

The New **INTERNATIONAL**

NOVEMBER • 1946

MARXISM and the JEWISH QUESTION

THREE POINTS OF VIEW

Shirley Lawrence:

THE MYTH OF GERMAN CHARACTER

•

H. Leder:

WHY THE GERMANS FAILED TO REVOLT

•

Editorial Comment:

**THE JEWS OF EUROPE AND PALESTINE — PARIS
CONFERENCE — WALLACE DISMISSAL —
TWENTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION**

SINGLE COPY 25c

ONE YEAR \$2.00

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. XII

No. 9, Whole No. 111

Published monthly, except June and July, by the New International Publishing Co., at 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. General Offices: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for five copies and up. Canada and foreign, \$2.25 per year; bundles, 20c for five and up. Re-entered as second class matter August 25, 1945, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

ERNEST ERBER ALBERT GATES ALBERT GOLDMAN

J. R. JOHNSON MAX SHACHTMAN

Managing Editor: ERNEST ERBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTES OF THE MONTH	259
MARXISM AND THE JEWISH QUESTION.....	264
THE MYTH OF GERMAN CHARACTER By Shirley Lawrence	272
WHY THE GERMANS FAILED TO REVOLT By H. Leder With a Rebuttal by Henry Judd	277
REPORT ON ITALY By Jack Armor	282
POLITICS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGCLASS	284
BOOK REVIEWS	285
CORRESPONDENCE	286

Business Manager's

MEMO TO OUR READERS

With this issue, we officially launch a two-month BUILD THE NEW INTERNATIONAL campaign! The aim and object of this campaign is quite simple—to take a great step forward toward rebuilding the pre-war circulation of our magazine—and then going on from there.

The months of November and December have been set aside for this campaign. These are vital months for the rebuilding of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. The campaign is simple in itself and has two clear aims in view:

(1) Five Hundred New Subscribers to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL—to be obtained by January 1, 1947.

(2) A sharp expansion in bundle orders, based upon increased sales to individuals and increased coverage of news-stands.

Today THE NEW INTERNATIONAL prints and circulates about 3,000 copies to its subscribers and readers. This compares unfavorably to its pre-war circulation. We cannot expect to get back to the pre-war figure at one jump, but with a real effort we expect to come mighty close to it. We can gain at least 1,000 in circulation if this campaign succeeds.

How is THE NEW INTERNATIONAL itself going to help this expansion drive? On our part, we are offering you a magazine that appears regularly, on time as scheduled. We hope to continue this regularity from this point on. We are offering you an improved magazine, with more varied and interesting material. And, to help fulfill our goal of 500 new readers by January 1st, we are offering the following special introductory subscription offer:

Six Month Subscription—Six Issues—One Dollar

Two months of solid effort of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. That's what we are asking for and that's what we're positive we will get as a response. Finally, to the Workers Party Branch that does the most effective and hardest work during this two-month campaign, we are offering, for its Branch library, the complete, 12-volume set of Lenin's Selective Works. Here are the quotas set for achieving the goal of 500 new subscribers by January 1, 1947:

Local New York	175
Local Chicago	75
Philadelphia	40
Los Angeles	30
Detroit	25
Newark	25
San Francisco	25
Buffalo	20
Seattle	20
Cleveland	15
Akron	15
Boston	5
Louisville	5
Reading	5
St. Louis	5
Minnesota	5
Streator, Ill.	5
Baltimore	5
TOTAL	500

In the December issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL we will give a full account of the campaign at the half-way mark.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME XII

NOVEMBER, 1946

NUMBER 9

NOTES OF THE MONTH

THE JEWS OF EUROPE AND IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE

The problem of Europe's surviving Jews can no longer be discussed apart from the question of Palestine. The two problems have become indissolubly linked by the mere fact that Palestine is the goal closest to the hearts of the homeless Jews of Europe. When the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry polled the inmates of the displaced persons' camps, not only did the overwhelming majority list Palestine as their first choice, but thousands answered the question of a second choice by writing the word "crematorium."

The desire of the remaining Jews to leave their old homes, even the very continent associated with their tragedy, need perplex no one. What would be hard to understand would be a desire to remain. How can Jews look upon countries like Poland, Germany, Austria, Hungary and Rumania as anything other than the cemeteries of their people? How can a survivor of Polish Jewry (one of the 80,000 that remain of three million) look forward to rebuilding his life amidst surroundings where even the most insignificant landmark must remind him of the bitter fate of friends and relatives, not to mention his own harrowing experiences? There is hardly a Jew in Central and Eastern Europe to whom the horrible statistics of the death camps do not represent a close personal loss.

But memories of the charnel houses are not all. The virus of anti-Semitism remains everywhere. For the surviving Jews it warns of charnel houses to come. The Committee of Inquiry reports that the testimony of the new "democratic" leaders of Austria was so shockingly anti-Semitic that they decided not to divulge it. Even the remaining three per cent of Polish Jewry is subjected to pogroms. The deluge of Nazi propaganda left its effects even in countries like Hungary, where the Jews were relatively well adjusted to the social and cultural fabric of the nation. The evil legacy of Nazism remains even in the snarled property rights that prevent expropriated Jews from reclaiming what was once theirs, above all in view of the absence of energetic measures on the part of the occupying authorities.

These conditions add up to form an overwhelming desire on the part of the Jews to flee the scenes of their past horrors and current indignities, to flee to a place where life can really begin anew.

But why Palestine? Is it only this tiny country, rent by violent antagonisms, that offers hope for a future life to Europe's Jews? Are there not scores of other places in a wide world that offer as good, if not better, prospects? Is not the effort to pose Palestine as the solution of the refugee's plight merely a device of Zionism to capitalize upon the catastrophe of Jewry in order to achieve their own narrow political aims: a Jewish majority in Palestine and a Jewish state? Is not the link that has been

forged between the future of Europe's surviving Jews and the future of Palestine an artificial creation?

Tired of Flight

Such reasoning reveals a superficial grasp of the facts involved and of the resulting state of mind of Europe's Jews. In a sense, Jews have been in constant flight since the Dispersion. It was always flight to a country *less inhospitable* than the one they were fleeing. The prospects for an end to flight were ushered in by the French Revolution, which brought liberation from the ghetto and the promise of peaceful and equal co-existence with their neighbors. The 150-year dream that bourgeois democracy was the road to final freedom and the door to assimilation was rudely shattered by the hell of Nazism, the worst catastrophe visited upon the Jewish people in their long history. The surviving Jews are not only tired in the sense of physical and spiritual exhaustion; they are tired in a historical sense—tired of flight. After Belsen and Buchenwald, the prospects of finding a home in surroundings that promise to be merely less inhospitable evoke little enthusiasm from those who must build anew their shattered lives.

But given even this state of mind of Europe's Jews, the question remains: But why Palestine? Because it is the one place where they expect—not the freedom and equality they yearn for—but *a fair chance to fight for it*.

Few of Europe's Jews have any illusions about Palestine. They certainly know they are entering an armed camp. They know that the end of their journey may not even be Tel Aviv, but Cyprus. They know that for most of them the new life will be hard; that they will live by the sweat of their brow in the most literal sense. They know that their coming is opposed by the Arab majority and that their presence is resented. They know that settlers have fallen victim to Arab terrorist groups in the past.

What promise is there in this tiny country of toil and danger that should cause the Jews of Europe to want literally to fight their way in, suffering hunger and thirst en route? It is the promise that they will fight as part of a nation—no longer the hounded individuals of an unaccepted minority. That is why the Jews are prepared to face British bayonets and Arab opposition in Palestine but shrink from the possibility that they may again wear the yellow "J," either literally or figuratively, as subjects, or even citizens, of a hostile state. To put it succinctly, they prefer to guard their settlements at night, arms in hand, rather than read rent ads that say "restricted" or employment ads that say "Christians only."

It is not the desire to cut themselves off from the non-Jewish world that attracts them to Palestine. It is rather that they feel they will meet the non-Jewish world on more equal terms. The large Jewish communities of Poland permitted the Jew to live an intense cultural life of his own. But it still was culture in the ghetto. The great difference is that in Palestine the

Jewish community has a measure of power, most certainly those basic prerequisites for state power—a police force of its own and an army, which though illegal is none the less real.

True, the Jewish "state within a state" is a feeble force when matched with the military might of Britain or even the combined forces of the surrounding Arab world. However, the Jew sees in the organized community of Palestine the opportunity of fighting under a common banner; a source of strength felt by every people of Europe under the Nazi heel except the Jews.

Nationalism a Step Backward

We may argue that the national consciousness awakened among Europe's Jews by the Nazi persecutions is a long step back from the advanced internationalist consciousness and assimilationist aims that predominated among Jews in pre-Hitler Europe and therefore constitutes a political retrogression for the Jews. True enough; but the same must be said about all the other peoples of Europe who underwent a resurgence of national consciousness as the result of German oppression. Yet we did not deny the validity of the struggles for national liberation on the part of the European nations. We based our socialist perspectives in large measure upon them.

But the other peoples of Europe had a territory to fight for; the Jew has none. The Jew cannot solve his problem fundamentally by fleeing to Palestine. He should seek to stay and become part of the proletarian class struggle in whatever nation he resides. Only the fight for socialist freedom for all of mankind can achieve freedom for the Jew. With all of this no Marxist can differ. More, it is incumbent upon the Marxist to offer this perspective to the Jewish people and seek to convince them of it. But what shall be our attitude toward those Jews who do not heed our advice and pursue their national aims, which, rightly or wrongly, they relate to joining the Jewish community in Palestine? Can we refuse to recognize this as a democratic right and a legitimate national aspiration? Are only Jews to be denied the right to have national consciousness and national aims?

True enough, no people has the right to realize its national aims at the expense of another nation. *Jewish national aims cannot be realized at the expense of the Arabs.* But is this the *implicit* and *inevitable* result of Jewish immigration to Palestine? The *mere* immigration of Jews to Palestine no more deprives Arabs of their rights than the continued residence of the Jews in Germany or Poland deprives Germans or Poles of their rights. The Arabs' rights would be jeopardized only if a "Jewish state" in Palestine were the only possible result of Jewish immigration. An infringement of the Arabs' rights is no more implicit in the fact of immigration itself than is abuse of a Jewish minority—let the Zionists note!—implicit in the fact of an independent Palestine under an Arab majority. (This thought is developed further in the resolution of the National Committee of the Workers Party published in this issue.)

To deny the right of the Jews today to immigrate to Palestine on the grounds of the *possible* consequences it will have upon the Arabs is to deny them the right to go anywhere. A larger percentage of the population of Palestine is prepared to welcome and assist them than is the case in any other nation. The doors are everywhere shut tight on the grounds that the entry of large numbers of Jews will have evil consequences for the present populations. Barriers either reduce all immigration to a trickle or specifically make Jewish immigration

all but impossible in each of the large under-populated countries.

In such a "democracy" as Canada, Jewish immigrants are placed at the very bottom of the "least desirable" category. In the United States, the notorious quota system effectively blocks immigration from the European countries containing the largest number of Jews. In Argentina and Brazil, preference is given to immigrants from the Latin countries of Europe and Jews are considered particularly undesirable. In Mexico, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand it is the same story with only minor variations. Russia shows neither a desire to accept the Jews of Europe nor do the latter show any eagerness to go there. Tens of thousands of them who escaped or were forced into Russia from Poland are now drifting back across Europe to enter the American and British zones of Germany, most of them regarding the latter as a way station to Palestine.

The Jews of Europe face a world of walls. It is this condition that also turns their face toward Palestine. Not that the wall around Palestine is less formidable. But behind the Palestinian wall the most powerful Jewish minority of any country in the world reaches out a hand of welcome and succor. (In contrast, a public opinion poll reveals that only five per cent of the population of the United States favors a liberalization of immigration laws.) The Jews of Europe feel that if they must batter down the walls of a nation to enter, they prefer to do it with help from the inside.

The fight for the right of the Jews to go to Palestine cannot be considered as a substitute for the need to fight against all reactionary restrictions upon immigration wherever they occur. The struggle to open the doors of their own country to the refugees is an obligation which the workers of each nation must place in the forefront of their demands on behalf of European Jewry. However, the need to open the large, under-populated nations of the world cannot, in turn, become a substitute for the need to take a forthright position in support of the immediate and pressing struggle raging around the right to enter Palestine.

In this respect, a special duty devolves upon the revolutionary socialists of the United States. No other country is in so favorable a situation to admit large numbers of immigrants and provide them with a high standard of living as the United States. Both the wealth of American economy and the vastness of its territories make it possible to admit a million immigrants without the slightest impression upon its economic or political institutions. Yet it is precisely in the United States that the greatest hypocrisy has been demonstrated on the Jewish question. Here, as with all American political questions, the Jewish question has in the past been debased to its lowest and most vulgar level—an angling for the Jewish vote in election campaigns. Beginning with the 1922 resolution of Congress on behalf of a Jewish "national home" in Palestine, and continuing with repeated declarations of this character by Congress and state legislatures (above all those with large Jewish constituencies), the politicians have engaged in a cheap gesture to the Jewish people—a gesture about which they were not serious and about which nothing was ever done. Since the recent war even the gestures have become more sparing as a result of American interest in Saudi Arabian oil and, as a result, a growing concern on the part of the military authorities and State Department not to antagonize Arab opinion. The hypocrisy of the American authorities was dramatically exposed in a recent speech by Bartley C. Crum, member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, when he said:

... when we got on the *Queen Elizabeth*, the secret files of the State Department were disclosed to us. We found that for every promise made by our Presidents from 1920 onwards, for every practically unanimous resolution passed by Congress, and for the planks in the 1944 platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties, our State Department advised the Arabs that nothing would be done.

The main content of the struggle of American socialists on behalf of the Jews of Europe must be to "Open the doors of the United States!" But together with the international working class movement they must throw their support behind the equally important and pressing demand of "Open the doors of Palestine!"

PARIS CONFERENCE ANOTHER ZERO

The diplomats have been successfully transported, in their "Sacred Cows" and "Queen Elizabeths," from the marbled, if somewhat shabby, halls of the Luxembourg Palace to the equally marbled, but not shabby, halls of the World's Fair ex-swimming pool located on the meadows of Flushing, New York. Quiet has been restored to the Luxembourg Gardens, and the children of Boul' Mich' and the Quartier Latin are reported back at play, at least until the venerables of France's newly-created upper House are prepared to meet in the emptied building. Our Paris correspondent reports that even a few birds, who previously had deserted the area in terror, lest they be mistaken by Molotov's bodyguards for the Dove of Peace, have timidly ventured a return, having learned that the apostles of peace have departed.

Conference Bankrupt

As is well known, the accomplishments of the conference added up to a scanty zero, unless one had previously not been acquainted with the two basic facts in modern international politics: (a) the principal, irreconcilable conflict in the world today exists between expanding American finance-capitalist imperialism and expanding Russian totalitarian-collectivist imperialism; and (b) each of these major rivals has constructed, and will continue to construct with might and main, a bloc made up of smaller, subordinate nations which it has succeeded in dragging in its orbit, by means fair or foul. Fifteen votes against six votes—this was the monotonous rollcall of the conference's last days—an ominous rollcall, a listing of the roster for World War III, Atomic War I.

On the final day of the conference, the wheel had revolved its full circle, and matters stood precisely where they had thirteen weeks before, in so far as the basic issues at dispute and their settlement were concerned. Even a temporary agreement, a *modus vivendi*, had not been worked out! Back into the laps of the Big Four and their Foreign Ministers went the issues. Twenty-one imperialist and capitalist powers had proved again the Marxist tenet—under capitalism there can be no lasting, secure peace or even tangible efforts in such direction! Above all, in the chaos of Europe and its general social decline, the ministrations of capitalist and Stalinist diplomats and rulers can only serve to spread further infection and social injury; they cannot cure or heal. Another dread winter approaches, threatening to be even more bleak and miserable than the first post-war winter. Yet neither Russian collectivism nor American capitalism have brought to Europe sufficient food, medicine, raw materials, supplies, loans and machinery, etc.—in a word, those things so essential for the beginnings of a restoration in Europe. Not even the formalities

of peace treaties with long-since defeated and overcome minor partners of Hitler have been completed! The conference of the twenty-one was a conference of bankrupts.

After an initial sharp struggle over the issue of the actual powers of the conference, and the system of voting, it was clear that at best the conference could not make decisions, but merely recommendations in accordance with the desires of the American fifteen-vote bloc. But America joined together with Russia in a *common interpretation* as to the weight and value of these recommendations, assigning a greater "weight" to those adopted by a two-thirds vote than those passed by mere majorities. Neither vote, of course, had more than symbolic significance and could become actuality only if accepted by the Big Four in unanimity. In accepting such procedure, American imperialism revealed that it had, at least, this much in common with Russian imperialism: that is, no intention of accepting anything put forward by the seventeen smaller power that did not suit and satisfy its desires.

The completed work of the conference is therefore subject to acceptance, modification or rejection by the pending Foreign Ministers Council meeting, consisting of the Big Four and set for November 4 in New York City. The five draft treaties adopted (with Rumania, Bulgaria, Italy, Hungary and Finland) are imperialist, predatory and scheming in essence, as a terse summary of their contents will show. But it must be borne in mind that these drafts, leaving out the disputed issues between the two blocs, cover the area of common agreement and can be assumed to be parts of whatever ultimate treaties may be drawn:

Draft Treaties

Territorial Transfers: Dodecanese Islands from Italy to Greece; small Alpine border regions (Briga, etc.) from Italy to France; postponement of Italian colonies' fate; Transylvania from Hungary to Rumania; Dobruja from Rumania to Bulgaria; Bessarabia-Bukovina from Rumania to Russia; Petsamo port, Finnish Karelia and various Finnish military bases to Russia.

Not a one of these transfers, it goes without saying, is to be put to a vote by the millions of people concerned in the action.

Reparations: Italy to pay \$325 million; Hungary to pay \$300 million; Rumania to pay \$300 million; Bulgaria to pay \$125 million; Finland to pay \$300 million.

Of this total sum, Russia alone stands to collect \$1 billion!

So much for the area of approximate conference agreement. The area of disagreement covers a still larger territory. The whole problem of Trieste and its future, involving the definite fate of the Italian treaty, is as hotly disputed as ever. The whole problem of trade and commerce in the Balkans and the Danubian nations, involving the economic fate of these countries, is still under dispute. The whole problem of final fixing of reparations is still an issue, since America refuses to recognize the current Russian demands. The whole problem of a final treaty with Austria, certainly decisive for that minor but important nation if it is ever to breathe again, remains up in the air. The whole problem of a treaty with Germany, unquestionably the key social and political problem in Europe, has only been scratched. The whole problem of how to remove the blood-sucking Russian troops of occupation, and how to ease off the constant American threat

CF "Post-Stuttgart Germany," by Henry Judd, in the next issue of *The New Internationalist*.

of stopping shipments and loans (a threat increasingly employed by the crude and callous Mr. Byrnes)—the vital problem, in a word, of how to remove the small nations, all of Europe indeed, from American and/or Russian clutches has yet to be solved. But the Paris Conference, of course, was not convened for such purposes.

