The Communist

20c. APRIL 1941

DEMAND THE FREEDOM OF EARL BROWDER!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY

•

WE ARE SAILING INTO THE FACE OF GREAT STORMS

EARL BROWDER

•

HOW THE BRITISH EMPIRE IS CONJURED AWAY

GIL GREEN

•

AMERICAN FASCISM SPEAKS OUT

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

LABOR'S STRIKE-WEAPON

SAMUEL PUTNAM

New and Forthcoming Pamphlets

JUST PUBLISHED —

Free Earl Browder, by Robert Minor	.01
The Path of Browder and Foster	.03
Constitution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.	.05
The Hollow Men, by Michael Gold	.25
World Capitalism and World Socialism, by William Z. Foster	.05
War and the People, by K. Pollard	.10
Growth of the Trade Unions, by Roy Hudson	.03
The Women Want a People's Peace, by Dolores Ibarruri (La Pasionaria)	.10
Old Jim Crow Has Got to Go, by Henry Winston	.01
Socialism: The Road to Peace, Prosperity and Freedom, by William Z. Foster	.05
Epic of the Black Sea Revolt, by Andre Marty	.10

IN PREPARATION —

New Aspects of Imperialism, by Peter Wieden	.10
Bright and Morning Star, by Richard Wright	.15
The October Days in Moscow, by I. Mintz	.15
May Day 1941, by I. Amter	.01
The National Question in the U.S.S.R., by M. Chekalin	.10

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

VOL. XX, No. 4 APRIL, 1941

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

DEMAND THE FREEDOM OF EARL BROWDER IN DEFENSE OF YOUR RIGHTS, LIVING STANDARDS AND PEACE!

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., MARCH 25, 1941

THE closing of prison doors upon Earl Browder, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, is an ominous signal to the people of the United States.

Browder's imprisonment is a heavy blow to the Communist Party. But it will count even more heavily as a blow against the entire labor movement and against the peace and welfare of the whole people.

Why has Browder been condemned to serve four years behind prison bars?

A year and a half ago, when Browder was first indicted, the Communist Party warned the country that the pretended charge of a violation of a passport law was only a ruse—and that his arrest was really the opening gun in an attack upon the rights of all Americans as Wall Street sought war abroad and war upon the people at home.

Have not the events of the past year confirmed this warning?

A year ago, President Roosevelt promised the American people that we would stay out of the imperialist war. Where is that promise today? Step by step—through the destroyer deal, conscription and the lend-lease bill—Mr. Roosevelt has betrayed his pledges and has deliberately led this country deeper and deeper into the inferno of the war.

A year ago, President Roosevelt still promised a "good neighbor" policy. But today we see him trying to bring the countries of Latin America under the iron heel of Yankee imperialism and attempting to instigate intrigues throughout the world against the Soviet Union.

A year ago, President Roosevelt promised to defend the rights and gains won by labor with so much struggle and suffering during the past generation.

But when the workers sought to defend living standards and union gains and to combat high living costs and speed-up, the Administration joined the employers in demanding sacrifices, in freezing wages and in lengthening hours.

Instead of curbing the tremen-

dous war profits of the trusts, the government started a drive upon labor by invoking the anti-trust law against the unions.

When the employers refused to give necessary wage increases and thus compelled the workers to resort to strike action, the Administration has sought to defeat these demands and destroy union conditions by setting up mediation boards, despite the opposition of the most important sections of the labor movement.

When the workers displayed their unity and economic strength on the picket line, the Administration has countenanced the use of police and gangsters, as in the Harvester and Bethlehem strikes.

A year ago President Roosevelt was still saying that no one would go hungry in America. But, bit by bit, he has whittled down all appropriations for relief, until now the millions of unemployed are even worse off than before.

A year ago, President Roosevelt pledged his solemn word that the democracy and the civil liberties of the people would be guarded as sacred. But today the fascist-like forces of bigotry and intolerance are in full assault upon our electoral rights, union rights and school system—with the direct encouragement of the President himself.

When Browder was first arrested, the White House and the Department of Justice assured the country that the Communist leader was not being prosecuted for his political opinions. But today the deception which lay behind these assurances can be seen by all. It can be seen in the arrest and unlawful imprisonment of the twenty-eight Communists and friends of the Party of Pittsburgh. It can be seen in the dismissal and arrest of Morris Schappes, teacher at City College, admittedly for his political views.

Working people of America: when you consider what has happened to you in this past year, is it not clear that the Communist Party was right in its warning that the prosecution of Browder was directed against all of you?

Earl Browder and the Party he represents have been persecuted because they are a section of the labor movement—a small part, it is true, but the most far-seeing part.

Do not the experiences of the past few years in Germany, France and England show you that attacks upon all the people always start with an attack upon the Communists?

What only the Communist Party and a few others saw a year and a half ago, millions are now beginning to see with clear vision. But because Browder and the Party he leads gave the most effective warning of the Administration's war program, he was imprisoned first.

Earl Browder has been sent to prison as the first American political prisoner of the second imperialist war, when the second Woodrow Wilson again attempts the conquest of the world and the suppression of liberty at home under the slogan of "preserving democracy."

Earl Browder has been sent to prison because he is the most brilliant and therefore the most hated and feared leader of the people in

exposing this war-mad Administration's policy of government by deception.

Earl Browder has been sent to prison because his whole life has been devoted, not only to helping the American working class, but the people of the entire world—especially of Latin America and China—and because he has thereby become a symbol of the international working class solidarity that will ultimately end this criminal war.

Earl Browder has been sent to prison because he is the spokesman for the Party that champions the cause of socialism, which alone offers an alternative to the misery, hunger, economic stagnation and wars spawned by the capitalist system.

* * *

In the imprisonment of Browder, the workers should see the catastrophe which the Administration has been preparing for them.

In the imprisonment of Browder, the people should also see the fears of the ruling class who know they can carry on their program of imperialist war only by deceiving and disorganizing the people. This ruling class has seen the movement to get out and stay out of the war rising ever higher. It has watched with fear the ever stronger defense of civil rights and the movement for wage standards and union organization, now embracing millions and sweeping all obstacles aside. The imprisonment of Browder is an important part of the efforts to prevent the working class from uniting against the war program of the monopolists.

The workers have been meeting the various attacks with rising determination. So too should they answer the attack contained in the jailing of Browder. They should strengthen their fight to take the country out of the conflict, to defend the trade unions and the mass organizations of the people, to improve wages and working conditions, to guard the right to strike, and to keep the Bill of Rights a living document.

But if these vital aims are to be achieved, the unity of labor and of the people must be cemented. This can be accomplished only if such unity includes Communists as well as non-Communists. This unity must be built upon the recognition that when the rights of the Communists are violated, a blow has been struck at the rights of all of us. The fight for the freedom of Earl Browder, therefore, is the fight of all the forces of labor and of progress.

In Wall Street and in Washington there is rejoicing today; there is also uneasiness and fear that, with each passing day, more and more people will learn the truth. They will learn that the cause of Browder's freedom is the American people's cause.

The fight for the freedom of Earl Browder has only begun. It is a fight for the peace, security and freedom of America. Every blow delivered against the war dictatorship of Wall Street is a blow for the freedom of Browder. Every voice raised for Browder's freedom

is a voice raised against reaction and war.

Fight against every step to involve the country deeper in the imperialist war!

Demand that America get out and stay out of the war!

Defend the rights of labor and the democratic liberties of the people!

Help build the Communist Party, the Party of socialism, the leader of the fight for peace, security and freedom!

DEMAND THE FREEDOM OF EARL BROWDER!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.,
William Z. Foster, *Chairman*
Robert Minor, *Acting Secretary*

EDITORIALS

WHAT KIND OF AMERICAN WORLD LEADERSHIP?

