R., together with the Resolutions, Amendments to the Rules of the C.P.S.U., etc.

Cloth, 488 pages

Price 75 cents

●

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SPEECHES AND REPORTS

By

Dimitroff
Ercoli
Pollitt
Browder
Varga

Thorez
Wang Ming
Marty
Cachin

Gottwald
Pieck
Okano
Kuusinen

and many others

Cloth, 600 pages

Price \$1.00

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

New



Books

Ready

**On the History of the Bolshevik
Organizations in Transcaucasia**

By L. BERIA

This volume contains many facts regarding the early Bolshevik activities of Joseph Stalin, as organizer and leader of socialist groups in Transcaucasia from the age of seventeen (in 1896). One of the most valuable aspects of the present volume is the extensive series of quotations which it gives from early theoretical articles by Stalin.

Cloth, 75c



TWO SYSTEMS

By EUGENE VARGA

This is a comparative survey of socialist and capitalist economy during the past two decades. Professor Varga shows the difference between the economic development of the leading capitalist countries and the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union. The volume is thoroughly documented with numerous statistical tables and other illustrative material.

\$2.00



CULTURE AND THE PEOPLE

By MAXIM GORKY

This collection contains the last essays of Gorky, and is a representative selection from the voluminous publicist efforts in which the author was engaged during the last ten years of his life.

The present volume reveals a side of Gorky's writings as necessary to an understanding of his work as his novels, stories, autobiographical volumes and plays.

\$1.50

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

TWENTY-FIVE GREAT BOOKS

YOURS FOR THE ASKING!

ANY ONE OF THESE TITLES WILL BE SENT TO YOU AS A PREMIUM WITH ONE YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION TO

THE COMMUNIST

12 MONTHLY ISSUES, \$2.00

- AGAINST AGGRESSION, Maxim Litvinov
- BRITONS IN SPAIN, William Rust
- CHILD WORKERS IN AMERICA, K. D. Lumpkin and D. W. Douglas
- THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE, Karl Marx
- CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAMME, Karl Marx
- DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM, V. Adoratsky
- FIGHTING FOR PEACE, Earl Browder
- FOUNDING OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, Karl Marx
- GEORGE DIMITROFF, S. Blagoyeva
- I LOVE, A. Avdeyenko
- THE IRON FLOOD, A. Serafimovitch
- JEWS WITHOUT MONEY, Michael Gold
- LETTERS FROM PRISON, George Dimitroff
- PROLETARIAN LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES
- LABOR FACT BOOK NO. 4
- LAST PLAYS OF MAXIM GORKY
- LETTERS TO KUGELMANN, Frederick Engels
- LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF V. I. LENIN, R. Palme Dutt
- LUDWIG FEUERBACH, Frederick Engels
- THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION, Joseph Stalin
- PASIONARIA: ARTICLES AND SPEECHES, Dolores Ibarruri
- THE SPIDER AND THE CLOCK (Cloth), S. Funaroff
- TRAITORS ON TRIAL
- WHEN JAPAN GOES TO WAR, E. Yohan and O. Tanin
- WORKING WOMEN IN GREAT BRITAIN, Joan Beauchamp

THE COMMUNIST
P. O. Box 148, Station D
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed find \$2.00 for which please enter my subscription to **The Communist** for one year beginning with the.....issue. At the same time please send me without additional charge a copy of.....

Name

Address