All of these matters will come up again, in one form or another, at the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the meeting of the Big Four Foreign Ministers. In all likelihood, additional if slow progress will be made toward temporary working agreements. In reality, these two new gatherings in New York are but continuations of the Paris Conference and the long-drawn-out series of negotiations between Russia and America which have become familiar since the late FDR met Stalin at Teheran. For the two world giants to live without precipitously and prematurely drawing the sword against each other an almost endless and constant state of negotiation is required. But this will not "liquidate the war and give the peoples of this world a chance to live again under conditions of peace," to quote Mr. Byrnes in his October 18 summary of the Paris Conference. At best, it can delay and postpone the inevitable conflict. The Paris Conference brought as little assurance to the world as prior conferences had, or future conferences will.

THE WALLACE DISMISSAL

The dismissal of Henry Wallace from the Truman cabinet is an event of deep symbolical importance. It marks the end of one epoch and, in more senses than one, signifies the opening of another.

Everyone knows that Wallace was the last on the list of those associated with the New Deal policies of Franklin Roosevelt. That the list was so rapidly exhausted was not due merely to the desire of Truman to surround himself with his own friends. The New Dealers departed with such rapidity because there was nothing more for them to do. Roosevelt himself had declared what all the world knew, that the New Deal was dead. Of the New Deal and all it signified nothing now remains but the desperate hopes of the labor leaders that somehow or other Truman will find some policy which will enable them to corral the workers once more into the Democratic camp.

That is why Wallace was allowed to remain so long. He was supposed to be the representative of labor and the liberal intellectuals. In reality Wallace's sole power lay with his influence in labor circles. He spoke often and with force against the formation of a third party or a Labor Party. To prevent that was his special value to the Administration. For the rest he did nothing in the cabinet. In the great strikes he was practically silent.

Wallace had startled the country toward the end of the war by declaring that America needed a revolution—a bloody revolution or a bloodless one; he was for a bloodless one and he implied that unless Congress carried out his bloodless revolution, there was certain to be a bloody one. But the country entered the post-war crisis. Wallace sat in Truman's cabinet and it was as if he was not there. What action of President Truman's on the domestic front was influenced by Wallace? Labor spoke for itself on the picket-line. It managed without Henry Wallace.

It is by no means unimportant that the break came over foreign policy. The internal crisis which the New Deal failed

to solve has steadily been transforming and developing itself into its true international dimensions. In 1940 the economic bankruptcy of the New Deal was patent. The growth of the fascist movement in the United States was unmistakable evidence of this. The growing transformation of the economy into a war economy saved the situation for the time being. Roosevelt (and Wallace) mobilized the population for war and each added a phrase to the history of bourgeois hypocrisy. Roosevelt blew the soap-bubbles of the Four Freedoms and Wallace, the "labor" representative, proclaimed the present century as the Century of the Common Man. This now was Wallace's dilemma. Of the men who actually led the country into the war behind the smoke-screen of false and lying promises, he alone remained in the government. The international results of the war are a global ruin. The people of the United States can see abroad nothing but the shambles and debris of the Second World War and, in a thousand places, the crackling flames of the new. Furthermore, Byrnes, of the right wing of the Democratic Party, and Vandenberg, of the Republican Party, are using the machinery of the United Nations to carry out their battle for world domination with Stalinist Russia. Wallace was faced with the task of opposing them or being as impotent in foreign policy as he was in the internal crisis. The psychologists will work out the degrees of his sincerity. The fact remains that the only "peace" policy he could find was to divide the world into two parts, leaving half the world to Stalinist imperialism and taking the other half under the "protective custody" of American capital and the American Army, Navy and Air Force. Even some of his own liberal followers are aghast at the abandonment of every pretense of idealism. But they have put forward nothing else—because there is nothing else for those who accept capitalism. The policy hasn't even the advantage of giving any hope for peace. Liberalism stands naked to the breeze, and the breeze is cold with doom.

RUSSIA, TWENTY-NINE YEARS AFTER

As the marching thousands once more pour through Moscow's Red Square for the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Russian Revolution, they will for the first time be reviewed by a government of *ministers*. Few of the formal *outward* changes introduced by the new ruling class in their efforts to obliterate the revolutionary distinctions between the Russian state and all others, speak such volumes as the recent amendments to the Russian Constitution changing the names of the heads of government from "People's Commissars" to "Ministers."

In Leon Trotsky's reminiscences of Lenin, published under the title *Lenin*, he relates the conversation that gave birth to the term "People's Commissars." Lenin and Trotsky were resting from the fatiguing all-night session of the Soviet Congress in Smolny on the day of the insurrection. Their thoughts turned to the formal organization of the new revolutionary government. Lenin was anxious to differentiate the new régime from the old, even in the nomenclature applied to its heads. He specifically wanted to avoid the term "Minister." The Russian masses had just had their fill of government by Kerensky's Ministers, not to speak of the long association of the term with the appointees of the Czar. Trotsky suggested "Commissar," an adaptation of the famous revolutionary "Commissioners" of the French Revolution. Lenin greeted it with enthusiasm. "It smells of revolution," was his comment.

The announcement of a government of "People's Commissars" instead of a new set of Ministers had a tremendous symbolic significance to the Russian masses and to the world at large.

The triumphant counter-revolution under Stalin waited a long time before venturing to discard the term "People's Commissar." Like so much of the nomenclature of the Revolution, the term was a necessary cover for the counter-revolutionary changes in the essence of the régime. However, the heads of the new ruling class must have felt exceedingly uncomfortable as "People's Commissars." They yearned to rid the state of its remaining revolutionary configurations in outward appearances in order to make Russian state forms more like those of other states. The Russian bureaucrat thinks: "Why can't we be like other states?" Though the heads of capitalism as a revolutionary power, it continued to be an unpleasant reminder of Russia's past to do business with officials who bore such titles as "People's Commissar," and, as with all that is strange and different, remained a source of uneasiness.

It is significant, too, that the Stalin régime chose "Minister" rather than the more democratic "Secretary" adopted by the young American republic when it won its war of independence against the Ministers of the British Crown. As in other instances, when the Russian rulers assume the trappings

of the bourgeois world, they choose the reactionary rather than the democratic.

But if the term "People's Commissar" was long devoid of any proletarian revolutionary content in Russia, the term "Minister" is just as devoid of any bourgeois content today. It has about the same relevance as evidence that capitalism is returning to Russia as the appearance of cosmetics shops and the introduction of American jazz. The stultified economy remains intact. Far from any evidence of the return of capitalist property forms, all indications point to greater state control. Significant in this respect is the recent announcement that henceforth the Council for Collective Farm Affairs will have its own direct representatives, "controllers from the center," to supervise the local collectives. This is part of a drive to centralize agriculture and offset tendencies toward "squandering of collective farm property" and "money chasing" on the part of collective farmers.

Few traces remain of the world-shaking changes wrought by the Russian Revolution. Even its outward symbols are being systematically uprooted. The meaning of that great liberating event lives on only in the program and activities of the Fourth Internationalist movement. The real celebration of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Russian Revolution will not take place in Red Square but in the press and meetings of the revolutionary Marxist parties.

Book Bargains

NO. 1

Lenin: The Teachings of Karl Marx20	} 50¢ for You
Lenin: The War and the Second International20	
Nearing: The American Empire50	
-----	.90	

NO. 2

Lenin: The Teachings of Karl Marx20	} \$1.25 for You
Lovovsky: Role of Labor Unions in the Russian Revolution05	
Losovsky—Role of Labor Unions in the Russian Revolution50	
Nearing: The American Empire50	
Shachtman: The Fight for Socialism	1.00	
-----	\$1.75	

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please send me No. 1 No. 2 No. 3

Have you read Trotsky's
THE NEW COURSE?

Paper Bound \$1.00
Cloth Bound \$2.00

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____

SUBSCRIBE NOW

To the New Eight-Page

LABOR ACTION



Start Reading Its New

Magazine Section

\$1.00 a Year 50 Cents Six Mos.

LABOR ACTION

4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Zone _____ State _____

Marxism and the Jewish Question

With this issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL we open a discussion of the Jewish question from the point of view of Marxist theory and politics. Our discussion will not present the first Marxist writings on the question. It has been the subject of lively polemics upon several occasions in the history of the Marxist movement. What makes our discussion so necessary, even urgent, is the entirely changed situation of the Jewish people, especially those of Europe, as a result of the rise of Nazism and its aftermath.

Marxists have been traditionally assimilationist and anti-Zionist. However, much of what was written from that approach no longer applies. The promise of assimilation ushered in by the bourgeois revolutions came to an end when the continued existence of capitalism required the destruction of bourgeois democracy. The Jews of Germany, once pointed to by Lenin as a model of assimilation, became pariahs in the country they had come to accept fully as their own. Just as the retrogressive tendencies unloosed by declining capitalism caused the re-appearance of a national question in Europe, so they once more called into question the relationship of the Jewish people to the nations of which they were a part. Jewish national consciousness became a mass phenomenon and Jewish nationalism became the concern of masses of Jews, rather than as was the case in pre-Hitler Europe, the concern of sects of Zionist politicians.

This changed situation of the Jews makes much of what Marxists once wrote on the question invalid. However, Marxists do not approach the problem from scratch. Marxism has an accumulated arsenal of knowledge and developed tools of scientific method that enable it once more to establish its theoretical bearings and work out its political program on the Jewish question.

There are two possible approaches to the problem before us. Each has been demonstrated in past Marxist treatments of the question. One finds its protagonist in Karl Kautsky who summed up his studies of the Jewish question in his book

Are the Jews a Race? The other finds its protagonist in Lenin who dealt with the Jewish question as part of his innumerable polemics on the national question, especially in those directed against the Jewish Bund and its theory of national cultural autonomy.

The approach of Kautsky gives the appearance of extreme profundity and thorough scholarship. However, its net value as a guide to Marxists in the political struggle is slight. Despite its many valuable contributions, it is a work of ponderous pedantry.

Lenin, on the contrary, seized hold of the Jewish question, not out of an academic interest, but as a burning political problem in Czarist Russia. He sought to give a political answer to the problem at hand, rather than write the definitive answer to the past, present and future of the Jews. However, his treatment did not confine itself to the particularism of the Jewish question as it existed in Eastern Europe. Basing himself upon the world trends of Jewish development and upon the teachings of Marxism on the national question he established a firm theoretical justification for the political solutions he offered to the Jewish proletariat and the Jewish people as a whole. Lenin could not conceive of a problem like the Jewish question unrelated to its specific historical context. We earnestly recommend that our contributors approach the problem in the same spirit of political relevance.

We open the discussion with the presentation of the following documents: (1) a resolution adopted by the National Committee of the Workers Party, (2) a resolution submitted by Comrades Edward and Albert Findley and (3) an article presented by Comrade W. Brooks. The three documents present, as our readers will readily ascertain, three different points of view. We welcome comment from our readers in the form of letters or articles not exceeding 1,000 words in length. Contributions of greater length will be published only by special agreement between the contributor and the Editorial Board.

EDITORS.

FREE IMMIGRATION EVERYWHERE; A FREE PALESTINE WITH MAJORITY RULE

*(Adopted by National Committee,
Workers Party, May, 1946)*

1. The barbarous depths to which a decaying capitalism can drag civilization finds its extreme example to date in the physical destruction of some six million Jews at the hands of the Nazis, i.e., all but the total extinction of European Jewry.

The rising, world-wide tide of anti-Semitism in the period of capitalist decay again emphasizes the close inter-relationship between the progress of the democratic and socialist struggles of the working class and the liberties of all oppressed and proscribed peoples. The Jews of Western Europe were liberated from their ghetto-existence and their

civil and economic disability by the French Revolution, which, though bourgeois in historical form, was achieved by the struggle of the urban and peasant masses and, in large measure, in opposition to the bourgeoisie. The rise of the modern working class and the development of the Socialist and labor movements further fortified these rights and carried them forward across Central and Eastern Europe, culminating with the Russian Revolution which liberated the millions of Jews from the Czarist ghettos and the periodic pogroms. With the growing inability of capitalism to maintain any kind of stable economic existence, the capitalist class finds all democratic forms and rights increasingly incompatible with their further rule. All

the great conquests of the last two hundred years, not only those of the modern labor movement but those of the bourgeois democratic revolutions as well, fall victim one by one to the onslaught of capitalist-totalitarian reaction.

2. The struggle for the defense of the Jewish people, of their full economic, political and social equality and against all forms of anti-Semitism is, therefore, an integral part of the struggle in defense of democracy and civilization, a struggle which finds its only complete expression in the struggle for Socialism. This struggle against anti-Semitism is likewise of greatest importance in the efforts of the Workers Party to educate the American proletariat to the political significance of anti-Semitism, to its use by the native fascist movements and by sections of the bourgeoisie as a weapon against the working class.

3. The remnants of European Jewry find themselves today in a worse plight than that of any other war-torn people of Europe. Deprived of all earthly possessions, totally homeless, without means of a livelihood, in most instances bereft of relatives, friends and even families, herded into Displaced Persons Camps, often little better than the concentration camps they survived, most Jews of Europe see no future in their old homelands and seek to emigrate into other lands to start life anew. The elementary democratic demand of free emigration and immigration, long part of every genuinely democratic program, must be most vigorously fought for in this specific case of the European Jews. All barriers against their immigration to the countries they choose must be broken down. For Socialists in the United States, in this the richest nation in the world and one having industrial and agricultural resources for a population many times the present size, this means, in the first place, the struggle against exclusion of Europe's Jews from *this* country. We must fight for the realization of the slogan, "Open the doors of the U.S.!" For Socialists in the United States, it means also exposing the policy of American imperialism which offers no other solution for the Jews of Europe than life in a Displaced Persons Camp in spite of all the pretensions of American imperialism to being the most liberal and inherently democratic state in the world.

4. The wave of anti-Semitism which followed the defeat of German labor by fascism and the victory of Hitler led to a tremendous resurgence of nationalistic sentiment among Jews all over the world. It seemed to millions of Jews that the struggle of Allied imperialism against Germany was at the same time a struggle against anti-Semitism. But this illusion has been rapidly disappearing as the remaining Jewish masses of Europe continue to feel the lash of anti-Semitism in the territories occupied by the victorious Allies and in the Allied nations themselves.

This growing Jewish nationalism has taken the form of a mass desire for a territory (in particular, Palestine) where the Jewish population might constitute a majority and thereby be able to develop its own life free from anti-Semitism. These aspirations are the legitimate, democratic yearnings of a people long subjected to oppression and discrimination.

It is an axiom for revolutionary social-

ists who alone can be consistent democrats that all peoples who desire to lead an independent national existence be given the opportunity to do so. Whenever such a national struggle, however, conflicts with the needs of the general revolutionary struggle against world imperialism and for the proletarian revolution which alone can guarantee real freedom for all peoples and provide the basis for a solution to the Jewish problem, that national struggle must be subordinated to the socialist struggle.

To pose the achievement of a Jewish state under capitalism as does the Zionist movement as the solution of the Jewish question is to pose a reactionary Utopia. The effect of the Zionist movement is to divert the struggle of the Jewish proletariat and the Jewish people as a whole from the class struggle of the entire working class of the countries they live in. The attempt to realize a Jewish state under capitalism is, at best, conceivable as a wretched adjunct of one of the imperialist empires. It is precisely because the Zionist aim is a reactionary Utopia that the practical policies of Zionism have a reactionary content. The aspirations of the Jewish people for a state of their own can only find its genuine realization as a Jewish Commonwealth in a World Socialist Federation.

5. Despite this political judgment of Zionism, it is still necessary for Marxists to take note of the tremendous desire that exists among Europe's Jews to settle in Palestine and take part in the building up of a Jewish community life which will afford them an economic existence and also shield them from the barbarous anti-Semitism to which they have been subjected. Their desire to go to Palestine has been continually frustrated by the opposition of the British imperialist régime, which conditions its immigration policy to its own reactionary political needs. It opens and closes the gates to Palestine (thereby playing with the very lives of tens of thousands of people), in accordance with its deliberate policy of maintaining and fostering Arab-Jewish hostility for the ultimate benefit of British rule. The struggle for the freedom of immigration is, therefore, today largely a struggle against the reactionary British barriers around Palestine. Our English comrades, together with the revolutionary Marxists of the United States and of Palestine, must become champions of the slogan of "Open the doors of Palestine!" to be achieved, not by bargaining with British imperialism, but by mass revolutionary struggle against it.

6. The Zionist movement has recently carried on a determined, world-wide struggle for free Jewish immigration into Palestine. While Marxists can give conditional and critical support to this fight, above all to those heroic Jewish youth in Palestine who have taken to direct action to break down the barriers to immigration, we at all times sharply condemn the reactionary political program to which the Zionists tie their fight for free immigration, i.e., the achievement of a Jewish majority and a Jewish state. The reactionary political character of the Zionist movement is revealed precisely in their demand for free *Jewish* immigration, while opposing free *Arab* immigration into Palestine. Their fight is not motivated by a genuinely democratic and internationalist position but rather by a narrowly Jewish, nationalist position. This position finds its ultimately reactionary conclusion in their opposition to a Constituent Assembly for Palestine at the present time, on the grounds that the Jews do not yet constitute a majority! This position leads them to prefer continued British rule to a free Palestine with an Arab majority.

7. The problem of Palestine is not, in the first place, a problem of Arab-Jewish relations but rather a problem of British imperialist domination over both Arabs and Jews. The solution of the Palestinian problem must, therefore, begin with the struggle against British imperialist rule. This struggle proceeds under the slogan of "Out with the British! A free Palestine!" Not the British but only the inhabitants of Palestine can decide its future.

8. The struggle for a free Palestine must, therefore, be a struggle fought on the basis of Jewish-Arab unity. Every national and religious issue which Jews and Arabs permit themselves to be divided over is another prop for British rule. It is not a problem, today, of self-determination of Jews against Arab rule or vice versa, but of Palestinian self-determination against British rule.

9. The slogan for a free Palestine finds its concrete political expression in the demand for the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly, elected by direct, secret, universal suffrage of men and women over 18. This demand must be the crowning political slogan for any genuinely democratic (not to speak of Socialist) program for Palestine today. The reactionary character of Zionism is seen precisely in their opposition to this slogan. From the extreme right wing to the most left, all Zionist tendencies stand

united in opposition to a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage until a Jewish majority is assured. Other slogans, such as "bi-national state" evade this question: Shall the majority of the people of Palestine have the right to decide democratically the fate of their own country through a Constituent Assembly? Not only does this position of Zionism make it an obvious tool of British imperialist policy but it plays into the hands of the most reactionary Arab nationalist elements. The latter use this reactionary role of Zionism as a means of assuring their own reactionary domination over the Arab masses and, thereby, to undermine all tendencies toward Arab-Jewish unity.

10. As demonstrated by every other democratic revolution of our epoch, the only class in Palestine that will prove itself capable of leading a thorough-going revolutionary struggle against British imperialism is the Palestinian proletariat. The proletarian class struggle against economic exploitation unites all toilers and serves as the bridge across all reactionary nationalist barriers. Under the political influence of a revolutionary Marxist party the Jewish and Arab workers will find their way to each other in a common economic and *political* struggle, directed against all exploiters and oppressors, British, Arab and Jewish. The inspiring unity of the Arab and Jewish railroad workers in their recent strike is an example of how the proletarian class struggle can cut through all national barriers. (The strike of the civil service employees which followed likewise demonstrated this.) The fact that the Jewish strikers received no support from the Jewish bourgeoisie and that the Arab strikers were viciously condemned by the Arab landed aristocracy on the grounds that they were forsaking the Arab national front, reveals how proletarian class action not only forges the unity of the Arab and Jewish masses from below, but also takes the national struggle out of the hands of the bourgeoisie and landowners and places it in the hands of the proletariat.