THE coming of Spring, as was anticipated, is bringing an intensification of the war, drawing into the orbit of the imperialist slaughter new countries. Most acute in the past month was the struggle between the two imperialist blocs for control over the small neutrals in the Balkans. At this writing, Bulgaria is the latest victim of this fight. The agreement of the Bulgarian government to the entry of German troops "does not lead to consolidation of peace but to the extension of the sphere of the war and to Bulgaria's being involved in it" (Soviet Note to Bulgarian government).

Again and again it is proven that when smaller countries decide to become "partners" to either one of the large imperialist blocs, they almost automatically sign away their independence, turning their lands into new theaters of war, becoming mere tools in the hands of the big imperialist bandits. Only the socialist Soviet Union, with its Leninist-Stalinist national policy, shows all nations threatened by foreign imperialism how to defend their independence in a world of war and aggression against smaller peoples and nations. And in all these developments there are great lessons to be learned also by the peoples of Latin America, who figure as very important "stakes" in the imperialist game for world power and who are now subject to particular pressure from American imperialism to become "partners" in the so-called "defense" of the Western Hemisphere.

With the coming of Spring, and following the passage of the so-called Lend-Lease Bill, there is also coming a more intense and widespread military collaboration between American and British imperialism in the actual prosecution of the war. The Roosevelt Administration has now been empowered by a Congress dominated by imperialists and warmakers—in defiance of the will of the masses—to place the military resources of this country at the service of the Anglo-American alliance in the war against the powers of the tripartite pact. Not only will the Administration try to "lend" to Britain parts of the American Navy—as convoys, for example—but it will seek to coordinate the activities of both the British and American naval forces in a unified strategic plan of common action especially in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. More and more it will become evident to all that a war alliance exists between the im-

perialists of England and the United States, with the latter fighting for hegemony in this alliance.

It will depend to a considerable extent upon the anti-war struggles of the masses of the American people as to how fast and how deeply American imperialism succeeds in further involving this country in the war. Fighting under the slogan to "Get Out and Stay Out of the War," the peace movements of the masses must now devote even more attention than heretofore to combatting every step toward further involvement, intensifying also the fight for a true people's peace, in collaboration with the masses of all countries and in support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union. The American People's Meeting taking place this month in New York will be able to make a large contribution to the further unfolding of this struggle.

Serious notice must also be taken of some of the newer features of the imperialist war *propaganda.* We refer to those features which carry a more frank and open appeal to the imperialist "self-interest" of larger groups in the American population, such as the well-to-do farmers, the reformist bureaucracy and aristocracy of labor, and certain sections of the city middle classes.

Such appeals have been made before—by Henry Wallace, for example, during the national election campaign, but they were sporadic, and incidental to the main line of imperialist war propaganda based on demagogic use of anti-fascism and democracy. While this still continues a major line of imperialist and reformist demagogy, and for the Roosevelt-Hillman forces it remains the main line, the so-called Willkie Republicans have begun to develop into a major weapon for war incitement this newer feature of imperialist propaganda, the appeal to the imperialist "self-interest" of the middle classes. And the Roosevelt-Hillman forces are also beginning to use it more often, especially for the reformist bureaucracy and top layers of labor.

This "appeal" was crystallized most crassly by the editor of *Life,* Henry R. Luce, in his article "The American Century." (*Life,* Feb. 17, 1941.) What is it that is particularly characteristic of this article? It is the attempt to entice the middle classes (and sections of labor) into supporting the war course of big business imperialism *by holding out promises of material gain, of "practical" benefits, and not merely "vague" ideas of "Democracy" and "Justice," or the defense of distant places like "Dong Dang."*

Mr. Luce does not altogether discard the use of "vague" ideas. No; he is too clever for that. He says: you can use these ideas; the President does, for example. They have their place. But, he asks, "Is there not something a little more practically satisfying that we can get our teeth into? Is there no sort of understandable program? A program which would be clearly good for America, which would make sense for America—and which at the same time might have the blessing of the Goddess of Democracy and even help somehow to fix up this bothersome matter of Dong Dang?"

And he proceeds to fix up a pro-

gram, a program of American imperialist world domination, in which there are "practically satisfying" things for the American farmer, engineer, artist, salesman, merchant, etc. For example: "America as the principal guarantor of the freedom of the seas," "America as the dynamic leader of world trade," "Asia will be worth to us four, five, ten billions of dollars a year."

Furthermore:

"Engineers, scientists, doctors, movie men, makers of entertainment, developers of airlines, builders of roads, teachers, educators—throughout the world these skills, this training, this leadership is needed and will be eagerly welcomed, if only we have the imagination to see it and the sincerity and good will to create the world of the 20th century."

The special bait for the farmer is the vision of America as the country that will feed the world "consistently with a very tough attitude toward all hostile governments." Hence, "every farmer in America should be encouraged to produce all the crops he can."

We shall not discuss here in detail the "realism" of these visions. We have done it before and will do so again. Except to say this: first, it is a program for the most extensive, exhaustive and prolonged wars by American imperialism in all parts of the world that humanity has ever known; secondly, it envisages a world role for the United States which, by its national oppression, political reaction and counter-revolution, imperialist robbery, violent suppression of labor and colonial liberation movements, would make the violent aggressions and reaction of present-day German or British imperialism look feeble. It would, by comparison, make Hitler and Churchill look like angels of liberalism; thirdly, such an American "Century" or "Empire" would be as stable as the "new order" planned by the tri-power pact, spelling unheard of oppression and exploitation for the masses in the United States, although bringing some "practical" compensation to the mercenaries of American imperialism.

These things have to be made plain, patiently and thoroughly, to the wide masses of the American people. The danger of such "appeals" must not be overlooked.

But why this new emphasis, especially by the Willkie Republicans, on the "practically satisfying" things in American imperialist war policy? We have already said that the Roosevelt-Hillman forces also make this point but not as a major weapon. Just recently Hillman declared in an interview with the International News Service that "whether she likes it or not, America is destined for a great position in world leadership. We cannot shrink from that responsibility," thus repeating verbatim the Luce argument. And, of course, the reformist flunkey of imperialism, as usual, made sure to hide the fact that the American leadership which he is advocating is leadership in imperialist slaughter, counter-revolution, world oppression, *and not leadership in progress, peace, national*

freedom and prosperity for the masses everywhere.

Even though the Roosevelts and Hillmans are also using this sort of "appeal" (integrated more closely with anti-fascist and democratic demagogy), it is the Willkie crowd that makes it its main business. And why? Because it has now a special function to perform for the imperialist warmakers. It is the function of "winning" for the war policy those middle-class groups on the farms and in the cities—very numerous—which voted for Willkie in the last election, who are today not supporting the war policy, and whose anti-war moods are now being exploited for imperialist purposes (and for inner-party Republican struggles) by the Hoovers and Landons and Deweys and Tafts.

These middle classes have so far shown a poor response, from the standpoint of the warmakers, to the "anti-fascist and democratic" appeal of the imperialists. For this there are several reasons. They are still under the influence of the many years of big business reactionary propaganda, carried out mainly by the Republican Party, favorable to fascism and critical of democracy; this having been the main line of Republican attack against the "New Deal" before the outbreak of the war. These middle classes find it also difficult "to warm up to" the Roosevelt Administration, which is leading America into the war, because of their very tangible and *justified* economic grievances against this Administration, on which basis they mistakenly voted for Willkie in the last elections. Another reason is that the war so far, and American collaboration in it, has made their condition *worse*, not better, and they see no prospect for change. Lastly, they remember the devastating consequences of the last war for the bulk of the people, and are fearful of this new war—consequently their persisting anti-war moods.

How to break up these moods is a problem for the imperialist warmakers, a problem of extreme importance. The Willkie Republicans seem to be the people best qualified to undertake the job. And so they are trying. And logically, from their special position in the imperialist war camp, they make their appeal to the middle classes who voted for Willkie, not particularly on the basis of some New Deal "nonsense" about "anti-fascism," "democracy" and "justice" in some such places as Dong Dang. No; these should be used only as trimmings, especially among those who fall for them, those still believing in the "New Deal." Willkie, Luce & Co. will make their appeal to these special groups of the middle classes—the anti-New Deal groups—on the basis of imperialist "self-interest," on the basis of a "partnership" with big business imperialism for sharing the spoils of the projected and expected aggrandizement.

If the Willkie crowd should succeed in this effort, they will have strengthened considerably the power of the warmakers in the country generally and, incidentally, they will have strengthened also their own position in the Republican Party—even though for a while—as against the Hoovers, Landons, Deweys and Tafts.

From all of which follows that the peace movements of the masses must take full note of these developments to spread and strengthen their influence among these middle classes *by widening and cementing the ties* between the working class, the toiling farmers and poor middle classes of the cities. The anti-war propaganda of the people's peace movements must be made more differentiated and more concrete. Proceeding from the general opposition to the entire camp of imperialism, it is necessary to expose *systematically,* not only every now and then, the *special* methods and tactics employed by each imperialist group for confusing and demoralizing the masses.

The methods used by the Roosevelt-Hillman forces are obviously not identical with those of the Willkie Republicans, nor are those of the Hoover-Landon-Taft-Dewey elements identical with either. To expose the nature of these respective methods of deceiving the people, to point out the particular sections of the population to which each of these methods is most particularly directed and, above all, *to expose the bourgeois-imperialist class nature* of each of the imperialist groups using these methods—and to do so in the course of the daily struggle against the imperialist offensive—this is the way to make the people conscious of their experiences and to win them for a consistent struggle against war and reaction.

There is no doubt that, as the American people become more conscious of the world nature of the struggle for peace, freedom and security, they will also gain a clearer understanding of the principles of *working-class internationalism* as the only road to these objectives.

They will also see better that in the worldwide struggle for these objectives the masses of the American people—the true America—can indeed play a leading role. Not as oppressors of other peoples; not as despoilers of other nations; not as robots of Wall Street for counter-revolutionary schemes of world domination; not on the road of the Roosevelts, Willkies, and, in the last analysis, of the Hoovers and Tafts—a road leading to national disaster, paved for the imperialists by the Hillmans, Greens and Thomases. No; not on this road lies the future of America's leadership in the world, but on the road of consistent anti-imperialist struggle, waged by a united American people headed by the working class, collaborating with the peace movements of the masses in all other countries, and with the peace policies of the mighty socialist Soviet Union, and moving in the direction of an America ruled by the people and led by the working class. *This is the people's road to American leadership in the world for peace, freedom, international brotherhood and security for all.*

This is what is meant by the slogan "For a People's Peace." And only under this banner will the American people achieve their own salvation as well as a leading role in the salvation of the world from imperialism, capitalism and war.

NOT CLASS COLLABORATION BUT CLASS STRUGGLE

THE conflicts between the finance-capitalist rulers of the country, on the one hand, and the masses of the American people, on the other, are visibly becoming sharper from day to day. As has been evident from the outset, the oligarchy is determined to make the masses of the people carry the full burden of the war. It is determined also to curtail and rapidly to destroy the people's civil rights and democratic liberties. All this in the name of "national" defense, precisely as was foretold by the Communist Party and other progressive labor groups.

But the masses of the people—and labor, in the first instance—are not taking it lying down. On the contrary. Labor is determined to defend itself, and is so doing in ever larger numbers, despite the treacherous maneuvers of the reformist leaders. There is also considerable ferment evident among sections of the working farmers and city middle classes. But these movements of the masses are facing dangers and the most serious ones originate with the class collaboration maneuvers of the reformist leaders.

What is the attitude of big business to the major wage movements now on foot in the industries? Says Mr. Murray, president of the C.I.O.: "The attitude of American industry today is one of absolute, positive refusal to make wage concessions of any description." That is a fact. But it must be added that this attitude of big business can be "modified" by an equally absolute and positive determination on the part of labor to secure such concessions. That this is so has been proven by several important labor actions in recent months, some of them led by C.I.O. organizations. And in each instance it was the *self-activity of the masses,* led in a progressive direction on a policy of *class independence,* that secured the maximum results for the workers and their unions.

The lesson that we would draw is: not class collaboration with the imperialists and war-makers but class struggle. This follows from the very analysis of the issue as presented by Mr. Murray before the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City on February 25. There he presented a set of figures which should be made the property of every worker, of the widest masses of the people. He showed the amount of *net* profit made by a number of the largest corporations on each worker employed by them in 1940.

General Motors had a net profit of $977 per employe in 1940, "approximately $4 per day profit on each employe." The American Telegraph and Telephone Company netted $528 per worker. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, $2,000; the United States Steel Corporation, $420; du Pont, $2,220 and the General Electric, $826.

Mr. Murray sums up these figures by asking: "Is this a fair economic system?" *Is* it? The answer that follows from these figures is that this is a system of class exploitation and oppression, a system under which the monopolistic owners of

the resources and productive plant of the nation—a handful of people—are in a position to compel the overwhelming majority to slave for them. That is how "fair" the capitalist system is.

And from this fact something else follows as well. It follows that the workers and all toiling people can have no trust or confidence in the capitalist class and its representatives. It follows further that any scheme of "collaboration" between the working class and the capitalist class must *inevitably* injure the workers and profit the capitalists; that the only way to meet the "fairness" of this system is by a labor policy of complete economic, political and ideological class independence—by a policy which unites the workers *as a class,* which places the working class at the head of the rest of the common people, in consistent struggle against the capitalist-imperialists and warmakers.

Let us see how this great issue of wages and working conditions is approached by the two main classes in our present society. Labor, speaking through the C.I.O. and the other progressive forces in the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods, believes that the first problem of true national defense is to protect and improve the economic standards and civil liberties of the masses of the American people. The C.I.O., for instance, has adopted an extensive program of measures and demands for this purpose, a program which is receiving increasingly more active support from the youth, the working farmers, the Negro people and many other groups. It is the program which John L. Lewis so powerfully expressed at the last national convention of the C.I.O. And that indicates the aspirations and line of actual struggle of the masses of the people.

Facing this, in determined offensive, are the imperialists, warmakers and their government, assisted by the reformist leaders (Hillman, Green, Thomas, etc.). How do *they* see the problem? Says *The New York Times*:

"The problem is to prevent inflation of prices and unnecessary expansion of industrial facilities outside the defense program. The core of this problem consists in avoiding an excessive increase in consumer purchasing power flowing out of the enormous government spending for defense." (March 4.)

It says the "core" of the problem is to prevent an increase in consumer purchasing power, thus coming in head-on collision with the demands of the masses that purchasing power of the people should be increased. *The Times* speaks of "excessive" increases; but this is a very elastic conception which, in practice, always spells no increase. And why so? Is it really an inflationary rise in prices that they are worried about? No; that is not the case, even though tendencies toward such an inflationary rise are present and developing. If big business and its spokesmen were really concerned with counteracting inflationary tendencies, the first thing they would advocate would be *expansion* of industrial facilities and full reemployment of all available labor

for *increased* production of all sorts of consumer goods.

Once again we must raise this question: where do the inflationary tendencies arise from in the present situation? They arise from the development of a war economy, from its one-sidedness, which shifts an ever increasing portion of resources and production to making weapons of war, leaving an ever diminishing portion of resources and plant for making articles of consumption for the people.