The organization of the Palestinian proletariat demands the fight against all attempts at setting up separate Jewish or Arab workers organizations. The trade unions and other working class organizations that are founded on the principle of the class struggle must encompass all workers, regardless of nationality. The organization of a specifically Jewish trade union movement by the "Socialist"

Zionists is but another reactionary Zionist blow against genuine Arab-Jewish unity. The Palestinian workers organizations will, of course, guarantee the fullest freedom of Arabs and Jews in the use of their own language, in the conduct of meetings and will foster a bilingual workers press and literature.

11. As in every democratic revolution, the demands of the masses for political freedom take on real meaning only as they relate these to their economic needs, so the struggle for a free Palestine must be linked to the economic needs of the Arab and Jewish masses. The key slogan in such demands for Palestine must be the slogan of "Land to the peasants!" This slogan, like all demands directed against the privileged, possessing classes, strikes a blow at the British, Jewish and Arab interests simultaneously. The fight for "a free Palestine" and "land to the peasants" will guarantee the best possible road to a liberated Palestine in which the Arab majority preponderantly composed of landless peasants and day-laborers, will wage an agrarian revolution against the Arab landowners, a struggle which will link up with the fight of the city and town proletariat against its capitalist oppressors. To the democratic demand of "land to the peasants" must be linked the transitional program of the Fourth International, as adapted to the specific economic conditions of Palestine.

12. The Workers Party warns all supporters of Palestinian freedom against the treacherous role of Russia in the struggles of national liberation and of the infamous role of the Stalinists everywhere in relation to the Jewish question and Palestine. Russia's interest in the Middle East is that of an imperialist rival of the British Empire. Russia will seek to exploit the differences in the Palestinian situation, not to advance any democratic cause, but to strengthen her own reactionary influence in that part of the world. Palestine's strategic location between the Iranian oil fields and the Mediterranean makes of it a natural pawn in the struggles of the great imperialist powers, and in this period, of special interest to Russia. Russia sought to enlist the support of world Jewry during her role as a war-ally of the United States and England against Germany. During this period, above all, in the light of the pro-Axis role of the Arab nationalist leaders, Russia sought to appear as the champion of the Jews. (This did not prevent the GPU from murder-

ing Ehrlich and Alter and thousands of other Jewish anti-Stalinist Socialists.) Today, Russia seeks to curry favor with the reactionary Arab nationalists by appearing as the champion of the Arab world against British oppression. Nothing but disaster will result from either Jews or Arabs placing the slightest confidence in Russia's role in the Middle East.

The Workers Party likewise warns all supporters of Palestinian freedom against any faith in the "democratic" intentions of American imperialism in the Middle East. As with the other great powers, the United States is motivated by its economic interests in this part of the world, above all in oil resources. The somewhat obscure dealings of Roosevelt with the King of Saudi Arabia are an indication of the American role of playing both the pro-Arab and pro-Jewish game in this sphere in the interests of American political and economic domination. The United States seeks to garner the maximum advantages from the Palestinian situation, without, however, openly taking political responsibility. It prefers to leave the latter in the hands of the British, thus freeing itself from the obvious blame for the reactionary results of what is, in the last analysis, Anglo-American policy.

Neither Great Britain, nor Russia, nor the United States, nor the Zionist world organization, nor the League of Arab states, can be relied upon to conduct a fight on behalf of the interests of the Palestinian masses. This struggle must rest entirely in the hands of the masses. Their only real allies are to be found in the world struggle of the working classes and the colonial peoples.

13. The successful conduct of the struggle of the Palestinian proletariat on behalf of national and social emancipation can only be guaranteed by the existence of a powerful revolutionary, Marxist party, firmly rooted among the Arab and Jewish toilers. The contribution of the Fourth Internationalist movement toward the solution of the Jewish question and the Palestinian question must, therefore, begin with all assistance toward the establishment of such a party in Palestine.

ASSIMILATION UTOPIAN; SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE JEWS

Modern anti-Semitism, flourishing in the rotten soil of decaying capitalism, is a new phenomenon differing radically from previous forms of anti-Semitism and from almost all other forms of national or colonial oppression.

In the past, the anti-Semitic program called for the extinction of the Jews as a separate national or religious community and their forced dissolution into the surrounding national or religious community. It offered the Jews a real alternative—expulsion or the adoption of the dominant faith and culture.

Capitalist totalitarian anti-Semitism, however, plans and executes an annihilatory policy—the complete and total physical extermination of the Jews. Whether it employs the “cold pogrom” technique of the Polish Endeks, whereby the Jewish population is completely frozen out of the economic life and slowly starved to death, or the more rapid and scientific Nazi process of gas chamber murder, the goal is the same. The arena of annihilation is today no longer limited to single countries. It is continental and worldwide.

The most brutal imperialism on the other hand, generally seeks only the subjugation and exploitation of the peoples it rules and not their full destruction. In non-colonial countries, national oppression seeks only the subjugation and degradation of the oppressed and their extinction only as a national community. Anti-Negroism in the U. S. and South Africa seldom goes beyond the desire to exploit and keep the Negro in his place as a servile, second class citizen, to be more easily and cruelly exploited. These subjected peoples are then offered the real alternatives of *death or slavery*.

The distinguishing feature of totalitarian capitalist forms of anti-Semitism is the total rejection of the Jews even as the most abject slaves.

Thus in a fundamental sense and in a very real personal sense the survival of the Jews is dependent upon the overthrow of capitalism. “The Jewish proletariat is in need of revolution more than any other.” The correct use of this concept in our propaganda to the Jewish masses will make the program of the revolutionary party real and vital to Jewish workers and petty-bourgeoisie as the only effective way of defending their lives.

The cause of anti-Semitism is to be

found in the nature of capitalist class relationships. The fundamental solution of the Jewish problem lies, therefore, in the participation of the Jewish masses in the working class struggle for the abolition of capitalism, and the creation of a free socialist society. This, by itself, is not, however, an *immediate* nor a sufficient answer to the needs of the homeless, uprooted European Jewry which finds itself in a worse plight than all war torn peoples of Europe.

For the overwhelming majority of these gas chamber escapees, with no real future in their former homelands, the question of uninterrupted and free immigration has become a LIFE AND DEATH question.

The Right of Immigration

The working class movement in every country has the duty to demand the general right of unrestricted emigration and immigration. This principle, long recognized in the international socialist movement as one of the elementary and genuinely democratic rights to be defended by the working class, must be specifically and vigorously fought for in the case of the homeless Jews of Europe. All barriers against their immigration to the countries *they* chose must be broken down.

For socialists in the United States, the richest nation in the world and one having industrial and agricultural resources for a population many times the present size, this means in the first place, the struggle against exclusion of Europe's Jews from this country. We must fight for the realization of the slogan “*Open the doors of the United States!*”

As part of the general desire to emigrate to safe haven, there exists an extremely powerful and spontaneous desire to go to Palestine and participate there in the building of a national territorial center. This fact must play a *key* role in determining the attitude of socialists toward the *direction* of Jewish emigration. In addition to fighting for opening the doors in the U. S., we must join in the struggle, to the extent we are able, to open the doors of Palestine.

The Workers Party recognizes the strong sentiment for a Jewish territorial center and the struggle for its realization as legitimate and progressive in the same sense that revolutionary Marxists thus

characterize other national struggles for self-determination.

The Workers Party rejects the old Comintern formulae which failed to distinguish between the legitimate national aspirations of the Jewish masses for *survival as a national community* and the reactionary and reformist parties that presume to represent them.

Question of Cultural Autonomy

Whether this desire for continued national existence is to take the path of national cultural autonomy (as advocated by the Jewish Bund for the Jews of Poland and West Russia with their compact, mass centers of viable Jewish cultural life), or the path of acquiring a territorial, economic strategic base for group survival (territorialism and Zionism), is a matter for *self-determination* by the Jewish masses.

The demand for national cultural autonomy is reactionary and anti-democratic *only* when raised as an alternative to full political independence; to deny an oppressed minority its right to secession (ex. Renner's program of cultural autonomy for the oppressed Slavic peoples of Austria-Hungary).

When, however, an oppressed nationality does not possess a basis for territorial autonomy and political secession by reason of geographical dispersion, it is anti-democratic and false internationalism to deny that people self-direction and self-determination of its cultural and social life in the name of an international fusion of peoples.

As revolutionary socialists we cannot but reject the attempt to impose an assimilationist perspective on the Jewish masses as *cultural imperialism*. Whether or not the Jews should submerge their identity into the surrounding peoples in whose midst they live or seek to preserve themselves as a nation, is for *them* to decide.

Revolutionary Marxists recognize that the perspective of assimilation under capitalism is *utopian* and can only lead the Jewish masses to underestimate the catastrophic weakness of their position in bourgeois and Stalinist society.

The Workers Party condemns the old “propaganda of indifference” with respect to the national aspirations of the Jewish masses. It is patently wrong and anti-democratic to fight for the right of all other oppressed nationalities to self-determination, even under capitalism, and at the same time deny this basic democratic right to the most oppressed Jews.

Those who argue that any organized struggle for a Jewish territorial center or other form of self-determination is utopian and reactionary because unrealizable under capitalism, are repeating the false and objectively anti-democratic thesis of Bukharin-Piatikov, who claimed that "the self-determination of nations is first of all utopian (it cannot be realized within the limits of capitalism) and harmful as a slogan that disseminates illusions." This thesis is just as erroneous when applied to the struggle for a Jewish territorial center as when applied to the national question as a whole.

"It would be a fundamental error to think that a struggle for democracy would be capable of diverting the proletariat from a socialist revolution, or of obscuring, or overshadowing such a revolution. On the contrary, just as victorious socialism is impossible unless it achieves complete democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for a victory over the bourgeoisie if it does not lead a broad, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy. The elimination of one of the paragraphs of the democratic program—for example, the paragraph about self-determination of nations—supposedly for the reason of its 'impracticability' under imperialism would be no less an error." (Lenin)

It is our task to correctly apply the Leninist program on the national question to the struggle for the Jews for national self-determination, to use this struggle as a lever toward the socialist revolution.

The Jews as a Nation

The Jewish struggle must be recognized for what it really is—a part of the national struggle, and not merely a struggle for civil rights and equality (although it is that too).

Lenin himself erred in this respect by uncritically following Kautsky in considering the Jews a social caste and not a socially heterogeneous nationality. A step forward was made by Trotsky when he came out in favor of a territorial center for the Jews in a Socialist world. By implication he thereby rejected the concept of the Jews as a caste but rather considered them a nationality. We must draw the full implications and make clear that the *Jewish question is a national question*.

For revolutionary socialists there is no need to set up hard and fast criteria before we permit a group to be considered a nationality. Such tasks we leave to the metaphysicians. *For us it is sufficient that*

the material and historical conditions have created such a strong feeling that the human beings involved think of themselves as a nation or nationality.

The Workers Party rejects as absolutely invalid today the old formulae which proclaimed that "idea of a Jewish 'nationality' has a definitely reactionary character"; that "the idea of a Jewish nationality is a denial of the interests of the Jewish proletariat, introducing within it directly or indirectly a feeling which is hostile to assimilation, a Ghetto feeling."

While supporting the struggle for Jewish self-determination, we must impart a revolutionary socialist *direction* to that struggle. Revolutionary socialists do not fail to point out to the nationally conscious Jewish masses that their aspirations cannot be fully achieved within the framework of decadent capitalism; that the struggle for their democratic and just national demands can find its only true expression in the struggle for liberating Socialism against both capitalist and Stalinist imperialism.

The Workers Party warns the Jewish masses against the danger of a despairing attitude toward the defense of Jewish and other democratic rights outside of Palestine. In countries where an independent labor movement exists such an attitude is not only cowardly but plays into the hands of the reactionary capitalists and can only hasten the development of capitalist totalitarianism. Such an attitude makes the job of the exterminators easier by removing one obstacle in their path, the force of a highly politically developed group—the Jews. Such an attitude will also defeat the territorial desires of the Jews, since there can be no freedom and independence in Palestine in a world dominated by imperialist England and America or by Russian imperialism.

The *world* character of the Jewish problem and the *worldwide arena* in which the struggle for its solution is fought must lead to a sharp rejection of the false counter-posing in practice (by Zionists and anti-Zionists alike) of the struggle for Jewish rights outside of Palestine as against their fight for national rights within that country. To permit one struggle to divert attention and energy from the other, signifies the abandonment of key battle positions in the war against national oppression.

The Jews must and will learn to understand, what many of them already sense; that the Big Three imperialist world is their mortal enemy; that *the*

struggle against anti-Semitism and for Jewish national liberation cannot be conducted apart from the struggle for all democratic rights and apart from the fight of the world proletariat for a socialist society.

The Palestine Problem

For the Jewish masses, freedom in Palestine means above all the right to free immigration into Palestine. This need has thus far been thwarted by a *de facto* alliance between British imperialism and the reactionary leaders of the Arab nationalist movement.

British imperialism, in order to retain control in the crucial area of the Near and Middle East, which is a bridge between three continents and a gigantic and relatively unexplored reservoir of oil, deliberately fosters Arab-Jewish hostility. It courts the Arab world by closing the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigrants and deliberately contrives to present the coming of the Jews as the spearhead of a hated foreign invasion. It courts the Jews by pointing to the Balfour declaration and blaming all attempts at restriction of Jewish rights on the necessity of placating the Arab and Moslem world.

The struggle for free immigration into Palestine means, in the first place, a militant struggle against the restrictive barriers imposed by the British colonial office. It also means exposing the lying propaganda of British and Stalinist imperialism and reactionary Arab nationalism that the Jewish movement into Palestine is an imperialist invasion: that the peaceful settlement of the Jews has taken place at the expense of Arab peasantry.

We Revolutionary Marxists must vigorously champion the demand to "Open the gates to Palestine." We must give critical but unambiguous support to the Jewish resistance movement in its efforts to break the immigration barriers by constructing an underground railroad and by resistance to all efforts to end "illegal" immigration.

At the same time we must condemn in the clearest and sharpest terms the reactionary political program of official Zionism which prevents the Jewish masses from becoming "part and parcel of the anti-imperialist revolution which will shape the future of Asia" and condemns the Palestinian and Near Eastern Jews to the "fate of other historic Levantine peoples (the Armenians and Assyrians) who permitted themselves to become the tools of imperialist protectors."

The bankruptcy of all Zionist parties—bourgeois, reformist and semi-Stalinist—is most clearly demonstrated by their failure to work out a concrete program for international unity of the Arab-Jewish masses in Palestine.

Responsibility for the lack of unity between the two peoples must be shared by the Histadruth (General Federation of Labor in Palestine) with the Arab-Jewish reactionaries, and the British colonial office. The organized labor movement follows a short-sighted, ruinous policy of pushing the working masses of the farms and cities into two separate economies (*Kibbush Avodah*—capture of jobs).

A United Labor Movement

The organizational consequences of this policy—the formation of separate national unions by Jewish and Arab workers to function in their separate national economic sectors—was and is an obstacle in the path of genuine Arab-Jewish unity.

Only where Arab and Jewish workers work side by side does the proletarian class struggle succeed in cutting through nationalist barriers as was demonstrated by the exemplary unity of action displayed by Arab and Jewish workers in the recent railroad and postal strikes. "Long live Jewish and Arab cooperation" was a main slogan shouted by the pickets.

These strikes only highlight the need for *united* trade unions and workers organizations encompassing both Arab and Jewish workers. The revolutionary socialist party of Palestine must place in the forefront the fight against the separation of Palestinian workers into national trade unions and parties. Formation of separate national locals within the same general union would not be an advance over the present—it can only highlight the exclusiveness and bring the conflict within the formal arena of an organization.

The demagogy of the laborites who defend the practice of exclusion on the grounds that the organized Jewish workers with their higher standards would otherwise suffer from the unregulated competition of the backward, low-paid Arab fellaheen must be exposed as false "progressive" camouflage for anti-democratic nationalist politics little different from the open chauvinism of the Arab trade unions.

The defense of this policy that bases itself on the necessity to provide work in Palestine for immigrant Jews is both

economically and politically wrong. The inevitable long-run economic consequence of a policy that splits a small country into two artificial economies is to limit its expansion and absorptive capacity. It is politically self-defeating because it tends to provoke fear and hostility on the part of the Arab workers and fellaheen, the only potential allies of the Jews in Palestine. The fact that Jews cannot find employment in the Arab sector (partly as a result of *Kibbush Avoda* policy) can hardly make reasonable the adoption of a suicidal policy leading to the destruction of all basis for Arab-Jewish unity.

Histadruth convention resolutions in favor of Jewish-Arab unity are worse than meaningless as long as that labor federation continues to exclude Arab labor from the Jewish economy and supports joint action only for Arab and Jewish workers in the employ of the government or of foreign corporations. The fact that the Arab nationalists are even more guilty of national exclusivism cannot justify this short-sighted practice which destroys the very foundation of unity between the Arab and Jewish proletariat.

Zionism and the Mandate

The undoubted reactionary character of the official Zionist movement's support of the British Mandate—or a new U. N. trusteeship—must, however, not be permitted to obscure for us the fact that the long run interests of Jewish nationalism are *incompatible* with British or other imperialist rule of Palestine.

To cling to the outdated, oversimplified Comintern characterization of Zionism as nothing more than "an agent of British imperialism" is to ignore the intense anti-imperialist temper and activities of the Palestinian Jewish masses and the *ever-growing conflict of interests* between these two forces.

It is not at all accidental that the appeal to British imperialism to create what Weitzman called a "Jewish Island outpost for British interests in an Arab Sea" or the supposed "Providential basis for a permanent alliance between England and a Jewish Palestine" (Jabotinsky) has failed utterly and proved illusory. Imperialist realities in the Middle East have always favored, and continue to favor, an alliance between British imperialism and the ruling classes of the Arab world.

The Workers Party warns all supporters of Palestinian freedom of the treacherous role of Russia in the struggles for

national liberation everywhere and reminds them of the infamous role of the Stalinists in the Palestine pogroms of 1937. During the war Russia attempted to appear as a champion of the Jews in order to enlist their support in the war. This did not induce her to give asylum, then or now, to the millions who could have found refuge in her vast territories. Her doors remained closed.

Palestine's strategic location between the Iranian oil fields and the Mediterranean makes it a natural object of imperialist struggle and of special interest to Russian imperialism. Russia seeks to exploit the differences in Palestine in order to strengthen her own reactionary influence in that part of the world.

Today, Russia seeks to curry favor with the reactionary nationalist leaders of the Arabs by appearing as their champion against British and American imperialism. Nothing but disaster will result from either Jews or Arabs placing the slightest confidence in Russia's role in the Middle East.

The Workers Party likewise warns all supporters of Palestinian freedom against any faith in the "democratic" intentions of American imperialism in the Middle East. As with other great powers, the United States is motivated by its economic interests—above all by the oil in this part of the world. The somewhat obscure dealings of Roosevelt with King Ibn Saud of Arabia are an indication of the American role of playing both sides—the pro-Arab and the pro-Jewish side in this game, in the interests of American political and economic domination. The hypocrisy of Truman's request for admission of Jews to Palestine is clear when contrasted with his failure to permit entry of Jews into the U. S.

Neither Great Britain nor Russia nor the U. S. nor the Arab League nor the official Zionist organizations can be relied on to conduct a real fight for the interests of the Palestinian masses. The struggle must rest entirely in the hands of the masses. Their only real allies are to be found in the world struggle of the working class and the colonial peoples.

The struggle for a free democratic Palestine can be fought only on the basis of Jewish-Arab unity. Every national and religious issue over which the Jews and Arabs permit themselves to be divided, is another prop for British rule.

The Constituent Assembly

The slogan for a free Palestine finds concrete political expression in the demand for the immediate convocation of

a *constituent assembly* elected by direct, secret, universal suffrage of *all* men and women over 18. This demand must be a key slogan of a genuinely democratic program for Palestine today.

The reactionary character of the Zionist parties is seen precisely in their opposition to this slogan. From extreme right wing to the most left all Zionist tendencies stand united in opposition to a constituent assembly until a Jewish majority exists. Not only is this position undemocratic, it makes the Zionists dependent on imperialist support with all the evil consequences we are now witnessing; betrayal, etc. It also plays into the hands of the most reactionary Arab nationalist elements. The latter use this role of Zionism as a means of assuring their own reactionary domination over the Arab masses and thereby to undermine all tendencies toward Arab-Jewish unity.

The question of a constituent assembly cannot, however, be posed in the abstract, separate from the *legitimate* fears of the Jewish population, who are well aware that the *cardinal* demand of all Arab nationalists, from the Arab feudal lords to the Arab Stalinists, is the stoppage of all Jewish immigration, and that the extreme Arab nationalists (Istaklil Party) favor the repatriation of all Jews who came to Palestine after World War I.

Revolutionary Socialism cannot and does not ask the Jewish masses to make a *unilateral* sacrifice of *their* democratic and national rights.

Similarly, we must understand that the opposition of the Arab masses to the continued Jewish immigration stems from their just fears of becoming a denationalized minority in a Jewish state, with nothing more than civil rights as individual citizens.

Only a political program that guarantees the *national* aspirations of *both* peoples of Palestine can forge the indispensable anti-imperialist unity of the Jewish and Arab masses.

The establishment of a democratic arena (constituent assembly) for free resolution of the complex Palestinian issues, though basic, is no more than a first step. The fundamental question of *how and on what political basis to resolve the conflict between Arab and Jewish nationalism* is left *virtually unanswered* by those for whom the call for a constituent assembly is the crowning slogan of their program for Palestine.

In the given political context, in

which all Arab nationalist "parties" strongly favor the establishment of an Arab Palestine where the Jewish masses will be deprived of all national rights and be forced to content themselves with precarious civil rights similar to those accorded Jews in the Arab states of Iraq, Egypt and Syria, merely to call for a constituent assembly is tantamount to political support, in effect, of the Arab National State in Palestine. It means political support of the anti-democratic Arab nationalist program which stands on the same plane with that of the maximalist Zionists who favor a Jewish State in which the Palestinian Arabs will either have to content themselves with civil rights alone or else migrate to adjacent Arab lands.

For a Bi-National State

The call for a constituent assembly in Palestine acquires democratic content only when directly linked to a clear demand for a *bi-national* (Jewish-Arab) Palestine, in which the national rights of both peoples are equally acknowledged.

Palestine is a bi-national country; the home of two peoples. Any other point of departure, no matter how concealed by democratic or socialist phraseology, signifies the acceptance of the domination of one Palestinian people by the other.

The banner of bi-nationalism must be wrested from the two Zionist tendencies that purport to be its bearers. The hypocritical lip-service given to a genuinely bi-nationalist solution by the partly Stalinized, Hashomer Hatzair Party of Palestine is belied by its political practice. The Hashomer Hatzair's support of the Histadrut principle that Jews must hire only Jewish labor with its inevitable corollaries of separate national economies and separate, parallel unions for Jews and Arabs flatly contradicts its most fervent bi-nationalist protestations.

On the other hand the Ichud (Unity) Party, which favors the immediate formation of self-governing institutions in which Arabs and Jews are to be represented on a parity basis and the elimination of national discriminatory practices in both communities (i.e., JNF restrictions), places its faith in a tripartite agreement between the "Notables" of both peoples and the imperialist power that controls the country. It vehemently opposes the prosecution of an anti-imperialist struggle against the mandatory power and denounces as "one-sided policy" any Jewish pro-Arab orientation which is directed against the British rulers. The Ichud (Unity) Party's pro-man-

date (or trusteeship) position tears the very heart out of bi-nationalist politics, its very reason for being. The bi-nationalist unity of the Arab and Jewish masses can be welded only in the fire of revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle.

Anti-imperialism and bi-nationalism are the two sides of the Palestinian coin of national liberation.

Role of the Proletariat

The democratic, colonial revolutions of our epoch have demonstrated that the only class in Palestine which will prove capable of leading a thoroughgoing, bi-national struggle against British imperialism is a united Palestinian proletariat. The proletarian class struggle against economic exploitation unites all toilers and serves as the bridge across all nationalist barriers between the Jewish and Arab workers.

The successful conduct of the struggle by a united Palestinian proletariat on behalf of national and social emancipation is inconceivable without the existence of a powerful revolutionary Marxist party firmly rooted amongst the Arab and Jewish toilers. The contribution of the Fourth International movement must, therefore, begin with all assistance toward the establishment of such a party in Palestine.

Such a party can be built only with a program specifically designed to answer the peculiar national and social questions posed by Palestine, based on the following platform:

1. Independence from British imperialism and its imperialist would-be heirs, Russia and the United States.

2. Immediate convocation of a constituent assembly.

3. For free and unrestricted immigration into Palestine.

4. For a bi-national, democratic republic—against both an Arab National State and a Jewish National State in Palestine.

5. Land to the peasantry (Arab and Jewish). For the division of the land (governmental and land-owner's) to those who till it.

6. Abolition of the usury system. Free credit to the peasantry.

7. For united organs of proletarian class struggle—organize the Jewish and Arab workers into the same unions,—joint cooperatives and organizations for the farmers.

For an autonomous, bi-national, Socialist Palestine within a Near East Federation of Socialist Republics.

EDWARD FINDLEY
ALBERT FINDLEY

NO IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE; ARAB FREEDOM THE MAIN ISSUE

The resolution of the National Committee on the Jewish question postulates free immigration for the Jews to Palestine. Abstract as it is, the resolution is undoubtedly correct: as a matter of course we fight for the principle of free emigration and immigration for all people from and to all countries around the globe.

The problem, however, is whether and how this principle should be applied or modified in the concrete case. Our objection to the resolution is that it is too abstract. If we consider the Palestine question, as it presents itself now, we must discuss mainly two points:

1) The people who have immigrated or want to immigrate to Palestine, their aims and predominant ideology, and 2) the people who have lived there all the time. Let us emphasize here that the Jewish and the Palestine question fall under the category of *transitory* demands and transitory solutions. Some of the discussion articles seem to be dangerously unaware of this fact.

Aims of Immigration

The Jews have immigrated or want to immigrate to Palestine in order to establish there a "Jewish Commonwealth." This they want for two reasons:

1) They have to leave Europe because of their persecution, for their desperate plight, for their lives. We have, of course, not only to fight against their discrimination and its causes but also to support, by all means, the realization of their right to immigrate to one or several countries where they can live free from inimical pressure. This statement, however, is still abstract. Let us look at the circumstances:

2) Why do they desire to immigrate to and colonize just Palestine? For two reasons:

When Zionism (or, generally, movements aiming at the re-creation of a Jewish nation) arose early in this century, its leaders found Palestine most appropriate for the realization of their aims not only for ideological reasons, about which later, but first of all because it was the "country of least resistance." Its inhabitants lived their miserable lives still unawakened, under medieval feudalism and despotism. No effectual resistance on their part could be expected. So the Zionists tried to acquire the country wholesale by some dirty deal with money-needing Sultan Abdul Hamid

and later acquired successively, in retail, large stretches of it by orderly business, purchasing it from the feudal lords. Thus the colonization started.

When, in World War I, British imperialism deemed it to its interest to implant some foreign body at the oil-pipe line in the slowly awakening Arab world, Jewish nationalism gladly took the chance and was granted the Balfour Declaration, to be achieved under the British Mandate. Their imperialist protector dealt effectively with the growing resistance of the Arabs, clubbing down their revolts by even more atrocious and brutal methods than she now employs against the Jews. Jewish colonization, nourished on funds abundantly furnished by wealthy Zionist partisans all over the world, has made such considerable progress that the Palestinian Jews can now, by their own means, not only check effectively the native majority of the country, but also dare to challenge even Great Britain who, now, deems it her imperialist interest to restrict further colonization. There can be no doubt that Jewish colonization, however effective it may be, will, in the long run, always depend on one or the other imperialist protector. But all its possible success is based on the economic, cultural and political backwardness of the Arab nation. Just imagine if a similar attempt were made to colonize some land under the sovereignty of a modern power with the purpose of establishing a sovereign "homeland": for instance, Virginia or even virtually uninhabited Alaska or the Aleutians! Unnecessary to state how hopeless this would be. This "least resistance" is the one, the practical, reason why Zionism chose Palestine.

Zionism as Racialism

The other is ideological. Zionism, as all varieties of Jewish nationalism, is based on a racialist ideology which is, at least, as old as and, by no means on a higher level than, Hitler's: The Jewish intellectuals who conceived the idea of a formation or reformation of a Jewish nation have adhered to the doctrine that a common origin postulates as necessary or desirable the preservation of the "race," a common life, culture, country and language. (As to the latter: the Jewish masses had, and prevalently still have, no other relation to Hebrew than, say, the Catholics have had to Latin. Hebrew had to be crammed by the neo-

phytes after having been developed into a vehicle of modern thought by the efforts of philologists.) The Zionists leaders considered Palestine the appropriate scene for their racist experiment not only for its "least resistance" but also because the new ideology could be made still more attractive by blending it with religious sentiments and historic "claims." The pact with Jehovah is a title not much worse than the Balfour Declaration and so is the fact that the Jews lived—prior to 2000 years ago—in the now once more chosen country. It might not be completely superfluous to remark here that analogous historic claims have been part of the stock-in-trade of all imperialisms and petty-imperialisms and that there is no nation in Europe whose country could not be claimed for such reasons by several states. The new ideology was further mixed with, and turned still more into a mystery by the age-old longing for an escape from anti-Semitism and discrimination. Let us be aware that this ideology (neglecting its not too interesting varieties) permeates all strata of the Jews, unfortunately including the working class, and is a *determining factor* of the social and political ends (which we characterize as petty-imperialist) of the immigration to Palestine. Let us not, in wishful thinking, anticipate any future effect which internationalist propaganda might have.

Role of Jewish Capital

The difference between the Jewish and other colonizations consists mainly in the fact that with the former the necessary state compulsion had first to be supplied by another nation, whereas the colonists themselves were able to take care of the economic means necessary for penetration and hegemony. These superior means have been supplied either by the colonists themselves or, principally, by a steady stream of voluntary contributions, mostly from wealthy European and American Jews. These funds were used, first of all, for buying land from the feudal lords. Juridically, these transactions were purchases; economically, however, they were expropriations of the indescribably poor Arab peasants who had tilled small stretches of this land as tenants and semi-serfs and who were promptly evicted. The landlords received the indemnity and the peasants lost their only source for a miserable living and were turned into lumpenproletarians. These former tenant acres and former arid lands were made highly productive by means of capital investments,

improvements and modern methods of production. The colonists became powerful competitors of the remaining native peasants and landlords. To be sure, Arab peasants were exactly as hungry for these lands as the colonists, but the former lacked the necessary funds to purchase and to improve the land, and they lacked wealthy partisans abroad to help them.

Other Jewish investments poured into industries and workshops, competing successfully with, and ruining the ancient Arab craftsmen. The immigrants have enjoyed a monopoly as far as capital and knowledge (which is another form of capital) are concerned. This monopoly has *necessarily* been transforming the natives into "natives," the lower and lowest stratum of the country, exactly as has always been the case in any colonial country. The argument that the economic and cultural standard of the Arabs has *absolutely* improved through these developments is undoubtedly correct. But what counts in a society is the *relative* standard. That of the Arabs has been lowered enormously, as compared to the standard of living of the colonists who form, now, more than a quarter of the population. (All colonial masters, after all, rightly boast about having raised the *absolute* standards of their natives. Even the most vicious imperialism, France, is able to show some improvements in favor of its natives as, say, sanitation, cheap household gadgets, transportation and even some minimum of medical care.) The fact that the lower stratum of the Jew-

ish colonists is allowed (by pseudo-socialist and other methods) to participate, to a certain degree, in the surplus gained by the monopoly on capital and knowledge does not make the slightest difference as to the purely colonial penetration of the Jews in Palestine. On the contrary, it exacerbates its effects and does so all the more, if we consider the ideology and aims of the colonists, which necessarily lead to discrimination against the Arabs as far as jobs, language and cultural institutions are concerned.

Relation to Arab Revolt

The Arab world is awakening. It is only a question of time when a powerful movement for national liberation and unification will set in. It will be a progressive movement whether it is led by feudal-capitalists or not; whether it can or cannot succeed without a victorious socialist movement. We will have to support it conditionally as we did even Haile Selassie, or other oriental despots, in their struggle for national independence from imperialism. The national interests of the Arabs will *naturally* clash with those of the Jewish colonists, leaving aside the former's no less legitimate economic and social grievances. There can be no doubt that in this clash, whose first symptoms coincide with imperialist wranglings, we will have to take sides—for the Arabs. Let us keep in mind that the national (therefore also Jewish) question will, *after* a socialist victory have quite a different aspect. Our *transitional* program, however, must be

based on the facts we stated above. As things are *now*: Jewish colonization in Palestine is dominated by a reactionary ideology; Palestine has been inhabited by the Arabs and is part of their national territory; the Arabs rightly refuse to let themselves be turned into natives, to be dominated or economically controlled by either a minority or majority, and their national aspirations deserve our conditional support. On the other hand, however, the Jews in Europe, terrifically persecuted and discriminated against, also deserve our support as all persecuted peoples do, in Europe and anywhere.

Conclusion: we therefore propose to modify the resolution so that it includes:

1) The demand for free immigration to and emigration from any country and for all people; but as far as the Jews are concerned, this demand should be limited by the words "except Palestine";

2) To call not only *abstractly* to the Jewish workers now in Palestine to fraternize with the Arabs, but *concretely* to share fraternally with the Arabs their land and improvement, their knowledge and skills, their hospitals and cultural institutions and *any advantage whatsoever flowing from their better equipment, better education and the funds* which have flowed and will flow in the future into the country from abroad; to lend to the Arabs their (the Jewish workers) conditional support of the right of the exclusive use of the Arab language in all institutions which the Arabs will hereby acquire.

W. BROOKS.

The Myth of German Character

Psychology and Historical Development

To provide ideological aid to the Allied subjugation of Germany, a large group of economists, psychologists, sociologists and journalists have been propounding a theory that German character contains unique elements which make it especially susceptible to totalitarian movements. Germans are supposed to be traditionally prone to militarism; they are said to be inherently submissive and their greatest joy is found, we are told, in blind devotion to a leader and adherence to barbarous acts of brutality. Having welcomed fascism, they are therefore held "collectively guilty" for its crimes; and it is their "national character" which is at the root of all this evil.

Thus are the complacent "victors" of the war constructing a nebulous justification for their reactionary role in world politics, at the same time that they succeed in beclouding the real meaning of the conceptions of national character and na-

tional differences. We shall here attempt to show that to postulate a typical German "national character" is to distort deliberately the evolutionary historical picture of German society; that not a single trait on the formidable list of accusations is uniquely German; and that, in particular, aggressiveness, allegiance to a leader and tight discipline are universal characteristics of certain kinds of groups.

It is worth while, at the beginning, to note that the most important untruth arising from these accusations is the myth that fascism in Germany was inevitable because of this German temperament. If the theory is propagated that there is something inherently Germanic about fascism; if fascism is regarded as a collective madness peculiar to certain evil nations, it is impossible to explain how it really arises, how it can be fought, or how to recognize it in the United States, where as yet it wears no brown shirts.

A century ago the German was generally supposed to be intelligent, kindly, peaceable, fond of music and the home. Other prevalent stereotypes were concerned with his scientific-mindedness, industriousness, stolidness, methodicalness and progressiveness.

During World War I, however, one became suspect if one did not like the Germans bloodthirsty savages. These propagandist mythologies about the rapacious Germans were forgotten during the spread of post-war disillusionment and pacifism and amid the general stabilization of capitalism. With the Second World War, this extremely convenient theory was again trotted out. The attributes of the national characteristics of the Germans were "changed" with successive historical periods—the revolution of 1848, the conservative traditions of the Hohenzollerns from 1871-1918, the "democratic" Weimar Republic, and finally the Nazi terror régime—depending upon the political propaganda needs of this school of national-character analysts.

However, while such a crude, propagandist concept of German national character does not stand up in the face of its own contradictions, does such a phenomenon exist at all? Can a group have a common character any more than it can have a common pair of lungs or, more important, a common soul? Or is the term *merely* a demagogic tool used in behalf of prevailing power politics? Let us see, then, how various writers and students approach this problem, beginning with political analysts and proceeding then to psychologists who apply their concepts to the problem.

The Ludwig and De Sales Schools

We can begin with the most depressing case, the notorious Emil Ludwig:¹

Knowledge of the German character might have prevented World War II. . . . National character is a genuine reality; it is the sum total of the traits which distinguish a nation as a whole—even though some of these traits may be absent in individual members.

We are then told that the Germans are eternally dissatisfied, they crave power, but at the same time their ambition is to obey; they are inclined to harshness, do not know love of liberty, and have a mystical urge for expansion.

The Germans had so long escaped a sense of personal inferiority through refuge in self-identification with the state that it became necessary psychologically to deny the defeat of 1918. This created a political situation in which effective resistance to a policy of revision or revenge was impossible and to which the logical conclusion was Lidice. In perpetrating such crimes, the individual feels himself an organ of the state. To be an efficient state organ means much more to him than to be a valuable individual. The German kills any neighbor he feels superior to. . . . Believing in his moral right coolly and without emotion, he brings death to others and, if need be, to himself.

Ludwig's is the typical vulgarization of the entire problem; all Germans are Nazis, all are guilty, all have possessed these traits from time immemorial. The German people are born with these personality characteristics full-blown. This is a return to old theories of the immutability of human nature. Modern psychological theory tells us that individuals are born with certain potentialities, that the environment determines the degree to which these may be attained, that there is constant interaction between individual and environment and it is this interaction which determines behavior. But this does not interest Ludwig; his only concern is to indulge in hyster-

ical and mystical chauvinism. Ludwig is the crudest of his school, but there are others who, if more subtle, are equally vicious. One such is Raoul De Sales:²

The German has two characters; as an individual he is kindly, but in the mass he is brutal. It is with the "Volk" that the rest of the world has to deal. Germanism in its most positive manifestations is one of the most dangerous forms of human destructiveness that history has known. Hitler is the last phase of an evolution toward total evil which has been pursued under the various incarnations of the primitive Teutonic tribe, the German concept of the state, Prussian militarism and the nation of Volk for several centuries.