If this process should continue unchecked, there will undoubtedly mature a serious inflationary rise in prices which will fall heaviest upon the masses of the people. But big business is not worried about that. It is concerned chiefly with placing the full burden of the war upon the masses, and keeping it there. That is why it seeks to meet the danger of inflation, not by increasing production of consumer goods, not by expanding industrial facilities for that purpose, but by curtailing the purchasing power of the masses. And curtailment it is, for failure to increase the income of the masses in the face of rising prices means cutting the people's purchasing power.

But the question of "financing" the war has also other important angles. Fiscal policy, for example. Big business wants "as much as possible of the defense program financed out of taxes and the borrowing of real savings." (*N. Y. Times,* March 4.) What is the catch here? It is the *kind* of taxes and the *kind* of savings that these people have in mind. They want the kind of taxes and savings that come from the purchasing power of the masses and not from the profits of the war profiteers.

Already Congress is giving "relief" to the war profiteers from the miserable caricature of an "excess" profits tax, while devising all sorts of fiscal schemes to drain off into the war machine the maximum amount of mass purchasing power, by increasing direct and indirect taxation of the masses, and by forcing them "to save" (to curtail consumption) and to "invest" in war securities. Here again the line of big business and its government is to make the masses pay the cost of the war not only in blood (to which we are coming) but also in income.

The C.I.O. program on taxation, formulated by its convention and supported by the widest masses, comes into head-on collision with the line of the monopolies and war-makers. What kind of "collaboration" can there be here between the masses and their exploiters?

What about price policies? Big business pretends to be favoring moderation. Says *The Times*: "Price advances and profits must be kept to a minimum." (March 4.) A "minimum"—what *is* a minimum? And who is to decide it? The fact is that profits are mounting and prices are steadily rising. And there is mighty little protection against that trend in the government's so-called "priorities and rationing system," since the real control of this system lies in the hands of big business itself.

More recently some experts in the

Department of Agriculture came forward with a proposal, submitted to the Temporary National Economic Committee, that the big food trusts be placed in the status of public utilities and thus made subject to Federal incorporation and regulation. But that looks more like eye-wash than the real thing. The people of America have had enough experience with Federal "regulation" of public utilities not to entertain serious expectations from such a proposal. Electric power, communications and railroads have long been subject to Federal regulation, but the masses are still to find out what good it did them.

No; any serious effort to combat the monopolistic food profiteers, to protect the farmer as well as city dweller from the rapacities of the food trusts, is *to break them up.* Dissolve the food monopolies and keep them dissolved—this is one of the major lines of struggle of the workers, farmers and all toiling people. And, certainly, there is mighty little room for "collaboration" between the masses and the food monopolies.

Hiding its mailed fist in a silken glove big business urges labor to avoid "ill-considered strikes that slow down the defense program and demands for raising wages to levels that will increase the threat of inflation." (*N. Y. Times*, March 4.) In reply to this brazen and cynical advice to labor from the war profiteers, we shall again quote Philip Murray, since he surely cannot be suspected of opposition to "class collaboration." And what does he say? Read:

"So they suggest, these leaders of American industry, very bluntly, very boldly, that nothing should be done in the United States of America during the period of national defense to improve living standards or to increase wages and that at the same time nothing should be done in the United States by government, labor or industry to disturb the profit-making opportunities of American industry."

Thus spoke Murray before the American Association of School Administrators; and it was good to do so, to acquaint the middle classes fully with the situation. But the masses of the workers in the industries and in the unions should be told that also, plainly and fully, so larger numbers will become organized to fight against these attitudes of the "leaders of American industry" and of their government.

Continues Murray:

"It is these attitudes on the part of mighty, important business men that create conflict; it is these economic disturbances that not only cause strikes and the spilling of blood but international convulsions. We are talking about breeding better world relations. We are talking in the United States today of supporting the enactment of legislation that will tend to promote democracy and yet we have employers of labor in the United States of America even today that refuse to recognize their labor when their labor is organized into labor unions."

The matter is clear. The responsibility for strikes, conflicts and war rests with finance capital and, we

would add, its imperialist governments. The talk about defending democracy by getting into the imperialist war is sheer fakery. And all this has to be told *to the masses,* to their unions and other progressive organizations, who already sense it, who already move in ever larger numbers to active struggle *against* "these attitudes of the mighty, important business men."

Look at the splendid solidarity and militancy of the workers in the Lackawanna plant of the Bethlehem Corporation, and at the rising surge of the Ford workers, at the struggle in the Harvester plants, at the fine achievements of the seamen (N.M.U.)—to mention a few cases at random—and the conclusion is inescapable that *the depths of the masses* are beginning to shake up and to move. What is needed is more intensive organization of precisely these masses, more consistent working class leadership, less dependence upon the non-existent good-will and fairness of the exploiters and their warmaking government, more systematic struggle against the reformist misleaders and betrayers of the masses.

As against the growing consolidation of the reformist bureaucracy and its steady integration in the imperialist war machine, a process much hampered by the unfolding struggles of the masses, the answer is: *deeper penetration* of the masses with progressive trade unionism and anti-imperialist peace struggle. This is the experience of the first world imperialist war, and of everything that took place thus far in the second imperialist war. This is embodied in the teachings of Lenin, who said in 1916:

"And it is our duty, therefore, if we wish to remain Socialists, to go down *lower* and *deeper,* to the real masses: this is the whole meaning and the whole content of the struggle against opportunism." ("Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement.")

FOR THE LIBERATION OF OUR LEADER

IN EARL BROWDER's more recent utterances there is one idea that is particularly relevant to the Supreme Court decision which sent him to jail. It is his observation of the contrast in the state of mind of the spokesmen of the ruling class, on the one hand, and of the representatives of the future rulers of the country, of the progressive and revolutionary spokesmen of the working class, on the other. Among the former there is fear, uncertainty, anxiety for the future, moral and political bankruptcy, despite all of the great power that they still wield. Whereas among the latter there is serene confidence, buoyant optimism, bold prognostication into the future while attending to the pressing needs of the present, boundless faith in the justice of their cause and equal determination to bring it to victory, despite the immensity of the tasks confronting them, the great difficulties, the persecutions.

With these ideas, our leader has expressed the innermost feelings of

the growing army of liberation in the United States, as well as his own state of mind. A movement thus inspired cannot be conquered, no matter how hard the enemy strikes. Such a movement is bound to win.

There is no doubt that the imprisonment of Browder was intended as a sharp blow at the Communist Party and as a grim warning to the entire anti-imperialist and anti-war camp in the country. And a blow it certainly is, coming as it does at a time when Comrade Browder's leadership, day by day, is more needed than ever before. The enemy knew what it was doing when it tore him out of our midst. But the enemy is bound for disappointment, nevertheless.

Our Party has already demonstrated its ability to withstand the foul blow of the warmakers; it will indeed grow stronger in the very effort to withstand the blow, supported by ever larger numbers of fighters against war, imperialism and capitalism. And as to the warning intended by the enemy for the broad anti-war camp as a whole, this warning also is having its effect, though not the one sought by the warmakers. It is spurring on the anti-war fighters to greater efforts, to more intensive exertions. It is making them more conscious, more determined, more persistent.

Something else also is beginning to take place. The struggle against the imprisonment of Browder, leader of the Communists and outstanding spokesman of the anti-war movements of the masses, is strengthening the Communist Party's ties with the masses and tends to create new ties and contacts with the masses. Thus the enemy will be achieving the exact opposite of what it was seeking.

For we must remember that one of the main things aimed at by the imperialists and their government since the outbreak of the war was *to isolate* the Communist Party, to separate it from the masses and their progressive movements, and in this way *to behead* the growing struggles of the people against imperialism, war and capitalist reaction. This was the chief purpose of all anti-Communist persecutions since September, 1939 — prior to, during and after the last national elections. And it is still the main purpose of the imperialist warmakers and their reformist flunkeys. Didn't Norman Thomas declare the Supreme Court's decision to be perfectly "legal"?

It would be foolhardy, of course, to overlook the new difficulties which these and similar persecutions are creating for the labor and progressive movements of the country as well as for the Communist Party. It is taking and will take great effort, skill and self-sacrifice to overcome these difficulties. But the point is that they are being overcome; that instead of intimidating the masses, these persecutions are resulting in deeper and wider movements of the people against their exploiters; that instead of isolating the Communists from the masses, the two are coming closer and ever closer together.

This should be remembered not in any spirit of self-satisfaction or

complacency. No; that would be a fatal thing to do. The tasks to be accomplished are too immense and the difficulties to be overcome are too great to allow of any complacency. But we can proceed in the serene confidence that by following our main line of struggle for the anti-imperialist people's peace front headed by labor, by going deeper and ever deeper into the masses of the people with our message and daily work, by building the Party and cementing its unity, we shall successfully withstand all the attacks of the enemy, and in the front ranks of the American working class heading the American people—we shall march to victory.

This is the meaning of Browder's work, of his leadership, of his own message to our Party and to the people.

In the first world imperialist war he was jailed for opposing the imperialists, taking his place, as a younger man, with Debs, Ruthenberg and Haywood. He is now being jailed again, and for the same "crime" against the ruling class, but as the head of a party that stands for the future and for victory, vanguard of a working class that is advancing to influence and leadership in the nation.

The National Committee of the Party has already made the necessary organizational provisions called for by the temporary absence of Comrade Browder from the daily operative leadership. It has elected Comrade Robert Minor as Acting Secretary, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to be a member of the Political Committee. These decisions have already received the approval and endorsement of the Party organizations, which know and appreciate the great abilities, courage and devotion of Comrades Minor and Flynn, as well as their popularity among wide masses of the people earned by long years of brilliant service in the cause of the American working class.

In the spirit of greater and more organic collectivity in all Party organizations and its leading committees, further educating and training our leading personnel in the Stalin art of leadership, developing to the utmost everyone's special aptitudes and abilities, we will aim to make good Comrade Browder's temporary absence, more determined than ever to carry forward the struggle against the war offensive of the imperialists, for the protection and defense of the masses of the people, for the freedom of our beloved leader and General Secretary, Earl Browder.

ON HOW TO GET ALONG WITHOUT CAPITALISTS

ONCE more the world has been given tangible proof "that the people can get along without exploiters perfectly well"; that the working class "is quite capable not only of destroying the old system but of building a new and better system, a socialist system, a system, moreover, to which crises and unemployment are unknown"; that the peasantry, led by the working class, can successfully take the path to

socialism. (Josph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union, Report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, March 10, 1939, International Publishers, New York.) These great truths were confirmed again by the deliberations and decisions of the 18th Conference of the Bolshevik Party, held in the second half of February, in Moscow.

And this is precisely what the bourgeoisie and its reformist flunkeys dislike most intensely. For supposing this truth becomes the property of the majority of the working class and its allies among the working farmers and city middle classes, how much longer would the bourgeoisie continue to exploit and oppress the masses of the people? Not very much longer, it must be assumed. And here will be found the reason for the peculiar reaction of the capitalist press to the 18th Conference of the Bolshevik Party. This press had to do all in its power to obscure or distort the new evidence coming from the Soviet Union that the people can get along very well without capitalists, that without them the people can manage their affairs much better.

In his report to the 18th Conference, Comrade Voznesensky drew a comparison of the *dynamics of production* in the last three years, between the United States and the Soviet Union. Taking the level of production in the year 1929 as 100, he showed that in the United States it dropped to 80 in 1938, rose to 98 in 1939, and rose again to 111 in 1940. Whereas in the Soviet Union it rose to 415 in 1938, rose again to 482 in 1939 and reached 534 in 1940.

In these figures, three things deserve special attention. First, in the capitalist economy of the United States, the dynamics of production are unsteady and discontinued, showing first a decline, and then a rise; in the socialist economy of the Soviet Union, the course is steady and continuous increase. Second, the *rate* of yearly increase in the United States is much smaller than in the Soviet Union, being 18 and 13 points respectively for the years 1938-39 and 1939-40 in the United States as compared with 67 and 52 points of yearly increase for the Soviet Union. Third, the *absolute* growth of production in the United States between 1929 and 1940 was a little over one-tenth (11 per cent), whereas in the Soviet Union it was over fivefold, five and one-third times (534 per cent).

What is the explanation? Comrade Voznesensky gives it in the following words:

"The national economy of the U.S.S.R. is developing planfully, according to the laws of extended socialist reproduction, which means above all a steady growth in production in all branches of national economy."

Exactly. *A steady growth*, according to the laws of extended *socialist* reproduction; in contrast to the laws of extended *capitalist* reproduction which, by reproducing on a wider scale all its contradictions (exploitation of the masses and planlessness of production), leads to crises, un-

employment, imperialist war, waste and destruction. According to the estimate of Mr. Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, the economic crises and depressions between 1930 and 1938 resulted in the United States in a loss in national income amounting to $230,000,000,000.

Extended socialist reproduction also means "the steady growth of socialist accumulation, something seen above all in the level of capital investment," the latter amounting in 1940 to almost 38,000,000,000 rubles. Compare this with the capitalist economy of the United States, and what do you find?

First, it shows no steady growth of capitalist accumulation, but ups and downs like the graphs on a fever chart. Secondly, increasing accumulation does *not* necessarily result in increasing capital investment. Hence, the basic problem of "idle capital," capital which refuses to be reinvested in production because it is not "profitable" to do so, even though the majority of the people cry out in anguish for food, for clothing, for shelter. But in the socialist economy of the Soviet Union increasing accumulation results directly and inevitably in increasing capital investments, meaning more factories, more machines, *more production for the people's needs.*

Thirdly, increasing accumulation in the capitalist economy of the United States, resulting from robbery of the masses and leading to a weakening of their purchasing power, itself becomes a powerful factor for deepening the crisis of capitalism, sharpening imperialist rivalries for world markets and colonies, eventually producing wars for the redivision of the world, such as is now taking place, with the participation of American imperialism. But in the socialist economy of the Soviet Union, increasing accumulation means increasing opportunities for satisfying the needs of the people, greater technological independence from the capitalist world, more strength to protect the socialist achievements in hostile capitalist surroundings, and to enforce the socialist foreign policy of peace and neutrality.

That is why extended socialist reproduction, as pointed out by Voznesensky, means also "the steady growth of the material well-being of the working people, the growth of their consumption." His report shows that in three years of the Third Five-Year Plan, national income increased by 29,500,000,000 rubles, that the payroll in the national economy increased 50 per cent, that the income of the collective farmers increased over 4,000,000,000 rubles, that retail trade in state and cooperative agencies increased nearly 50,000,000,000 rubles.

And what has the capitalist economy of the United States to show in this respect? According to the figures of the Social Security Board, of the 31,000,000 workers covered by the Old Age Insurance program in 1938, a quarter of them had an annual income of less than $200, over one-half received less than $800, and 80 per cent received less than $1,400 during the year. And in general: labor's share in the

national income is *decreasing* and so is the farmer's share. According to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, the farmer's share in the national income decreased from 16.6 per cent in the five years preceding the first world imperialist war to 9.1 per cent in 1939.

Yes, the bourgeois press says; but what about the critical report of Malenkov, with all the shortcomings and weaknesses it brought forth? Yes, what about it? He called upon Soviet industry to do better and bigger things. He said:

"We cannot tolerate an attitude of complacency and satisfaction with what has been achieved to flourish anywhere in the country. Such an attitude tends to make executives non-exacting and blind to shortcomings. Such an attitude is unworthy of Bolsheviks."