De Sales' description is simply incredible; it postulates a Jekyll and Hyde theory in which the individual and society lead a kind of dualistic parallel existence but never meet or interact. Yet it seems incongruous that the "Volk" aspect of German character asserted by De Sales should not ultimately affect the individual German—and there you have Ludwig's theory. This schizophrenic duality is given to German character as a means of trying to escape Ludwig's crass chauvinism, as a means of projecting a national character for the Volk apart from the observable characteristics of individual Germans. But the attempt fails for the two cannot exist in isolation; the one must influence the other and De Sales must end up in the camp of Ludwig.

If these theories were truly descriptive of the German people, Hitler would have needed no concentration camps, no Gestapo, no immense propaganda agency, no intensive education of the young, no book-burning. The whole people would have been prepared to follow his party from the start. These writers urge upon us a doctrine of racial discrimination and attempt to persuade us that German fascism is a peculiarly German phenomena. We are to forget the international nature of fascism in the comfortable conviction that such ideas flourish only in the "German mind." Completely forgotten is the role of the German working class. Why should fascism have paralyzed proletarian resistance, destroyed the independent unions and stamped out every vestige of the class struggle from its own "labor" organizations if it did not fear the threat of the powerful class sentiments and socialist aspirations of the workers? If all Germans are such singularly savage and amoral beings, why this dissidence?

From Seydowitz's³ description of "Civil Life in Wartime Germany," we learn how terror held the army and the home-front together during the war years. Seydowitz shows that after six years of concentrated terror and propaganda to prepare the German people for war "the lethargy of the masses at the beginning of the war disproved the frequent and vociferous assertions that the German nation stood unitedly behind its Fuehrer. Even at the time of Hitler's greatest successes, the major part of the people stood aloof from Hitler's *volksgemeinschaft*, assuming either a passively waiting or indifferent attitude or one that was downright hostile. . . . experience had taught the masses that even the most striking victories seemed unable to restore peace."

The Liberal Interpretation

By contrast, the writings of two liberals, Hamilton Fyfe and George Soule, though often naive, are on this matter comparatively sane and rational. The former, though his approach is journalistic, has some interesting things to say: According to Fyfe,⁴

2. De Sales, Raoul, *What Makes a German?*, Atlantic Monthly, 1942.

3. Seydowitz, Max, *Civil Life in Wartime Germany*, 1944.

4. Fyfe, Hamilton, *The Illusion of National Character*, 1940.

1. Ludwig, Emil, *The Moral Conquest of Germany*, 1945.

...national characters are not distinct, homogeneous, well-defined. A nation is not a natural unit like a herd of buffalos... the nationality of large numbers has often been changed. A great deal if not all the trouble in Europe is the result of people everywhere being taught by rulers and newspapers to distrust one another; to suppose their interests clash with those of their neighbors; to regard these neighbors as inferior, presumptuous, unfriendly. All of that teaching is based on the delusion that nations have different characters and one forgetfulness of the fact that when we speak of a "country" we mean the rulers of the country.

Having won the leadership of other elements in the population, the Prussians have contributed most to the common belief as to German qualities and characteristics... What was glorified in Germany during the short existence of the German Empire under the Hohenzollerns was the personality of the ruler... Yet so little could the Kaiser influence the country's political life that the largest party in the Reichstag was the Social-Democrats, and so little did the nation identify itself with him that in 1918 he was told to go. It would be unjust to pretend that all Germans are guilty alike. The course of national action is set by a few; they persuade or compel a nation to follow. Vast numbers have been deluded, others terrified into support of Hitler.

Fyfe's is a healthy, questioning approach and gives some idea of the German national character, but it is simplistic and suggestive rather than concrete and integrative. It is true, as Fyfe says, that rulers are identified with national character. Yet he disregards totally the concept of class structure and is, we think, wrong in his implicit rejection of national character. George Soule,⁵ on this matter more sophisticated, writes:

The common observations about the German herd spirit and Hitler's ruthless drive to power are true enough but not sufficiently scientific in so far as they posit the existence of something in the German character which does not exist in some variety or other among other peoples as well; and to the extent that they assume that Hitler is a unique individual whose counterpart could not be found elsewhere under some other form. After all, fascism conquered in other countries than Germany, and though the Nazi movement brought to its finest flower the destructive forces of the human personality, traces of the same cruelties, exaggerated attitudes, and will to brutal conquest may be discovered in many parts of the world and in many situations of less moment.

It would be a mistake to suppose that there are not many kinds of Germans, or that they all, through the decades, have been subject to the same kind of upbringing. Yet there is generally recognized, especially in the Prussian tradition, a certain hard and authoritative attitude which is observable not only in public institutions but in family mores. The father is usually the dominant parent, and he is traditionally severe. This type of family organization, with its continuity through many generations, has doubtless left its mark on the national character which has often in the past been noted in the army and the state... A background of insecurity has also left its mark on German culture. The short history of unity, long after other great nations of Europe achieved theirs, predisposed Germans to overvalue the national state as a unifying force and as a way of compensating for the inferiority long felt as newcomers.

The versions of national character promulgated by Soule and Fyfe are obviously more tempered analyses and help us discern the intricacies of a perplexing array of opinion. Especially helpful is the emphasis upon the cultural indoctrination of patrimonial traits in early childhood, for we know that the structure of the adult personality is based on early experiences. The common weakness of writers such as Fyfe and Soule is that they fail to consider class relationships and stratifications within society as determinants of character traits; they do not consider the role of economic and political factors in their interrelationships, nor the dynamic role of conscious classes and individuals in effecting change. As a re-

sult they cannot rise above the merely descriptive level; they are welcome antidotes to the Vansittartism of people like Ludwig and De Sales, but they do not themselves provide satisfactory answers to either the problem of fascism or of national character.

The concept of national character, however, necessarily contains psychological ingredients as well as political, and if this review of typical spokesmen for the official world of thought has not proven satisfying, perhaps the practitioners of the psychiatric approach have more to offer. Here we find the equivalents of Ludwig using a new jargon but the same ideas.

According to Frederick Schuman,⁶ Nazism is a psychological malady with which the German post-war middle-class was afflicted.

In the program of the Nazi Party it found solace for all its woes, forgiveness for all its sins, justification for all its hatreds, scapegoats for all its misfortunes, and a millennial vision of all its hopes.

Elucidating this collective neurosis, Schuman runs the gamut of Freudian concepts. The discontent of the lower middle class he attributes to a denial of satisfying expression of the "id-drives," and aggressiveness, to a weakened "super-ego" with the result that sin becomes fashionable. Nationalism is traced to a "castration" phobia arising from World War I, which "brought about the amputation of various parts of the Fatherland and its reduction to impotence." The prevailing opposition to the Weimar Republic is explained by the fact that it offered neither adequate "mother symbols" nor "father symbols." The conciliatory policy of the Weimar régime was distasteful to a castrated and impotent patriotism which had need of the "phallic symbol" of the bloody sword as an emblem of recovered strength. The so-called popular acceptance of Hitler's leadership is interpreted as the most complete expression of "the athological regression to infantilism" of the lower middle class.

If the neurotic burgher could not quite return to the dark unconsciousness and the complete security of the unborn foetus in the womb, he could at least become once more a little child, his whole life controlled for him by a stern and loving father.

Schuman's argument has a deceptive ring; he fails to offer any evidence for the presence of the Freudian clinical symptoms which are well-defined for purposes of individual psychology but which are merely analogical and verbal substitutions when applied to social groups. As an example of what is meant by analogical verbal substitutions, consider his equation of nationalism with a castration complex. A nationalistic German would be emotionally aroused by the loss of territory suffered as a result of the Versailles Treaty. This territory has been "cut off" from Germany. The term "cut off" is analagous to "castration." Result: Schuman's equation of national feeling with the "castration phobia," even though there is nothing in the nationalist feeling to indicate the characteristic symptoms of the castration complex as clinically observed. A similar substitution is made by equating Hitler's bloody sword to the phallic symbol. Such reasoning, involving substitutions from one intellectual discipline to another, unrelated one, can only be described as slipshod and dangerous.

A less Freudian but more circumspect interpretation is furnished by Richard Brickner,⁷ who has submitted a plan to the State Department aiming to change the "German character." His diagnosis is that the German people have been

5. Soule, George, *The Lessons of Last Time*, 1942.

6. Schuman, Frederick, *The Nazi Dictatorship*, 1935.

7. Brickner, Richard, *Is Germany Incurable?*

suffering for more than a century from a bad case of "psycho-cultural aggression."

German institutions have bred into the individual German an aggressive concern for his "status." In the family, the father has long been absolute master. Business, education and politics have likewise been ruled by an authoritarian system in which to assert and defend his status, the German alternately commands and scrapes. Unlike Americans and Englishmen, who consider it un-sporting to exert their full strength against weaker opponents, (!!!) Germans are traditionally more brutal and ruthless toward their inferiors. In their relations with other nations, they have been alternately arrogant and afflicted with a persecution complex, a condition resembling paranoia. What distinguishes the Germans is not their aggressiveness alone, but the megalomania, suspiciousness, feeling of persecution, projection, complex rationalization, retrospective falsification, sense of mission, exaggeration, and, above all, the total irrationality with which that aggression is manifested. Germany's unremitting insistence on claims of "un-just treatment," "encirclement," "need of living space," etc., coupled with their martyr phraseology makes them appear typical and by definition, insatiable paranoid demands.

From this diagnosis, Brickner deduced that it would be useless merely to preach democracy to the German people; they are emotionally unable to understand the democratic principle of give and take, and cooperation among equals.

Nazism is merely the current expression of a paranoid trend which has existed for over a hundred years. Although the trend is cultural, it has the same implications as of the individual paranoid.

Here we witness the strange spectacle of paranoid behavior without a neuro-psychological basis; a whole population behaves as do individual paranoids, yet is not afflicted with paranoia. What then is the origin of this strange affliction?

Psychiatry and Social Phenomena

Schuman's and Brickner's interpretations of German character are faulty in the misapplication to social phenomena of psychiatric terms originally intended only for individual analysis. Psychiatric concepts are concepts of individual psychology. If we apply them to institutions and collective behavior without concerning ourselves with clinical symptoms or the neurological basis which they imply, we do not provide very much illumination. Our ability to understand, to predict and to control is derived from our knowledge of causes; argument by analogy is no substitute for causal analysis. Analogies from individual psychology to social behavior have value only insofar as it is always understood that they are merely analogies.

Also implied in the theses of Schuman and Brickner is the assumption of a collective personality which can be described in terms of individual personal disorder. It is our belief that groups and classes in society do not have a personality structure in any sense equivalent to that of an individual personality structure. The character and mode of functioning of a group in society is not merely the result of the sum of the character and functioning of its individual members; the group has an autonomous existence. Social factors are seen to be caused by antecedent social factors and cannot be referred back to individual characteristics.

In addition, the author's Freudian orientation precludes a complete understanding of cultural and social factors and their interaction with the individual in society, for Freud's system is in the main instinctualist and thereby prey to "human nature" theories. Freud and the earlier psychoanalysts carried on their investigations entirely within the frame of European culture and largely within that of a single class in

European society. Lacking comparative materials, they took many environmental factors for granted and built up an elaborate theory of universal human instincts. The various attempts which were made by Freud and others to apply this instinctualist approach to the explanation of cultural phenomena were not successful. Thus while recognizing his outstanding insights into human motivation we do not agree with the Freudian notion that man is inherently wicked and aggressive and that, therefore wars are inevitable. An important implication of recent psychological findings is that traits like aggressiveness or submissiveness are not instinctual, innate or universal and therefore cannot be spoken of in terms of "national" attributes permeating the whole of a population. Nor can any one trait like aggressiveness for instance, ever reveal all about an individual or group. Individuals are complex organisms; groups are more so. Aggression may merely be one of a constellation of traits. Even when dominant it may have varying underlying motivations. It has different meanings and serves different functions according to the needs of the individual and group in a particular situation. It may be a response to frustration, simply a means of securing safety, or may embody other meanings. People may be aggressive in one situation and not at all in another.

One final point needs to be made against the Schuman-Brickner approach. Both of them implicitly accept Freud's dictum that "sociology which deals with the behavior of man in society, can be nothing other than applied psychology." (New Introductory Lectures) The acceptance of this idea, if logically developed, undermines any scientific approach to history or society; it makes of politics and history merely sub-branches of psychoanalysis. We believe rather in an approach which focuses attention first of all on historical processes, on aspects of social structure and group mores as clues to causal factors.

* * *

There still remains a group of scholars who have attempted to relate historical, cultural and psychological approaches. Two such writers, Abram Kardiner and Erich Fromm make interesting contributions.

Kardiner,⁸ combining anthropological and psychoanalytic techniques in his study of the reciprocal relations between culture and personality chose the term "basic personality structure" to obviate the lack of clarity in the terms group, national or social character. This is an attempt to apply to cultures a psychoanalytic approach modified by a realization of the important part played by social factors in determining psychological phenomena. The "basic personality structure" for any society "represents the constellation of personality characteristics congenial with the total range of institutions comprised within a given culture." It is that personality configuration shared by the bulk of the society's members as a result of the early experiences which they have in common and need not correspond to the total personality of the individual. No one individual is ever familiar with the whole of the culture in which he participates nor does he express all its patterns in his own behavior. The constellations identified in "basic personality structure" are not finished personality traits but the matrix in which such traits develop. In general the concept represents that which differentiates the personalities of members of two different cultural communities. Kardiner has also tried to discover not only what the basic personality types were in the various cultures studied but also

8. Kardiner, Abram, *Psychological Frontiers of Society*.

how they were produced and what influence they exerted on the culture itself. These dynamic features are an integral part of the concept.

The "cultural approach" has enormous significance in the attempt to understand the diversity of human cultures and the plasticity and potentialities of human nature everywhere. It is most meaningful when applied to simpler, primitive cultures which tend to have a unity, a pattern and an organic wholeness of a kind. In such homogeneous cultures one feature may become predominant in all institutions and individual functions. This kind of approach, however, often results in a mere anassing of facts where all facets of the culture are given equal weight; it is superficial and misleading when applied to the more complex patterns of western society. Through their findings, anthropologists are led to question many of the institutions of modern society, conclude that "we must re-examine our basic institutions," but go no further.

According to Kardiner then, no matter in what form and with what qualifications we use his concept of "basic personality structure" as a means of historical interpretation, we do away with a constant human nature which can be counted upon to behave in a uniform manner under all conditions. One need not agree with any particular estimate of the value of Kardiner's theory to realize that it is at least scientifically permissible in approach, that it attempts to investigate precisely those problems which others take for granted as premises. Similarly with the writings of Erich Fromm,⁹ who tells us that to understand the dynamics of the social process,

... we must understand the dynamics of the psychological processes operating within the individual, just as to understand the individual we must see him in the context of the culture which molds him... Freedom, though it brought man independence and rationality, has made him isolated and thereby anxious and powerless. This isolation is unbearable and the alternatives he is confronted with are either to escape from the burden of this freedom into new dependencies and submission, or to advance to the full realization of positive freedom which is based upon the uniqueness and individuality of man.

Nazism is an economic and political problem, but the hold it has over a whole people has to be understood on psychological grounds. What we are concerned with is this psychological aspect of Nazism, its human basis. This suggests two problems: the character structure of those people to whom it appealed, and the psychological characteristics of the ideology that made it such an effective instrument with regard to those very people.

In considering the psychological basis for the success of Nazism, Fromm makes this differentiation: that one part of the population bowed to the Nazi régime without any strong resistance, but also without becoming admirers of the Nazi ideas—there were the working class, the liberals and Catholics. This readiness to submit is explained as mainly due to a state of inner tiredness and resignation. Another part was deeply attracted to the new ideology and fanatically attached to those who proclaimed it—these were the lower strata of the middle class, composed of small shopkeepers, artisans and white-collar workers. The reason why the Nazi ideology was so appealing to them is to be sought in their social character, their love of the strong and hatred of the weak; their pettiness, hostility and thriftiness with feelings as well as with money. Their outlook on life was narrow, they suspected and hated the stranger, and they were curious and envious of their acquaintances, rationalizing their envy as moral indignation; economically as well as psychologically their life was based on the principle of scarcity. The event that took place after 1914

intensified the very traits to which the Nazis had its strong appeal: the craving for submission and the lust for power.

Hitler's personality, his teachings and the Nazi system express an extreme form of the "authoritarian character," the personality structure of which is the human basis of fascism—and by this very fact, he made a powerful appeal to those parts of the population which were more or less of the same character structure. The essence of the authoritarian structure is described as the simultaneous presence of sadistic and masochistic drives, the craving for power over men and the longing for submission. Everyone thus has somebody above him to submit to and somebody beneath him to dominate. (This is somewhat akin to the anti-Semitism of some Negroes.)

Fromm believes there should be positive freedom, which consists of the "spontaneous activity of the total, integrated personality." We are to achieve this desideratum through "democratic socialism wherein the irrational, planless character of society must be replaced by a planned economy."

Fromm's description utilizes Marxian concepts with some success. He fails of course to state how his society is to be achieved. Before individuals can become "productive and spontaneous" they must first overthrow the society they live in and construct a socialist society. Fromm is not correct in stating that the working class showed no strong resistance to Hitler. His theory of an "authoritarian character" as the basis for fascism is unconvincing. His discussion of the role of the middle classes in supporting Hitler is credible; yet the middle class, torn between two extremes, always follows the party offering the most militant program. In Germany, profoundly discontented with their condition, they turned to Hitler because the working class leadership did not show itself capable of leading the struggle. No doubt a number of clashing interests and certain antipathies separated them from the organized proletariat but these conflicts would have been surmounted if the revolutionary proletariat had opened up for them an escape from their misery. While Fromm thus clarifies somewhat the meaning of national character and social forces, he neglects the overwhelming importance of historical factors—of economic political forces, of classes and parties.

Both Fromm and Kardiner display imaginative and challenging approaches to the relationship between the individual and society. Because of various common modes of development and thought due to intercommunication, cultural diffusion and other generally similar factors found in western society, they properly choose to speak of the character structure of "western man" instead of specific national or racial groups; this of course includes the specific local variations to be found everywhere.

Since the world is divided into nations, each with a typical cultural and historical background, national characteristics among nations differ, as individuals interact with their respective environments. Similarly are there differences and variations within a particular nation: economic, regional, religious, etc. Thus there are mores common to the whole of a nation and there are those common only to sub-groups. And within this sub-group individual differences exist. In human behavior—individual, group or national—there is much variation, much unity and much diversity. This must be understood in a specific context—the cultural historical matrix.

German "national character" is seen as a much maligned and vastly misunderstood concept, which in its contaminated form is strategically projected from time to time, whenever it serves the interests of the powers that be.

SHIRLEY LAWRENCE.

9. Fromm, Erich, *Escape from Freedom*.

Why the Germans Failed to Revolt

A Reply to Henry Judd

I

The great flood of propaganda on the "collective guilt of the German people," "the responsibility of peoples," the "national character of the Germans" which makes them "unfit for democracy," is written for a definite purpose: to justify the policies of the victorious powers of mass enslavement, starvation, humiliation, looting, raping, expropriation—all in the name of "democracy." Nor are the outrages imposed on the German people an outgrowth of the enraged feelings of formerly suppressed peoples who now take their revenge. This explanation is a fairy tale told to the people in the United States.

The "statesmen" of the victorious powers defend their class interests in accordance with a "great design." Russian acts of barbarism in Germany were a matter of policy—not only of Stalin but also of Roosevelt. American-Russian "friendship" (world rule) was to be sealed with the extermination of Germany as an industrial country. No German proletarian revolution was to be allowed to upset this "holy alliance." No chances were to be taken with a German Badoglio, for then forces might have arisen that American imperialism would be unable to control. In this light, the policies imposed on the German people have a definite meaning.

A huge educational campaign has been conducted in defense of this policy. Official reports have suppressed facts which may have revealed the real nature of the official policy. From this point of view, Henry Judd's article, "The Germanies,"* is embarrassing indeed. We do not doubt his good intentions. But he completely misunderstands the historical significance of the events in Germany. He does not sufficiently understand the background of the German labor movement and the German working class under fascism. Finally, he gives a wrong interpretation of trends in Germany today. As a result his predictions are utterly misleading.

Anything may happen to the German proletarians. They may die of starvation. They may become paupers, or slave laborers. They may be hired as mercenaries by foreign powers. They may even again become industrial workers and free proletarians. The only thing that they cannot become is the prediction of Henry Judd: "farmers and artisans."

The same applies to the fate of the German bourgeoisie. They may be eliminated by the foreign conqueror (especially in the Russian zone, but to a great extent also in the western zones). They may become proletarians or even paupers themselves. They may emigrate into foreign countries, for most of them still have money or some wealthy relatives abroad. Under certain conditions they may even revitalize their former existence under a new German fascist dictatorship (though this is most unlikely). The only thing that cannot happen to them is the prediction of Henry Judd: that they will "continue their existence as some kind of compradore bourgeoisie." They cannot become industrial capitalists and exploiters of German labor, "under a foreign imperialist victor with whom they must share their profits."

These "predictions" are derived from a basically false conception: According to Henry Judd, Germany may exist as a

colony of the victorious imperialist powers, with an economic structure mainly agrarian, and the German "compradore bourgeoisie" may be able to run such a colonial Germany. Thus a new stability for German "compradore capitalism" may be found.

Thus we are to conclude that a new stability can be established in Europe without Germany as a real nation, with Russian and American imperialism as the new foreign overlords in Europe, with French and British imperialism playing additional but secondary roles. Such a transformation of European capitalist-imperialism into a colonial area for exploitation by foreign imperialism is a trend reflecting the general decline of the world economic position of Western capitalism. But this trend cannot be decisive, for it presupposes a new stability of the present régimes in Central and Western Europe.

There are several possibilities for future changes in Europe, but the above fate for Europe does not belong to them. European, and in particular German society, will enter a period of such acute crisis that American capitalism may not be able to play its role as overlord of Germany. Proletarian revolutions may fail or never take place, but this will not create new social stability. The crisis may also lead to new violent overthrows of the existing régimes, to new fascist dictatorships and to immediate preparations for new wars.

II

This must be concluded from the special position of Germany. Germany is a country with great traditions and a long history. National peculiarities play an eminent role, and the national character certainly differs from that of other countries. One of the national peculiarities is the great contrast between the historical growth of the upper class and of the proletarian class. This contrast is much greater in Germany than, for instance, in America or Great Britain. In this sense Germany has two histories and two national traditions more distinctly than do most other Western countries. The intellectual life and the habits of the German working class were far more distinct from those of the upper classes than in other Western countries (especially England and France). Thus while the spirit of narrow nationalism was especially deeply rooted among certain sectors of the upper classes, the spirit of internationalism was more deeply rooted among the German working class than in other countries. National peculiarities had little to do with the inability of the German working class to prevent fascism and to replace old reformist leaders who would necessarily miss the historical opportunities that arise during a revolutionary crisis.

We may be disappointed in the failure of the German proletariat to become master of its fate during the crisis and breakdown of the old system. But this disappointment is only the expression of a sentiment or feeling; it does not help to guide us toward an understanding of the real problems involved in its defeat in Germany.

The German working class embodies the experiences and historical conditions of the Western European labor movement, which has completed the "bourgeois revolution" and where the task of the proletarian revolution was the socialist

* See the May and June issue of *The New Internationalist*.

(international) revolution and not the completion of the bourgeois revolution.

The first immediate task of the Russian revolution was the completion of the bourgeois revolution. This could be done only through a proletarian revolution. Historical conditions seemed to make it possible to combine the completion of the bourgeois revolution in Russia with a proletarian world revolution. Yet the character of the Russian revolution was molded by the fact that the proletarian revolution occurred in a country where semi-feudal conditions had curbed the growth of modern capitalism. Such conditions did not exist in Germany, either before the First World War or before the second. Certain national traditions and even social institutions still reflected the traditions of feudalism (for instance, the fact that a relatively great number of high army officers came from the old nobility—but even this proportion was rapidly declining). The general nature of German capitalism was molded not by remnants of feudalism but by the most advanced forms of capitalist growth (or “ripeness”). For this very reason the problem faced by the German labor movement, to seize power at a moment when the old traditional movements collapsed, is the problem that all Western countries have to face.

This point must be stressed for another reason: Germany and the German proletariat had a special importance for the international labor movement.

III

The fate of the international labor movement will ultimately depend on events in Germany; and vice versa, there is little chance for German labor to liberate itself from the foreign overlord without the aid of the international proletariat. There is no possibility for a revival of the international labor movement as a force that can prevent a third world war or find a revolutionary way out of the great decay of our era without the German working class as an active revolutionary participant. For if they cannot act as a strong positive force, the German workers will not be neutral but a powerful negative force. As paupers and starving proletarians they will be the cheapest labor force European capitalism ever had at its disposal. As state slaves they will lower the social position of the proletariat all over Europe. They will be forced to become “Stakhanovites” to be played against rebellious workers who struggle against their oppressors. Thus the German workers cannot be simply ignored in an analysis of the situation in Europe, written off as if they now had only a historical existence.

Failure to stress the international significance of the terrible policy of enslavement and extermination of the German proletarians will help to seal the fate of the European proletarian liberation movements with corresponding consequences for international labor.

Marx and Engels, as well as Lenin and Trotsky, expected that the Western European proletariat would be the leading force in a proletarian world revolution. Without the working class of Western Europe there was no possibility for the international proletariat to free itself from capitalist-imperialism. This concept did not derive from a narrow nationalist or “European” point of view. Western Europe was the primary training ground for the international labor movement. In Western Europe, capitalism had created industrial world centers with concentrated masses of industrial workers largely organized in labor movements. The very dependence of the European proletariat on the world economy made it necessary

to find an internationalist anti-imperialist way out for the working class, a new economic revolution which would create the foundations for international socialism. If the European working class failed, where could the working class movement find forces of greater strength, with better training in class warfare, with prouder traditions of struggle against capitalism, militarism and imperialism? And in Europe, the German proletariat held a key position. This refers to the Second as well as to the Third International, and also to the conglomeration of forces existing at the time when both Internationals had died as revolutionary forces and had become agents of imperialist forces.

What has happened in Germany is a most serious defeat for the entire European working class. We have not yet grasped the full meaning of the fact that the German working class—formerly over a third of the Western European working class—now consists mostly of paupers, slave workers (state slaves) or prisoners of war. With the defeat of the German working class, slave labor has become a social institution in Europe.

After the defeat of Nazism in Germany, the German proletariat suffered a second great defeat due to the intervention of the foreign imperialist powers. They have crushed the German proletariat before it had a chance to recover after the collapse of German fascism. A discussion of individual or “collective guilt” does not help us to achieve an understanding of the historical conditions under which the dramatic events occurred, nor does it give an explanation of the “failure” of the German proletariat. Without a historical approach to the conditions under which the German working class was expected to make a revolution, we cannot critically approach the “facts” reported by authors and writers who themselves never understood the real problems but wrote to please the American public or to defend a popular thesis.

IV

Many books have been written about the pre-history of fascism and the failure of the German working class to revolt. But this does not mean that Judd is right, that, therefore, “the reasons for this failure to ‘revolt’ are well known.” Until now no major critical study has been written about the working-class struggle before the Nazis rose to power and the failure of the German working class to “revolt.”

Often, events that were milestones on the road to fascism have been ignored or falsified; for instance, the preparations for a general strike of the Berlin workers during the days when von Papen dissolved the Prussian coalition government (under Severing). During those days the workers in the big factories of Berlin and other towns prepared a general strike—almost spontaneously—and made concrete preparations for a revolutionary uprising. These workers waited for the reformist leaders to act because they were in control of the only organization that could start a general strike on a national scale against the powerful dictatorial régime. Or we may mention the Berlin Transport workers strike in 1932. It also has never been accurately described.

The same applies to social class conflicts under fascism. Here it is even easier to cloud the truth, for a totalitarian régime makes it more difficult to see behind political surface appearances. There are few visible phenomena such as strikes, elections or the numerical strength of political parties. The only “objective” record is the numbers of prisons, prisoners and concentration camps. This record has been available to

the occupying powers in Germany. But they have been careful not to publish the data collected by the Gestapo and the concentration-camp authorities which they now have in their possession.

During the days of Munich, for example, the German Army High Command had sent a dossier to Hitler containing reports and data that the workers in the factories were more anti-Nazi and anti-war than ever before and were absolutely "unreliable" from the point of view of the Army. For this reason, therefore, war would have to be avoided. The Allied powers must have discovered this document among the captured documentary materials. But it belongs to that great pile of secret documents whose publication is forbidden.

It is true that the German workers never revolted against the Nazi rulers. But the technique of revolt against a totalitarian dictatorship that still commands a well-organized terror-machine has not yet been invented. It is also difficult to overlook the fact that German prisons and concentration camps were filled with German anti-Nazis, and that civil war preparations of the Nazis were greatly intensified during the war, despite the scarcity of material and manpower. Furthermore, war planning was greatly influenced by the lack of inner unity of the nation. The entire history of the war could be written as a chain of decisions that can be understood only in terms of the growing internal social antagonisms. Hitler's policy of leading Germany gradually into war—with Chamberlain as his reliable collaborator—was related to the precarious inner situation. The reluctance of the Army High Command to act independently was largely due to the fear that the overthrow of Hitler would release revolutionary forces that the Army would be unable to control.

The final course of the war was also modified by the fear of a revolutionary conclusion to the war. We cannot determine now how real this danger was. It was certainly taken seriously by Stalin as well as by Roosevelt. They adapted their propaganda campaigns and their strategy accordingly.

Roosevelt may have believed that it would be easier for Stalin than for him to deal with the four million proletarian anti-Nazis in Berlin immediately after the collapse of the Nazi régime. In this connection we may quote the experiences of the American and British armies in Western Germany. In many towns, especially in the Ruhr area, local revolutionary governments were established upon the downfall of the Nazis. They began to remove the Nazi leaders and took active steps toward the immediate ending of the war. They also tried to survive under Allied occupation. But the American and British commanders had strict orders to liquidate this movement before it had a chance to spread over greater areas. Not one American war writer dared report the truth about this movement until finally Paul M. Sweezy in a book review in the *New Republic* (April 22, 1946) gave the following account:

It is a curious fact, which certainly reflects on the adequacy of press reporting of the occupation, that the American public knows nothing about the proto-revolutionary movement which sprang up in city after city as the Allied armies swept eastward from the Rhine. Organizationally, this movement took the form of anti-fascist committees led in most cases by Communists or left-wing Social-Democrats. These committees had a variety of local titles (e.g., in Bremen, Kampfgemeinschaft gegen den Faschismus; in Leipzig, Nationalkomitee Freies Deutschland, etc.), but they soon became widely known under the generic name of Antifa (for anti-fascist). In many cases they undertook direct action against Nazis, resisting notorious local bosses, confiscating food hoards and evicting party members from their houses in favor of the bombed-out. This reviewer attended a meeting in Bremen two weeks after the fall of

the city at which were gathered some 70 or 80 representatives of district groups with a total membership of several thousand. Most of those present were workmen with pre-1933 political experiences; anyone listening to their impassioned discussion could not doubt for a moment that their hatred of Nazism was much more personal and profound than that of Americans who have never experienced it and yet find it so easy to moralize about the guilt of all the German people.

But the Antifa movement never got a chance to develop. Direct action against Nazis was, in the view of the MG, "illegal" and subversive of law and order. Buildings which had been seized for headquarters (in Bremen, the building which had belonged to the Labor Front) were taken over by the MG. In many cases the organizations were suppressed out of hand; American (and British) officers weren't going to have anyone telling them how to run their business; and besides, how could you be sure that these weren't Nazi outfits in disguise? The result was that within a month or so most of the Antifas, deprived of the possibility of functioning openly and being in principle opposed to the formation of an underground movement against the Allies, dropped out of the picture. When political activity was once again permitted, it ran for the most part into the old party channels. It is this reviewer's considered judgment that the Antifas represented the beginnings of a genuine revival of working class revolutionary activity, and that their strangulation gave the played-out politicians of the Weimar period a new opportunity to divide the workers and to reinstate themselves in party and trade union bureaucracies.

V

Many writers and authors now write about the German people, what they think, what their real character is, what their social status ought to be or will be. Some of these writers have made trips to the new colony in order to have a look at the "natives." Special researchers in medicine are sent over to collect scientific data on the various stages of mass starvation. These new experts on Germany have one great handicap. They meet many Germans, but very few German workers. They always find it difficult to penetrate German society beyond the strata that are close to the life of occupation armies: prostitutes, hungry children, and those demoralized job-hunters who are ready to sell "reliable" aid to the powerful conquerors. The Nazi conquerors had such "natives" throughout Europe. Now it is the turn of the Americans and British. What is alarming is that these impressions of the modern conquerors should also poison the critical minds of anti-imperialists. They draw long-term conclusions from personal experiences which are not typical of the "waves of the future." We can read between the lines of Judd's article a contempt for "the Germans" who did not fight against Hitler, who were "atomized" and deeply influenced by Nazi ideas, for the "German youth—these demoralized young people," and for "the young German girls" who "have reached the lowest level, at the greatest speed."

Henry Judd has been unable to recognize the basic trends in Germany today. Therefore, he is wrong even where, in the light of personal experiences, he may appear to be right. Even the facts he reports are outdated, or will be within a few months. He draws a picture, for example, that shows a great contrast between Anglo-American and Russian methods of occupation. The former is "quite peaceful, moderate and even tolerant"; the latter is "barbaric and criminal." It is true that in the Anglo-American zones there were no officially-ordered mass rapings and deportations. But even these omissions have not made the American conquest "quite peaceful, moderate and even tolerant." It is true that at the beginning there was more "order" and less individual terror in the Anglo-American zones. But there was also plenty of looting, wanton destruction, rape and other acts that were to make the German feel "guilty," inferior and completely crushed. This was the first

stage. During the second stage, economic conditions; and therefore also, political conditions, have greatly deteriorated. Hamburg, a center of the British zone, has become a hotbed of anti-British sentiment. There is not a single social stratum in this traditional anti-Nazi town that is pro-British. The destruction of the great Blohm and Voss shipyards by British troops almost a year after the ending of the war has infuriated the population, especially the workers who have thereby lost their means of existence.

It may be true that there is more personal freedom in the British than in the Russian zone. But even this difference is vanishing—not because there is now more freedom in the Russian zone but because there is now less in the British. Another difference, however, that has become political dynamite is that the degree of starvation is now greater in the Western than in the Russian zone. That is not entirely because of the industrial character of Western Germany. The great starvation in Western Germany is mainly due to the occupational policies of curbing large-scale industrial reconstruction, looting and “denazification” which aims at the extermination of the technical intelligentsia, suppression of reconstruction, etc.

VI

Another phenomenon must be dealt with: slave labor. It is true that several millions of Germans have been taken away from their homes and their families by the Russians. When the Russians first started these mass deportations many Germans looked to the Western powers as the representatives of “Western civilization.” This difference too is vanishing. It is no secret in Germany that most of the sons, husbands and fathers whom Hitler conscripted into the army have not yet returned home. This applies to those who were captured by the “civilized” conquerors as well as those whom the Russians took captive. It has been estimated that five and a half million German prisoners of war are still kept as slave laborers in Europe and Siberia. This means that only a small fraction of the total number of German prisoners of war have been released. These include mostly cripples or those otherwise incapacitated and a few peasants or agricultural workers from the Western zone. Thus the institution of slave labor is traveling from East to West, and has become acceptable even to the “democratic labor” governments of Great Britain, Belgium, Holland, Norway, etc.

European labor has no chance to free itself or even improve its position unless it opposes the institution of slave labor. Slave labor more readily corrupts the working class of those countries that enslave than it does those who are enslaved. Thus there is not one known working-class demonstration by a labor party against the exploitation of German slave workers in Britain, France, or Norway. German labor, degraded, starved and pauperized, will draw the working classes of the whole Western world into pauperism or enslavement after it.

VII

This brings us to our final point. Nowhere in the world, outside of Russia in 1917, was there such a body of workers who had participated in proletarian revolutionary activities as in Germany. At the time Hitler came to power there were hundreds of thousands of German workers who were politically experienced but disillusioned with the failures of the Communist movement and the Russian revolution. They belonged to no party, or had withdrawn from party activities. But they were potential followers of new revolutionary move-

ments whenever a new revolutionary crisis should arise. They also were more disillusioned with Russian policies than the working class of other Western countries.

During the war, the German workers had more opportunities to find out the truth about Russia today than did the workers of the other Western countries. Yet, it is a matter of fact that thousands of German workers are again joining the Communist Party, which is reorganized by the bureaucratic Stalinist clique. Personal opportunism as well as coercive measures (in the Russian zone) play a great role in the recruitment campaign of the German CP. It is difficult and dangerous, in the Russian-controlled zones, for a worker who was in the party in 1932 to declare that he does not want to be a member now. But this is only part of the story. Thousands of former oppositional Communists, even former Trotskyists, have deliberately decided to join the Communist Party. To a great extent many revolutionary workers are being attracted by the same Stalinist organization that shares responsibility for barbaric acts of Russian imperialism. We may be sure that the outrages of the Russian armies or GPU troops and Russian imperialist policies have left a deep impression among most Germans. But this has not prevented many former oppositional Communists from returning to the Party. How explain this phenomenon?

Some people may declare that this is only another proof for the claim that the German working class has not yet succeeded with “the tremendous task—wiping out the effects of Nazism within its ranks.”

It is easy for an outsider to look down at the miserable existence of the German proletariat. Without a deeper understanding, he may condemn the former revolutionary worker in Germany who now returns to one of the two parties which share the “guilt” for the defeats of the German working class. Thus we may circumvent the crucial question:

What are the underlying reasons for this new political trend in Germany?

It has nothing to do with the revival of the old Communist movement of the 1919-1923 type. Such hopes still existed among many German workers in the spring of 1945, during the collapse of the Nazi régime. Since then something has been lost by many German workers—the belief in international proletarian class struggle, or in the possibility that international socialist movements can be made effective in our lifetime. Hence the cynicism, and in part also, the apathy with which many former German Socialists and Communists consider the question of party membership.

The second underlying reason is the feeling that the national existence must be defended against the foreign conqueror in order to be able to struggle for social liberation. Finally, miserable economic conditions make corruption by an extra dish of soup for the children at home much easier and simpler.

But there are many others, individual workers, who resist the current trend of moral decay and corruption and who excel in strength of their personal integrity. The visible “facts” are not on their side. They may talk about proletarian solidarity and internationalism. They may point out that liberation from foreign oppression and exploitation is not possible without the aid of the foreign proletariat. They may appeal for an understanding of why the masses of starving German workers, children and slaves find so little effective support among the working class of countries which now enslave and starve the German proletariat. But these German working class families cannot wait. They are hungry today and tomorrow.