He called upon the Communist Party organizations, which hitherto gave their main energies to agriculture, and with great success, to turn their attention to industry and transport, "and equally to devote themselves to both industry and agriculture." To which every informed American worker will say: splendid; this is how our Soviet brothers will be getting ready to outstrip the chief capitalist countries in per capita production, thus solving their main economic task; this is how the Soviet Union will equip its national economy with all the advanced technique and material reserves for the defense of the socialist country in the face of the spreading imperialist war.

The meaning of self-criticism as the highest sign of genuine democracy and as a powerful weapon for educating the millions to true self-government and socialist construction, this apparently will forever remain a mystery for the apologists of capitalism. How could *they* understand it? But for the masses it can be made crystal clear, as is done, for example, in the "conclusions" of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* It says:

"The history of the Party further teaches us that a party cannot perform its role as leader of the working class if, carried away by success, it begins to grow conceited, ceases to observe the defects in its work, and fears to acknowledge its mistakes and frankly and honestly to correct them in good time.

"A party is invincible if it does not fear criticism and self-criticism, if it does not gloss over the mistakes and defects in its work, if it teaches and educates its cadres by drawing the lessons from the mistakes in Party work, and if it knows how to correct its mistakes in time." (Page 361.)

It was by following the leadership of this kind of a Party that the working class of Russia abolished capitalism, establishing a better system, a system which runs without capitalists. And when a bourgeois scribe in the *New York Herald Tribune* tells us that good labor discipline can be had "only in private enterprise by appealing to the ambitions and the ability of the individual," the answer is twofold. In terms of growth of industrial pro-

duction between 1913 (taken as 100) and 1938, the index in the United States in the latter year stood at 120 while in the Soviet Union it reached the astounding figure of 908.8.

And in terms of appeal to the "ambitions and ability" of the individual worker, where is there a more powerful appeal than the socialist principle and reality of "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work"? Where in the capitalist world are there such wide and practically limitless opportunities, created and guaranteed by the socialist state, for the economic and cultural advancement of every individual citizen? Nowhere. This is the case—thus far—only in the socialist Soviet Union; and the growth of Stakhanovism among the masses in the Soviet Union, the growth of high standard production in quality and quantity, is only the most dramatic expression of the appealing power of socialism to the individual worker.

Capitalist industry increases output per man-hour *largely*, though not exclusively, by speed-up. Then what happens? In the case of piece work, increased earnings of the workers resulting from increased individual output are always in danger of being vitiated *by cuts in piece rates,* something which is a common occurrence in many industries. And where the workers are paid by the hour or week, they have to wage bitter struggles to secure even a tiny share of their increased output. This is how capitalists reward the "ambitions and abilities" of the individual worker. And what about the millions of unemployed? To what particular ambitions and abilities does capitalism appeal among *them*?

But in the socialist Soviet Union every ability has its opportunity and reward. Everything is being done to discover abilities, to encourage them, to train and develop them to ever higher levels. And why so? Because it is good for socialism; because it advances the well-being of society as a whole; because production is carried on, not for profit to capitalists, but for use of the people.

And so we learn once more that the people can get along very nicely without capitalists and that the working class, having acquired the power of state and governing in alliance with all working people, can build a better system, the socialist system.

WE ARE SAILING INTO THE FACE OF GREAT STORMS

BY EARL BROWDER

(An address delivered at the Madison Square Garden mass meeting, on March 17th, honoring William Z. Foster, National Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday.)

BILL FOSTER'S birthday furnishes a convenient occasion for looking back over the past, for estimating the present historical moment, and for expressing our appreciation of the role of Foster, whose name is permanently written into the history of our times.

The most far-reaching and significant development in American life in the period reaching from the First World War down to today, when the United States has entered the Second World War, is the emergence of the *organized labor movement* as a mass phenomenon, as a decisive force in the life of the nation. The growth in *volume* of trade union membership, to its present figure of nine to ten millions, registers an advance in *quality* which marks the emergence of the working class as a conscious participant on the stage of history, a fundamental change in the relationship of classes.

The qualitative advance of organized labor is registered by its penetration and conquest of organizational strongholds in the basic and mass production industries, the citadels of monopoly capital, and by its emergence on the *political field* with its first steps as an *independent force,* divorced from the tutelage and domination of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

It was the pioneering work of Bill Foster and his associates which laid the first indestructible foundations for these historic achievements. It was Foster's leadership in organizing the packinghouse workers in 1917-18, and the steel workers in 1919-20, which broke through the "open-shop" barriers so laboriously erected around the mass production industries by the combined forces of Wall Street and the Gompers labor bureaucracy, and thereby established the guarantee, despite all temporary defeats, for the ultimate victory of industrial unionism.

These achievements furnished the driving force for the first modern efforts for establishing a labor party as the expression of the political independence of the working class, the movement of 1920-24, in which again Foster played a central and indispensable role. The wrecking of that movement by the combined forces of the Gompers bureaucracy, the Social-Democratic leadership and the disorientated petty bourgeoisie furnished the lessons which enabled Foster to bring about the merger of the militant trade unionist circles with the revolutionary Socialist and Communist movements, which laid the foundations for the Communist Party of the United States and its development in life as the vanguard party of the working class, as the indispensable instrument of the masses for achieving their political independence.

Thus, it was no accidental decision when, upon the definite unification and constitution of our Communist Party upon a Bolshevik basis, from the year 1930, that Foster was our national chairman. Nor was it an accident that the ruling class took the occasion of the great mass movement of the unemployed of 1930, organized and led by our Party, to deal out a vicious prison sentence against Foster, along with Minor, Amter and others, as its response to the great step forward being made by the Communist Party. But the persecutions of the Communist Party at that time only drove our roots deeper among the masses, and steeled our membership for the greater tasks ahead.

But we have not the time tonight for an exhaustive review of the past, valuable and interesting as that would be. I cannot, however, on this occasion refrain from a few personal reminiscences and observations of my association with Foster.

* * *

My first meeting with Foster, in the winter of 1912-13, was the direct result of our common activity in the American Federation of Labor, and of Foster's first efforts to establish national contacts and a center for such work. Soon after, in the summer of 1913, on Foster's proposal, I organized a meeting in Kansas City for Tom Mann, then visiting this country from England. In the same year, I first met Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. All three of these contacts were of greatest significance to me, and established political relationships as well as personal friendships which were never broken. But it was my association with Foster which had the greatest importance and continuity; he became my teacher and guide in the broad and complex field of trade unionism, over many years, without which I would surely not have found my way except at the cost of much loss of time, and which gave me indispensable contributions to equip myself for the later tasks that fell to me. How many thousands of young men and women in the United States have the same testimony to offer of the indispensable help and guidance they have received from Bill Foster!

One of Foster's outstanding char-

acteristics, from the days of my first contacts with him, was his keen sense of *proletarian internationalism.* I remember a visit he made to me in the first winter of the World War, in the course of which he received letters from active trade union leaders in several of the warring countries, part of a constant correspondence he had maintained ever since his extended visit to Europe in 1911, and how he discussed the problems of the working class in other lands with the same familiarity as those of our own country. Six years later I attended my first international labor congress along with Foster.

Perhaps it is a signal of my own advancing years that these old memories begin to have a special attraction and interest. But I like to think they also have a value for the younger generation, giving them a keener sense of values whereby to weigh their own experiences, and sift the more permanent from the transitory and unimportant. The great traditions of our movement have their roots in millions of such memories, and in the stormy days ahead we shall need to draw heavily upon our great traditions, and hold up the best examples of strength of character for the emulation of our younger generation.

* * *

Yes, we are sailing into the face of great storms, and the world which will emerge will be radically different from the present one. The old world is gone beyond recall, and the new world will be built by those who have the deepest understanding and the strongest character.