REBUTTAL BY HENRY JUDD

They have seen the destruction of their physical means of livelihood. The need for an immediate way out—which cannot be found—is the basic dilemma. Therefore many individuals are inclined to clutch at promises coming from the East like a drowning man to a straw. There is only one party that can make such promises. It represents the most powerful state in Europe today—Russia.

The experiences of German workers seem to indicate that the entire foreign world is trying to enslave, starve or pauperize them. As a result, for the first time in the history of German labor, a genuine national spirit is arising among them. Without reconstruction of a German nation and without complete freedom and independence for their organizations there is little chance for a regeneration of a socialist proletarian movement. At present, the proletarian vanguard may know that a final socialist victory is not possible without a European socialist revolution. But in the immediate period ahead the workers will be in the forefront of the struggle for national liberation. It is the next step in the struggle for social liberation and international socialism. Both issues cannot be separated from each other although they exist as two different problems.

An example of the practical dilemma: How can the workers affectively use the strike weapon against their exploiters if the foreign overlords are not really interested in increased production or in conditions which would raise the productive capacity?

The foreign overlord wants to curb the old and new industries. The struggle is mainly against foreign imperialism, with the German capitalists—insofar as they still exist—playing only a minor role.

There is no proletarian force abroad that now helps German enslaved workers in a task which they cannot accomplish alone under present conditions. Thus it is enticing for many former Communists and Socialists to try to participate in the play of power politics by backing the foreign power which seems to be more willing than the others to let the Germans exist as a modern nation.

Therefore, the main slogan of the German Communist Party now is national unity and national recovery, together with the propaganda that this national salvation is possible only if Germany joins the Russia bloc.

Such a German-Russian "bloc" will introduce the worst kind of totalitarian dictatorship. But German workers who resist such a development cannot show an alternative unless proletarian movements abroad come to their aid. Foreign socialists may blame the German Socialists or Communists for their defeats and failures. But the latter will blame the foreign labor leaders for not having helped them in the hour of greatest need for international solidarity.

In Germany today the German proletariat feels more the loss of national freedom and oppression by foreign imperialist powers than does any other social class. It cannot make the slightest move forward without coming into conflict with the powers which have deprived the German nation of its independence and which challenge the right of the German people to exist as a nation. Dealing with "the German problem" today, we must stress the point that the enslavement and destruction of Germany as a nation and the enslavement of the German proletariat must have fatal consequences for the international labor movement.

H. LEDER.

A careful reading of the above article by Comrade Leder convinces me that, in effect, there are no serious differences in our respective viewpoints, but rather misunderstandings, or differences in emphasis. Leder is correct, in section VII of his article, in emphasizing the internationalist causes and aspects of the decline of the German working class movement—that is, the tragic consequences of the lack of general class solidarity with the German proletariat, and that feeling, prevalent in the German worker, that he stands alone. But aside from this, we must regretfully express our opinion that Leder either has too hastily read the articles on Germany, or that he read only the incomplete Part I, published in the May, 1946, issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. We find no basis for his exaggerated polemical comments, nor for his conclusions.

"The only thing that they (the German workers) cannot become is the prediction of Henry Judd: 'farmers and artisans.'" So remarks Comrade Leder. Is it his opinion that we prophesize that the German working class, as a whole, will become "farmers and artisans"? If so, it is a clear case of misunderstanding, obviously. Nevertheless, it remains a cold fact that large numbers (statistics unknown, naturally) of German workers have been reduced to precisely such a status in order to live; they will remain so, unless and until a serious revival in German economic life takes place. This "declassed" German worker is a familiar figure throughout Germany; I would gladly put Leder in touch with some whom I know, if he wishes.

Likewise, Leder objects to my remarks that the remnants of the German bourgeoisie, in the Western half, continues on in a subordinate capacity, a sort of "compradore bourgeoisie." This, he says, is the "only thing that cannot happen to them. . . ." But what then is the nature of the German capitalists remaining on in the American, British and French zones; operating their plants within the framework permitted by the occupying power? Leder himself answers this when he writes, "The foreign overlord wants to curb the old and new industries. The struggle is mainly against foreign imperialism, with the German capitalists—insofar as they still exist—playing only a minor role." Wherein does this differ from our description of the remnants of the German bourgeoisie, and its part in the new Germany? We do not understand.

Judd's "predictions are utterly misleading." Which predictions, we must inquire? These articles on Germany predicted little or nothing; they were essentially descriptive in character, and indicated the basis on which we believe a revival of the German movement can take place. Does Leder disagree with this; specifically, with Part II of the series? We think not. He writes, "In Germany today, the German proletariat feels more the loss of national freedom and oppression by foreign imperialist powers than does any other social class. It cannot make the slightest move forward without coming into conflict with the powers which have deprived the German nation of its independence and which challenge the right of the German people to exist as a nation." Exactly, we accept every word. But we must point out how these concluding remarks contradict the tone and meaning of the opening section of his article, where his general position seems much closer to that of Comrades Ria Stone and Willie Gorman (May, 1946, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL)—that is, the position that the German proletariat is still essentially intact, capable of leading the nation today, etc. In his justified anxiety to defend the

German workers against their imperialist slanderers and malicious-minded detractors, Comrade Leder has confused the issue. We will defend the German workers against any and all imperialist propaganda, but at the same time analyse objectively their actual state and capacities in the Germany of today. These two needs do not conflict.

"Antifa" Committees and the "Dual Power"

"Even the facts he reports are outdated, or will be within a few months." But Leder makes this accusation without giving a single example of these "outdated facts," with one exception that we shall mention below. What facts are wrong, or outdated?

We find a terribly exaggerated misunderstanding of certain facts in Leder's article, concerning the alleged creation of "local revolutionary governments," established with the downfall of the Nazis. That "Antifa" committees did come into being, as the Allies overran Germany, is a well-established fact. That they were committees representing a revolutionary "dual power" is nonsense. They were spontaneously organized committees for the purpose of the orderly handing over of power to the Allied authorities—that is, *ending the war*. One can speculate on their potential capacity as organs of "dual power," but this is not fact. It did not happen, nor could it have been expected, given the circumstances. Likewise, is it a fact that, as Leder writes, "The final course of the war was also modified by the fear of a revolutionary conclusion to the war?" But then, why did Roosevelt, Stalin & Company persist, up to the very end, on their "unconditional surrender" formula? They were well aware that this demand was the final prop under the Nazi war machine, the ultimate fear that prolonged the war as long as it did. Why did they not remove this slogan, if they feared revolution? The fact is that they had no such fear; every Allied document dealing with the early occupation and control of Germany (and I had the opportunity to read many long before the actual surrender) indicates the absence of such a fear. Unfortunately, no doubt, but true. Leder himself gives many indications as to why it was impossible to have such a perspective. Again, his completely understandable and justified emotional revulsion against the smug traducers of the German workers has led him afield.

Finally, there are two more personal, subjective attacks directed against me which cannot be ignored. It is unfortunate that Leder saw fit to introduce these remarks, particularly in a far from objective manner. Both are false to the core, and I deeply resent them. Their falseness can be shown to anyone

willing to examine these "between the lines" remarks in their context, not in the manner in which they are presented by Leder. Thus, the *entire* responsibility for the demoralization of the young German girls is clearly placed upon the system of occupation. In reference to, (1) my alleged "contempt for the Germans," it is simply inconceivable that anyone could find a single trace of this in these articles, describing one of history's most tragically betrayed and oppressed peoples. In reference to, (2) my alleged "great contrast between Anglo-American and Russian methods of occupation," permit me merely one quotation from the original as to any glorification of the "democratic" occupation as contrasted with the Stalinist occupation.

Although each imperialist occupant pursues radically different *methods* of exploitation within its zone, all have much in common—pillage and robbery of German wealth and resources, denial of independence and meaningful democracy, imposition on great masses of an unwanted, oppressive régime." Or, "...every principle, method, tactic or means employed by one and all of the four occupying powers must be cleaned off the slate."

One of the major purposes of the articles, beyond their descriptive purposes, was to indicate that, despite the differences, the various imperialisms worked hand in glove in achieving certain common aims, that the general, overall aspects of the occupation, as affecting the mass of Germans, was essentially the same. It is almost beyond belief that any other meaning could have been established.

Finally, although we do not grasp Leder's ideas on the question of European and German stability, and although we do not at all grasp his motivation or evidence in predicting a period of "acute crisis," we take it for granted that any real, durable stability in Germany is out of the question, if alone for the reason that growing conflicts between the rivals exclude this. What the imperialist powers had in common is now rapidly being replaced with what they do not have in common—their mutual desires and needs to court and win Germany as a whole. This is perfectly clear, particularly since Byrnes' Stuttgart address. The concrete consequences of this falling apart of the thieves are just beginning to be felt, and are of the utmost objective significance for the slowly reviving German working class movement. It is our intention to analyze these new trends in Germany and their results in the next, December issue of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, for this represents a new phase in the entire process, but certainly not disconnected from the first phase we have previously described.

HENRY JUDD.

Report on Italy

Two Years After "Liberation"

Cooling their heels in the corridors of the Palais du Luxembourg in Paris, Italian bourgeois leaders are waiting to hear the Peace Conference confirm the proposed draft peace treaty which though unsigned has produced serious repercussions in Italy.

Already food prices have risen still further: the masses are paying for the treaty. Olive oil, chief index of how food prices are moving, was selling in Rome's black market for 600 lire a liter, 100 lire more than in

June. Potatoes, cheese and coffee all rose. When UNRRA's small aid ends in December there is no known way to pay for sufficient food imports to maintain the sub-existence level of 1,700 calories daily. The American dollar and even the lowly French franc have doubled in value on the black market.

Anxious to pin the blame for the heavy peace terms on the Western imperialists, the Communist Party *Unita* declares: "If the economic clauses of the draft treaty are

endorsed, Italy will be for many years wholly at the mercy of the United States and Britain without hope of recovery," and praises Russia for helping (?) Italy. Doubtless the CP is motivated by the desire to avoid being a party to accepting openly the treaty agreed to by its Stalinist masters in Moscow. But even if they and the rest of the Italian government, of which they are a decisive part (in winning mass support), do not sign the treaty, it goes into effect when the Big Four sign.

The battle of propaganda over Trieste would make Goebbels green with envy. British-American propaganda against Stalinist support of Yugoslav claims in the Istrian peninsula (Venezia Giulia and the port of Trieste, principal opening for Central Europe on the Adriatic and to the Mediterranean) is an outright farce. Italians and others who read the full text of the voluminous treaty (it covers 78 pages) can see for themselves the territorial provisions Britain, France, Greece, China and the U. S. have insisted on. Lost are: Albania, the frontiers, power plants and areas of Branda and Tiga, all the colonies in Africa (Libya, Ethiopia, Eritrea and others), islands in the Mediterranean and three concessions in China (Tientsin, Amoy and Shanghai parts of international settlements). Both U. S.-British imperialists and the Stalinists have joined hands to have a nice ripping party. With the exception possibly of Hungary, not even the former Nazi Balkan satellites are getting rougher treatment. None of the big powers is interested in what the inhabitants of the disputed areas might think.

Bad as is the Russian reparations demand for \$100,000,000, the Stalinists offer to export raw materials to Italy and to collect the reparations out of current production. This is actually far less of a drain than the many financial claims of the British, French and Americans, plus the provisions that Italy has to pay for all Allied requisitions in Italy and to pay or back up all Allied military currency issued in Italy (estimated as in excess of 100 billion lire). The Stalinist plan is shrewder than that of the U.S.-British imperialists, for the Stalinists hope to make Italy dependent on the Soviet Union for raw material imports, thereby tying the country to Soviet economy. How important raw materials are for Italian economy can be seen by examining its structure.

Raw Materials and Foreign Credit

The peculiar nature of Italian economy stems from the fact that its entire existence depends on foreign trade. Of total imports for 1938, raw materials accounted for 74.5 per cent. Using raw materials in a broad sense, except for sulphur and mercury, Italy has no coal, iron, tin, nickel, oil and little grain—not enough to feed its own population. Even Mussolini's "battle of wheat" was won at the expense of reduction of other crop acreage and production. Without the import of coal, Italian economy is bloodless. Without iron imports, it has no backbone. Without food imports, it is near death. Agricultural production is low, not so much because of wartime destruction and lack of agricultural machinery and implements but from lack of imported fertilizers.

Worse still is the lack of foreign credits for obtaining raw materials. Italy needs markets and with the loss of the German market, which took from 30 to 60 per cent of Italian exports for the last ten years, Italy can only grow weaker. Under Mussolini's attempts to achieve economic self-sufficiency (autarchy), Italian exports remained far short of imports. Balance of

payments was made from proceeds of tourist industry (of decisive significance for economy), merchant marine and emigrant remittances. Where imports in 1938 reached \$800,000,000, in 1946 for reconstruction and replacement at least \$1,200,000,000 will be needed and will have to continue for many years.

When UNRRA shipments of coal and grain cease in December, Italian reconstruction will be retarded still more. Though imports for 1947 (including freight and other invisible imports) are estimated by UNRRA experts to be able to come to \$1 billion, exports will not exceed \$540,000,000, leaving an unfavorable balance of approximately \$460,000,000 (these figures are given at current valuations on the international monetary market and are roughly comparative to between one-half and five-eighths of the 1938 valuation). Unless some means is found to make up this unfavorable balance by increased production, Italy will founder further. Without assistance from UNRRA or other sources, Italy will be unable to pay the \$200-\$250,000,000 required for fuel and industrial materials. Instead she will have to spend available funds for food imports. Italian economy increasingly runs deeper into what UNRRA experts call a "dangerous vacuum."

Effects of Wartime Destruction

Raw materials imports at such extraordinary high levels (comparable only to Japan of pre-Manchuria days) were largely exhausted at the time of the German surrender in May, 1945.

Ninety per cent of the merchant marine is sunk, seized by the Allies or missing. Railroad transportation was reduced by 38 per cent, a most serious matter for a country with long north to south rail communications. It is estimated that even ten per cent destruction is enough to paralyze a rail network; in Italy, communication between the industrial north and the agricultural south was ruptured.

Two million five hundred thousand single-room units of housing were demolished, 500,000 more than the total number built after 1931, or seven per cent of the pre-1939 total. In all of France during the war years, 1,500,000 comparable housing units were shattered. Thirty per cent of the livestock is destroyed. Total damage to agriculture is placed at 312 billion lire (current rate).

Bank note issues have risen from 22,496 billion lire in 1938 to 300 billion in 1946, plus the close to 100 billion in Allied military currency which is a terrible drain on the economy and a most vicious form of "invisible" reparations. National income has dropped from the 116 billion lire of 1938 to less than 70 billion in 1945 (at 1938 valuation).

Government debt is 630 billion lire out of a total public debt of 970 billions, and the tax-paying ability of the country is falling. To slow the increase of paper currency, the government floated a special loan by bank borrowings and sale of government bonds, but this is not based on industrial revival and raw material imports.

When the Allies landed in September,

1943, the exchange rate was set at 100 lire to the dollar and 400 to the British pound sterling, a rate so high it could not reflect real purchasing power of the lire. Adding Allied military currency to the economy has further weakened the lire. As prices rose rapidly Italian exports could not compete in foreign markets. In January, 1946, the government devalued the lire to 225 to the dollar and 900 to the pound sterling, but prices were still too high to permit competition in the international market. Now Italian regulations (designed to aid the big capitalists) permit exporters to sell on the free market at rates higher than the official rate fifty per cent of foreign currency gained from their sales. Thus the government legalizes the black market as the only way to "get rid of it." The other fifty per cent must be sold to the central bank at the official rate, and buyers of foreign currency are required to use it within ninety days for purchase of essential industrial imports. But the way is wide open for wholesale speculation in lire exchange.

Snarl in Production

With swift ending of the war in the North and rapid reconstruction, productive capacity in the North reached almost 90 per cent of the pre-war level, but total production has remained very low. One index is artificial textile fibers, which fell from 145,500 tons in 1939 to 3,612 tons in 1945—all most complete paralysis. There is a slight general industrial revival, most of it based on UNRRA importation of coal and raw materials. When UNRRA aid ceases in December over-all production is estimated to be able to reach only 30 per cent of pre-war levels.

Government reconstruction has been concentrated shrewdly on power and transportation. Total point production of the larger power plants (comprising 89 per cent of national power production) was 3,244 billion kilowatt hours for the first three months of 1946 (almost 13 billion average for the year, if the rate of production is maintained). This compares favorably with 13,143 billion in 1938, 17,734 billion in 1941, 11,795 in 1944 and 11,289 in 1945. But these figures are meaningless unless it is understood that electric power expansion is only a small part of total power production and that without coal and oil as power, total power production is still low.

Railroad reconstruction is growing: Single and double-track line mileage which had fallen from 16,582 kilometers in March, 1943, to 11,659 kilometers in July, 1945, had risen to 14,210 kilometers by January, 1946. Available locomotives, which had fallen from 4,971 in March, 1943, to 2,825 in July, 1945, had risen to 3,081 in January, 1946 (an increase of 251). Decisive element is the total for train mileage, which fell from 14,030,443 kilometers in February, 1943, to 3,585,305 in June, 1945, and by December, 1945, had risen only to 5,266,710.

In merchant shipping, which had been practically annihilated, 124,797 tons were launched or repaired from May, 1945, to February, 1946.

It is clear that even this partial recovery is largely concentrated in transport and

power. Other basic industries are dragging behind.

Agricultural production is very low, even with UNRRA aid. Wheat production in 1945 fell 38 per cent below the 1940-43 average as drought was added to war destruction, and 34.1 per cent below 1944. The 1946 wheat harvest is expected to yield 60,000,000 quintals (6,600,000 tons), compared to 1936-39 average of 70,000,000 quintals. But that is the expectation and not the reality; meanwhile statistics of future production cannot be eaten by starving workers. Bean production fell 68 per cent compared to 1940-43 and 51.1 per cent compared to 1944; potatoes 49.8 and 35.4 per cent for these comparable years. The land problem is considerable. The huge latifundias in the South with peasants in virtual serfdom, have to be seized to smash the existing breach between industrial North and agricultural South, a breach carefully maintained by the landowners. A big landowner is the Catholic Church. In the center and North, land holdings are small and unprofitable. Lack of imported fertilizers, agricultural machinery and destruction create insuperable obstacles.

Living Costs Rise

In the general breakdown of government controls as the German armies were defeated, the black market, which had been considered a necessity to show opposition

to German occupation and to the fascist régime, grew into an enormous government-backed monster. Only the grain capitalists and financiers could gain from it.

It was based on the food shortage and private capitalist control of food production, of course. In 1945 grain production was 50 per cent below normal, oil 25 per cent below and sugar 90 per cent below. Farmers hoarded products instead of bringing them to government pools, thus starving the workers. Much of their production found its way to the black market. As UNRRA food and coal and credits from the American FEA vanish, there is no chance of raising the present average food ration of 1,700 calories to the 2,000 calories essential daily minimum for an adult (set by the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe).

In January, 1946, the cost of living had risen twenty times the pre-war level, while salaries and wages were only five to ten times higher. By summer, 1946, the cost of living had risen more than thirty times, while salaries and wages were between ten and fifteen times higher. Unable to buy the insufficient food available, the masses are reduced to a pitiful condition.

CP and SP representatives in the capitalist government reached a silent agreement against raising salaries and wages, but huge strikes swept the peninsula. Wages were forced up a little. Large trade unions

which had sprung up after the German fall came under CP-SP domination.

Italy's 5,000,000 industrial workers forming 29 per cent of her total labor force are concentrated heavily in the northern industrial regions. Cut off from the food producing South by smashing of rail and sea communications, the workers began to starve. Production fell as raw materials on hand were used up and raw material imports fell near zero. The government could not release industrial workers from the plants where they had been employed up to the time of the surrender, but under pressure from the capitalists who refused to pay wages without getting production in return in January the government permitted dismissals. Its public works program had little effect.

Unemployment accelerated like a snowball, reaching 2,000,000 by June and 2,500,000 by mid-July. As an enormous number of soldiers were hurled into the unemployed, a new type of organized unemployed came into existence. These are the fighting, organized unemployed, who, with tommy-guns, military formations and mass strategy, are behind the well organized demonstrations, strikes, temporary seizures of plants and areas, and of wars against the police.

JACK ARMOR.

Paris, August 2, 1946.

Politics of the International Workingclass

South Africa

Joining together with other sections of the Fourth International, the Trotskyist organization of South Africa has gone on record favoring unification of the American movement. We quote in full a resolution recently adopted by these comrades and forwarded to us.

We regret that the Workers International League of South Africa has not yet achieved a full and rounded understanding of the 1939-40 fight in the Socialist Workers Party which led to the split and formation of the Workers Party. Points one to four in their resolution indicate that they still adhere to the version of the Cannon majority which Trotsky unfortunately shared. The facts are not wholly accurate and the interpretation is most unsound.

However, this difference over an interpretation of the past is of secondary importance to the key question of unity today. It is because of this that we find the position of our South African comrades so welcome. Unlike the unprincipled position of the Cannon faction of the SWP, the South Africans do not make agreement on the causes of the 1940 split a precondition to unity today.

Their resolution follows:

Although the Workers International League is not yet officially a section of the Fourth International, we are however vitally interested in the discussions now proceeding in the Socialist Workers Party on

unification with the Workers Party and after examination of all available documents and material, the Executive Committee has taken the following stand:

1. That the Socialist Workers Party minority in 1940 was completely unjustified in splitting from the SWP and its action dealt a cruel blow to the Fourth International in a time of world crisis. In the principal ideological dispute of the Russian question we agree with Comrade Trotsky's characterization of Soviet Russia as a degenerated workers state, yet worthy of unconditional defense against imperialist aggression. We reject the WP theory of the Russian state as being one of bureaucratic collectivism.

2. Although pointing out the petty-bourgeois nature of the opposition in 1940 Trotsky sought to maintain the unity of the SWP and affirmed that the ideas of the minority were compatible with remaining inside the Fourth International.

3. Six years after the split the minority organized in the WP has expressed its desire to reunite with the SWP and to take its place in the ranks of the only world party of socialist revolution—the Fourth International. During these six years of its independent existence, the WP has maintained a Leninist attitude to its own ruling class—calling for the continuation of the class struggle against American capitalism and its reactionary war. Burnham, the chief representative of the petty-bourgeois ten-

dency, left the WP and other petty-bourgeois tendency, left the WP and other bourgeois members rubbed off their petty-bourgeois dusting by coming into close contact with the working class in the factories and army. This can give new impetus to the fusion of the two organizations and aid the building up of the mass Bolshevik revolutionary party for America.

4. The chief obstacle towards unity was the refusal of the WP membership to subordinate themselves to the majority decision inside the SWP and to abide by the principles of democratic centralism. The move towards unity indicates a change of attitude and readiness to accept the principle of democratic centralism and to work as disciplined members in the carrying out of the program and the policies of the SWP.

5. The unity of the two organizations is a progressive step in the development of the Fourth International in America, a pooling of revolutionary resources which we fully support. It would also influence the International towards cohesion and give new strength to the struggling Trotskyist groups elsewhere and serve to discourage splits and fruitless division in the other Trotskyist groups.

6. We firmly believe that the ideas of the WP are compatible with membership in one organization with the SWP. The SWP has grown significantly during the war years and has brought the ideas of Trotskyism to increasing sections of the workers. Unity

with the WP would remove a rival organization and clear up the confusion that the present co-existence of two Trotskyist parties with similar programs must necessarily have created in the minds of the advanced workers of America.

7. In order to facilitate the fusion of the two parties we support the holding of joint membership meetings, the issuing of joint bulletins and the engaging in common action in trade unions, elections, etc., so that a firm and lasting unity can be achieved.

8. We strongly urge the SWP majority to bring about unity with the WP and in this way prevent any further split in the Trotskyist ranks. We also urge its minority not to split but to continue to work for the consolidation of all the revolutionary forces in America.

March 13, 1946

India-Ceylon:

A note published in the August, 1946, NEW INTERNATIONAL regarding the position of the Ceylon section of the Fourth International on the problem of China's role in the Second World War requires correction and amplification. It was not only the Ceylon section that adopted the same position as that held by the Workers Party in America—namely, the impermissibility of supporting China's war within the general confines of the world imperialist struggle. *The Bolshevik Leninist Party of India*, to which the Ceylon section is federated as its Ceylon unit, adopted the resolution, along the political lines presented by Comrade Max Shachtman in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL supplement, June, 1942.

Contact with the Indian section of the Fourth International, and its unit in Ceylon, has now been re-established. We shall devote the major part of our December issue to the problems of India today, including the Hindu-Moslem question, the Pakistan slogan and a theoretical document explaining the approach of the Ceylon unit to the problem of the national revolution in their country.

The Indian party now publishes a legal paper, *Spark*, as well as a theoretical magazine of high quality, *The Permanent Revolution*. The Ceylon unit issues four publications, a fortnightly newspaper in English titled *Fight*, and newspapers in Sinhalese, Tamil and another language of Ceylon and South India. All these publications have legal status and a correspondingly wide circulation. The Ceylon unit is a legally functioning organization, while the Indian section—suppressed during the war—is slowly achieving legal status in the nation.

Both organizations participate actively in the class struggles of their respective countries. We hope to publish details on their work. A split of serious proportions has taken place, immediately after the end of the war, within the ranks of the former Lanka Sama Samaj Party of Ceylon, resulting in the formation of the above-mentioned Ceylon unit of the Fourth International, with a partly new and partly old leadership. The causes and nature of the split are not yet too clear. The former Lanka Sama Samaj Party (still functioning in Ceylon, under the same name) undoubtedly

is the stronger and more popular of the two organizations, retaining its mass popularity among the workers and peasants of the island. Its exact political stand on the split is not known to us as yet. It must, however, be noted that the Lanka Sama Samaj, although claiming to be a Trotskyist and Fourth Internationalist party, has gone far along the road leading to capitulation to Stalinism. It has hailed, in its press, the demagogic activities of Russia and the Stalinist movement in behalf of the colonies and has accepted the fatal illusion that Stalinism is swinging toward a "revolutionary stand." We quote from an issue of their paper (*Samasamajist*, July 24, 1946) to illustrate the extent of this trend:

"The struggle between the forces of democracy and semi-feudal reaction in Persia is sweeping the entire country... Britain is on the side of reaction and conservatism, whilst the Soviet Union is encouraging the democratic and working-class forces to organize themselves to overthrow feudal reaction and end British imperialist domination of the land of Iran... a phase of the development of democratic and working class forces which are struggling to liberate themselves."

In general, the Lanka Sama Samaj Party leadership is permeated with the fiction that Russia is working in behalf of the colonial movements for national liberation.

France:

From September 7 to September 12, the PCI (Workers' Communist Party) of France, French section of the Fourth International, held a special convention for discussion of basic political questions. On the agenda were questions of the present situation in France, including the issues of "yes" or "no" voting in the past referendum on the defeated French constitution, as well as the question of support to the slogan of a "Socialist-Communist-CGT"

government. The question of the Russian state and a revolutionary attitude toward Stalinism likewise occupied the representatives of this major Fourth Internationalist section in Europe. In our next issue we hope to present in detail the results of the convention, as well as extracts from the various resolutions presented. Several different tendencies, including one standing close to the political line of the Workers Party, were represented at the convention. The RCP (Revolutionary Communist Party) of England likewise held a convention, the details of which we hope to report also.

Stalinism at Work:

We give two examples of Stalinism at work.

1. It has been revealed in the Indian nationalist and Trotskyist press, by a former leading member of the Indian Communist Party, that the leader of that organization—a cynical scoundrel by the name of P. C. Joshi—acted directly as a police agent and police spy for the British government during the war. Joshi kept a special file, giving details on nationalists and radicals, for the benefit of the British CID (the FBI of India). The British made ample use of it for their arrests.

2. *Action*, a French Stalinist literary and political publication, has posed the question, in serious vein, whether Kafka's works should be burned because of their "social pessimism." The violent attack upon the famous expressionist author, Franz Kafka, leaves little doubt as to the answer of these neo-totalitarian book-burners to their own question. We hope to report in more detail on this event, and its repercussions among French writers and intellectuals. An anti-Stalinist tendency is growing rapidly among French writers and supporters of the "existentialiste" school, so important during the movement of the French Résistance.

H. J.

Book Reviews . . .

SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM, by Karl Kautsky. With an introduction by Sidney Hook. The Rand School Press. 142 pages. \$2.00.

Here is the swan song of Social-Democracy, sung by its most powerful voice, Karl Kautsky. Written in the 1930's, these essays comprise the last grandiose attempt to present Social-Democracy as a political theory consistent with the Marxian system. And surely Social-Democracy could have found no more competent spokesman! Kautsky writes with the broad historical sweep and assurance which is given only to the most competent of theoreticians and historians; his logic is keen, his argument close.

Yet, once tribute has been paid to Kautsky's competence, one must pass to the content of his work. And how sad that is! Not all of Kautsky's skill and authority can

give sheen to the tarnished goods that are found each week in *The New Leader*: the same formal preachment of "democracy" to which no content other than constant support of capitalist institutions is ever given; the same hypocrisy with regard to political means: Quaker-like indignation at the idea that the defense of socialism may require extra-parliamentary means coupled with vicariously bloodthirsty support of imperialist war; the same uncanny ability to embroider the most paltry political practices with the most stirring humanitarian rhetoric. It would be absurd to attempt a review here of the historic quarrel between Marxism and Kautsky's revision of it; a few points only, of special pertinence, should be made:

1) It is remarkable how an idea can gain currency, despite its invalidity and inaccuracy, if it is repeated often enough. Kaut-

sky tries, with much erudition, to discover the roots of the Bolshevik ideology in the theories of the extremist leader of the French Revolution, Babeuf, and later the 19th century putschist, Blanqui. The theories of Babeuf—he notes correctly enough—were developed at a time when the working class was still incipient in formation and when the extreme left in the chain of French revolutions found itself in the tragic and anomalous position of trying to anticipate history. Lenin, continues Kautsky, developed a similar theory with regard to the also backward Russian proletariat; he made the same error as Babeuf and Blanqui, he tried to substitute the action of a small conspiratorial group for the movement of a social class.

But it needs only to be pointed out, in refutation, that Lenin's theory was an internationalist one, based on an assessment of the Russian working class in relation to the world proletariat. He took the historical "gamble"—and who dares call himself a revolutionist or a Marxist if unwilling to take such "gambles"?—of seizing upon an extraordinarily favorable conjunction to lead the Russian workers to power in the hope that the workers of the advanced West would soon come to the rescue. That they did not is another matter—a matter, incidentally, for which Kautsky carried a heavy share of responsibility. The point is that even if, by some historical freak, the little groups of Babeuf or Blanqui had been able to seize power in France, they could not have counted on the aid from elsewhere for which Lenin was later to hope. For 19th century France had the most advanced revolutionary masses of its time, not the most backward population of Europe, as did 20th century Russia. Rather than relying on small conspiratorial groups, Lenin was able to gain the support of masses of workers, unlike Babeuf and Blanqui, who neither desired to nor were able to appeal to masses. Historical analogy is a powerful weapon, but it is two-edged.

2) Why did the Social-Democracy fail? Why, if it, unlike the "Bolshevik conspirators," represented the true union of socialism and democracy, did it not succeed in wresting power from capitalism and forestalling the contemporary nightmare? Here is Kautsky's answer: "Everything of a truly progressive nature which the Bolsheviks sought at that time to realize was also part of the program of the other Socialist Parties and would have been carried out by them, for the people had empowered them to do so." (My emphasis—I. H.) Has there ever been a historical apology at once so tragic and comic? Before the Bolsheviks took power, there was a Menshevik-SR government in Russia, that is, one composed of Kautsky's friends. What prevented it from beginning to put into effect "everything of a truly progressive nature which the Bolsheviks sought"? And what prevented the German Social-Democrats? If "everything of a truly progressive nature which the Bolsheviks sought" had really been carried out by the Mensheviks, then Lenin would have been politically disarmed; if...

Sees State Capitalism in 1919

3) Kautsky was one of the first in the labor movement to characterize Russia as a society of state capitalism. Let it be noted, however, before there is even a handclap of misplaced applause for this seeming prescience, that Kautsky applied this label indiscriminately to the varied and rich development of post-revolutionary Russia, all the way from 1919 to the period of Stalin's consolidation of power in the middle thirties. Such a lumping of infinitely different social phenomena under one generic heading is only a means of escaping the historian's responsibility rather than facing it. One cannot take seriously any sociological category which is supposed to encompass within its discreet fold both Lenin's revolutionary and Stalin's counter-revolutionary Russia. Kautsky's use of the label, state capitalism, as a means of describing the new, unique phenomenon of a totally statified economy in which no workers control exists, is merely another instance of the common fallacy of believing that an unfamiliar phenomenon is made less so if it is given a familiar label. But if calling Stalinist Russia state capitalism attenuates the shock of novelty in the heart of the observer, it does not in the slightest penetrate into the reality of this new social formation.

* * *

It may be asked: How a man of Kautsky's stature, who in the early part of the century was one of the two or three greatest Marxists, could have degenerated to the point where, in the thirties, he pinned his hope for the future of humanity on...

the League of Nations? Answers to such questions, when confined to individual cases, must skirt the unsteady grounds of personal psychology. In Kautsky's case, it has been suggested, that his life of comfort as a theoretician of the powerful Social-Democracy—a life of secluded scholarship (for which, let us wryly admit, almost every revolutionary theoretician yearns)—gradually acclimated him to an acceptance of the status quo. Revolutions may be hatched in libraries; they are not led there. But whatever the explanation for Kautsky's personal development, it cannot be gainsaid that there is an element of genuine tragedy in the decline of this once titanic Marxist.

Tragedy, however, is hardly the appropriate word for the author of the introduction to this book, Sidney Hook, who was also once a Marxist—and a talented one at that. Hook, who has come a long way since he wrote *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx*, contributes an introduction of unrestrained praise for Kautsky to which he merely appends a critical phrase in polite *sotto voce*. Hook writes: "...although Kautsky is perfectly justified in defending the Social-Democratic attempt to preserve the democratic heritage of the Weimar Republic, he minimizes the consequences of its attempt to preserve the capitalistic economic structure of the Republic as well." Notice that deliciously delicate phrase: "minimizes the consequences."

For Sidney Hook is hardly the person to become raucous about a mere detail such as the preservation of the "capitalistic economic structure."

IRVING HOWE.

Correspondence . . .

Editor:

The Shields-Gates debate in the August issue on self-determination was very interesting, but shows the need for further discussion.

In his conclusion, Shields stated that "each nationality must be recognized as having the right to determine its destiny for itself, whether it be separation from the rest of the country, some form of autonomous co-operation, or simply majority rule." Shields seems to forget the alternative of advocating the independence of Palestine, together with unequivocal support (expressed now) of the right of the Jews to a separate state if their position in an independent Palestine proves unsatisfactory.

Gates, however, throws the whole issue of self-determination out of the window. His point that the Jews are not now an oppressed minority in an independent Palestine is not decisive. The Jews are an oppressed people, who have already demonstrated their desire for certain distinctly national rights. The Jews are an oppressed minority—considered on a world scale. They desire not merely equality as citizens in an independent Palestine. They want a state that will permit and facilitate the immigration of perhaps a million Jews.

While Shields has not justified his subtitle "Against the Slogan of Majority Rule," Gates has not successfully attacked the idea that slogans on self-determination are sorely needed. Recent Palestinian events have shown the willingness of the Jewish masses to struggle, now, against British imperialism and for their national aspirations. The revolutionary party must not devote itself to bemoaning the current "ideology" of the Jews (masses and leaders together), but rather support unequivocally the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish masses in the interests of the social revolution. It is around "how and under what slogans" that the discussion should revolve.

Comradely,

DAVID CORBIN.

The Labor Action School starts November 12 at 114 West 14th Street.

Courses in contemporary problems of Marxism and the Labor Movement.

Write for Catalog to:

LABOR ACTION SCHOOL
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

TOWARD SOCIALIST KNOWLEDGE

WE OFFER THESE BARGAIN COMBINATIONS
OF WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

Special No. 1 at \$1.00

- (1) PLENTY FOR ALL—THE MEANING OF SOCIALISM, by Ernest Erber (80 pgs.)
- (2) THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM, by Max Shachtman (paper cover, 182 pgs.)

Originally \$1.25

Special No. 2 at \$2.50

- (1) THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM, by Max Shachtman (paper cover, 182 pgs.)
- (2) THE NEW COURSE, by Leon Trotsky, with essay by Max Shachtman (cloth cover, 265 pgs.)

Originally \$3.00

Special No. 3 at \$4.00

- (1) PLENTY FOR ALL—THE MEANING OF SOCIALISM, by Ernest Erber (80 pgs.)
- (2) INDIA IN REVOLT, by Henry Judd (95 pgs.)
- (3) THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM, by Max Shachtman (cloth cover, 182 pgs.)
- (4) THE NEW COURSE, by Leon Trotsky (cloth cover, 265 pgs.)

Originally \$4.75

Mall Orders and Checks Payable to:

WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Now Available!

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

*Indispensable for a
Revolutionary History
of the Year 1945*

The American Labor Scene

The European Scene

The End of World War II

Classic Marxist Documents

Resolutions of the
Workers Party

9 Issues

Cross-Indexed by Author
and Subject

PRICE NOW \$3.00

Order from:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Now Available at a Bargain!

LEON TROTSKY'S

THE NEW COURSE

Get this historic essay on Russia, together with Max Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism, now on sale for:

\$1.00

Paper Bound

265 Pages

(Originally \$1.50)

Order from: WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Now Available!

Two Study Outlines

- 1. The Role of the Party**
- 2. The Economic Role of the Trade Unions**



10c Each



Order from:

Workers Party

114 West 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

An Introductory Offer to Our New Readers

BECOME A NEW INTERNATIONAL SUBSCRIBER NOW!

Six Issues, Six Months \$1

We are making this offer to our new readers who wish to become better acquainted with THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. For \$1.00 you will receive regularly, through the mails, the next six (6) issues of our magazine. Just return the blank printed below, properly filled out, with a dollar bill.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

I wish to receive the next six (6) issues of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and I am enclosing \$1.00 as per your offer.

NAME.....ADDRESS.....

CITY.....ZONE..... STATE.....

(This Offer Expires January 1, 1947—Add 25 cents for foreign countries)