Roosevelt has committed the United States to "total" involvement in the war for the redivision of the earth among the imperialists. Our country will also receive the "total" consequences. Let there be no illusions on this score. And there are still illusions which must be dispelled.

The great illusion, now being elaborately built up by Roosevelt, and by his ideologists and scribblers, such as Walter Lippmann, Dorothy Thompson, Henry Luce and Virgil Jordan—all the troubadours of the "great and glorious new American Empire"—is the illusion that American dollars, piled billions upon billions, will pave a broad and comfortable avenue to the "Americanization of the world." It is the illusion that Wall Street's dollars can and will purchase a world empire, as they purchase statesmen and political parties and industrial plants—and "great ideas" *a la* Lippmann, Thompson and Luce. It is a pitiful illusion, reflecting the profound ignorance and intellectual bankruptcy of the American bourgeoisie. It has the brilliant hues of a rotting fish, and is equally full of poison.

It is amusing and instructive to watch how the hard-boiled and experienced British imperialists inflame the ambitions and egotism of their more naive American cousins, and cultivate the illusion that the Americans are "buying" a senior partnership, a commanding position, in the "new Anglo-American

Empire." Far from resenting the high-and-mighty attitude of "mastery" which Wall Street's scribblers —and Roosevelt—take toward them, the rulers of Britain welcome, encourage and stimulate it.

This illusion is priceless for the British imperialists. It has given them "total" command of all American resources, including manpower whenever they demand it, and it costs them very little. For Churchill, "Holyfox," Bevin & Co. have a little secret among themselves; they know that the American bourgeoisie has entered the game too late and ill-prepared morally and politically to become in reality the "masters," that the real trend toward "American mastery" over Britain, represented by Lindbergh and Hoover, has been decisively put into the background for this most crucial period in which real power is being redistributed. American money is "buying an empire" much as the traditional yokel on his first visit to New York buys the Brooklyn Bridge. But the American people will pay the bill, just the same, plus millions of lives and their democratic achievements. The mirage of "Empire" is a costly one, and the people must pay the total cost.

In taking their ideas and inspiration from the British rulers, Roosevelt and his associates have taken over an illusion which their British cousins fully share with them. That is the illusion that they are going to find a way out of the war *at the expense of the Soviet Union.* It is the old idea that led to Munich in 1938, that has led to so many disasters since then. The original anti-Soviet scheme of Chamberlain has more lives than the traditional cat. It refused to stay drowned after Munich, and as a consequence Europe was plunged into war. It dramatically stalked back upon the stage with the Mannerheim adventure, and Britain, France and the United States promptly forgot their war with Germany, to whoop it up for Mannerheim and strip themselves of arms and men on his behalf, still under the illusion that they could "swap the wrong war for the right one." They paid for that by losing all of Western Europe. Now the old cat is stalking through the Balkans and the Near East, and is leaving similar disaster in that region.

And, incredible as it seems, Roosevelt's central strategic conception was and remains essentially the same as that which led Chamberlain to Munich—namely, that the chief aim of the war is to force Hitler to march against the Soviet Union, with the threat of sustained war if he does not, and the promise of help and amnesty if he does. That idea remains the key, without which it is impossible to unlock the riddle of London's and Washington's policies. It is the same old will-o'-the-wisp, and America's rulers are following it as blindly as did the French and British before them. It is a policy of catastrophe.

This is the great illusion. It is the too-clever scheme which comes to wreck upon the rock of a simple fact. That fact is that Hitler and the German High Command know it is less costly for them to fight

all the rest of the world put together than to fight the Soviet Union. And not all Roosevelt's billions can change that hard fact, disagreeable as it may be for the bourgeoisie of all lands.

The truth of the matter is that the dream of American world empire came upon the scene of history too late for its realization. Monopoly capitalism is strangling in its own contradictions even while it inflicts misery and death upon millions of people. The revolutionary working class has accumulated too much understanding and wisdom to be much longer used as cannon fodder for imperialist wars. The colonial and semi-colonial peoples are awakening and organizing too quickly for them to be reliable pawns any longer in the game of imperialist world politics. The great and ever more powerful land of socialism is too bright a beacon showing the oppressed and lowly of the world how they can take control of their own destinies. And in every important country there are Communist Parties, steeled in the struggle and in the scientific teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. No, today there is no future for "dreams of empire"; they are all idle illusions, even when backed by all the billions of Wall Street.

* * *

Perhaps the greatest illusion of all among the bourgeoisie is the idea that they can conjure away the coming revolution by oaths and incantations, by witch-hunts and forced recantations, by reviving the spirit of the Inquisition. We see this expressed in all its hideous obscenity in New York universities and colleges today, in connection with the infamous Rapp-Coudert investigation of "subversive influences." What a revelation of the intellectual vacuum that dominates the ruling class! What a revelation of the reactionary obscurantism, surpassing the middle ages, that rules America through the bourgeoisie! Into what an abyss of fear and hysteria have the rulers of America fallen! Never was the old Greek adage more fitting: "Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad."

But throughout the world, in every land, there are people who are immune from this fear and hysteria, who have shed all illusions, who are organizing the masses to achieve a new and better world. In the vanguard of such people are the Communists. In honoring Comrade Foster tonight on his sixtieth birthday, as the Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, we are also honoring the great leaders of Communism throughout the world, who represent the Communist Parties that will rescue the world from imperialist war and oppression.

Let us recall the names of a few of them. There are our close neighbors, Tim Buck of Canada, Dionisio Encina of Mexico, Blas Roca of Cuba. There is Carlos Contreras Labarca, who led the Chilean Popular Front to its new victories. There is the great giant of the German proletariat, who will observe his fifty-sixth birthday next month while beginning his ninth year in

a Nazi prison—Ernst Thaelmann. There is Thorez in France, and Gallacher in England. There is the glorious leadership of the Spanish people, José Diaz and Dolores Ibarruri. There is that magnificent group of men who galvanized the great body of China into life, Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh, Wang Min, Chou En-lai, Yeh Ting. There is the mighty Bulgarian who, single handed and in chains, met and defeated the Nazi machine in the courts of Leipzig, Georgi Dimitroff. There are the surging battalions of the land of socialism, and the great Stalin. There are the spirits of Marx, Engels and Lenin, who live and grow more powerful in their disciples.

With such men and women, and the millions who are molding themselves upon these models, we march forward into the coming battles with calm confidence in victory, with deep enthusiasm for the new world which will flower out of that victory.

JAMES B. McNAMARA

THE death of James B. McNamara in San Quentin penitentiary on March 8, after thirty years of imprisonment, brought sadness to the hearts of all real fighters in the class struggle. Here indeed was a true son of the American working class, one of the big figures of our times. McNamara's name stands high on the glorious roster of labor's heroes and martyrs, together with such unforgettable fighters as Parsons, Mooney, Little, Joe Hill and Vanzetti.

McNamara typified in the highest sense the bold fighting courage of the working class. In his years of labor activity before his arrest he bravely carried his life in his hand, with never a thought of his own personal safety or welfare. And thirty long years of especially harsh imprisonment, although it broke his body, had no effect upon his resolute fighting spirit, except to refine and toughen it. He was loved by his fellow prisoners. Tom Mooney, who served many years in prison with McNamara, pays glowing tribute to his upright and indomitable nature. Never once did he ask for a parole or a pardon. Throughout his life of danger and hardship McNamara held his head boldly erect like the solid proletarian oak that he was.

McNamara was filled with a sublime confidence in the revolutionary role of the working class. His faith in the workers was so tremendous and unfailing that all those who had the honor to know him, either in person or through his inspiring correspondence, were literally overwhelmed by it. McNamara, the victim of a frame-up plea, was long misunderstood and neglected by the labor movement. He was shamefully abandoned by the official leaders of the trade unions for which he had sacrificed his life, and the Socialist Party bureaucrats turned their backs upon him.

But all this did not trouble the iron heart of McNamara. Throughout the long years of his imprisonment he closely watched and studied the class struggle and his understanding of the workers grew. He was an inveterate enemy of the reactionary trade union leaders. His early militant trade unionism ripened into revolutionary class consciousness. McNamara hailed with joy the birth and progress of the Soviet Union and he sympathetically applauded the fight of the revolutionary workers all over the world.

McNamara's bold fighting spirit and undying belief in the working class inevitably brought him into the ranks of the Communist fighters for socialism.

J. B. McNamara is dead, but his fighting proletarian spirit is immortal. His life, bold, unafraid and devoted, will be an inspiration to the proletarian youth in the great and decisive class struggles now looming ahead. The working class of America will never forget this resolute and faithful champion of its cause.

—WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

HOW THE BRITISH EMPIRE IS CONJURED AWAY

BY GIL GREEN

WHEN A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, compared "the theory of empire of nineteenth-century Britain" with "the later British thought which gradually transformed the empire into a commonwealth of nations,"* he was only giving expression to the current attempt of the imperialist apologists to "prove" that the British Empire is no longer an empire. Why has this become necessary? First, because the word "empire" has lost most of its former glamour. Secondly, because Berle, writing of Latin America, realizes full well that the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of the world have cultivated a distaste for anything even remotely related to imperialism and empire.

Yet in the early years of this century the opposite was true. Paeans of praise were sung to the glory of the empire builders and the new imperialism. Rudyard Kipling, poet laureate of the rising imperialism, emphasized this accent on empire and put into rhyme the self-confidence and optimism which pervaded the bourgeoisie of that day. Of course, the peoples of the colonial countries were not asked to express themselves on this score and had not yet taken that right for themselves.

Imperialism in those days was seen as a higher, more advanced and more progressive stage of capitalism, not its decaying and final stage, as Lenin taught. The very subjugation of the colonial millions was explained by imperialism and endorsed by the opportunists in the Socialist movement as a "civilizing mission."

The Theory of "Ultra-Imperialism"

This worship at the shrine of imperialism found its theoretical expression in the concept of "ultra-imperialism." First developed in 1902 by the British economist Hobson, under the name of "inter-imperialism," this theory was taken over bodily by the Social-Democrat Kautsky and became the opportunist justification for supporting the imperialist war. "Ultra-imperialism," according to these bourgeois economists and pseudo-Marxists, was

* *Survey Graphic*, March, 1941.

the final goal of imperialism, the stage at which the process of trustification would have eliminated all competition, contradictions and conflicts on a world scale, and replaced them with lasting peace and prosperity—with an "organized capitalism."

Under imperialism the trend is toward a single world monopoly that will devour all competitors and all states. Lenin spoke of this as early as 1915, but pointed out that it was only a "direction," not a realizable goal. He proved that monopoly capital had not eliminated either competition or the class struggle but had only raised them to a higher level—a world level. He therefore concluded that "the development in this direction is proceeding under such stress, with such tempo, with such contradictions, conflicts, and convulsions—not only economical, but also political, national, etc., etc.—that before a single world trust will be reached, before the respective national finance capitals will have formed a world union of 'ultra-imperialism,' imperialism will inevitably explode, capitalism will turn into its opposite."

"Ultra-imperialism," as propounded by the opportunists, served the strivings of each major imperialist power for an increasingly larger share of world booty. It helped glorify British colonial policy which, especially after the Boer War, was being questioned by the masses who had lost their sons in African fields and were paying for the war in increased taxation. German imperialism, entering late into the scramble for world empire and world power, likewise found this theory a useful one. On the basis of this theory it therefore became possible for Social-Democracy, which, based on the bribed labor aristocracy, had become soft and corrupted during the period of the so-called peaceful development of capitalism (1871-1914), conveniently to support its *own* bourgeoisie in each imperialist country.

If prior to and during the first World War it was necessary to supply a theory to "prove" the civilizing and progressive mission of imperialism and empire, this is not quite the case today. True, the Axis partners, *i.e.*, the erstwhile "have-not" imperialist powers, have succeeded in hypnotizing large sections of their populations with the mirage of empire as the cure-all for their economic ills. But the British Empire, which is the world's greatest, and America, which is the richest and most powerful capitalist power, cannot so easily do this.

It is true that the more frank and open spokesmen of finance-capital, like Jordan and Luce, and like Lindbergh and Dennis, do not hesitate to praise anew the virtues of imperialism and empire, and that such voices are becoming more numerous and more vocal. Yet the main task of the imperialist apologists is to win over the laboring masses, who cannot today be so easily enamored of the glory of empire, to the support of their own imperialists.

How strongly anti-imperialist—in most cases unconsciously so—the sentiments of the people are, can be judged by the frantic endeavor of

the Social-Democrats and bourgeois liberals to disown (in words) everything pertaining to imperialism. According to one of this tribe, "If Hitler wins he will attempt to establish one master race in a world of subject races," but "if the English-speaking countries win, the results will not be imperialism; and in the nature of things, they cannot be." For the war, says he, "is a struggle between world slavery and world cooperation: nothing less." *

Turning the Lion into a Lamb

To hoodwink the people into believing this lie is not a simple matter; it taxes the ingenuity of these apologists to the utmost. How to convince the masses that the world's greatest empire, the power which enslaves 450,000,000 souls, is fighting a war against empire—that is their problem.

This paradoxical situation provides the background and inspiration for the new theories that have cropped up aiming to prove that the carnivorous British lion is but a gentle vegetarian lamb. These theories have many variations, but they can be classified under two main heads: (1) those that aim to prove with Berle that the British Empire is no longer an empire but a democratic commonwealth of nations; (2) those that accept the empire as a reality but view British imperialism as less virile and therefore less dangerous than Nazi imperialism.

The first variation is the more prevalent and is propagated by the liberals of the *Nation* and *New Republic* variety as well as by the Social-Democrats of the *New Leader* stripe and the Hillman-Dubinsky type. Among its most consistent and most typical exponents are such bourgeois liberals as Lewis Mumford, currently a feature writer in the Social-Democratic press; and Sir Norman Angell, who wrote a book elaborating this theory of "de-imperialization."*

The main arguments put forth to prove this theory are: (1) Britain cannot be considered an imperialist power because she has given Dominion status to some of her possessions; (2) other possessions, such as India, are now "ripe" for self-rule, and Britain is preparing to grant it to them; (3) imperialism has brought about a rapid industrialization of the colonial countries and has thereby de-colonized them; (4) imperialism and empire have proved to be unprofitable, and British imperialism is only too glad to give up the "White Man's Burden"; (5) the insatiable appetite of German imperialism for world empire can therefore be explained only by its racial theory, its desire "to lord it over" all mankind.

This thesis is set forth by its outstanding proponent, Sir Norman Angell, as follows:

"There has gone on for three-quarters of a century a really amazing process of de-imperialization. Britain has done her best to unconquer conquests; dis-annex her

* Lewis Mumford, *New Leader*, March 15, 1941.

* *America's Dilemma: Alone or Allied?* Harper & Bros., New York, 226 pp., $1.75.

annexations; turn what originally was an empire into a group of sovereign and independent nations." (p. 151.)*

If Britain has been unconquering conquests, how would Angell explain away the fact that from 1880 to 1932 the colonial possessions of Great Britain increased from 7,700,000 to 13,500,000 square miles, and from 267,900,000 to 466,500,000 inhabitants?** He could only explain it by rewriting British history to read somewhat as follows: The Boer War? Nothing but a peaceful step to unconquer conquests! Easter Sunday, 1916? Nothing but a British pilgrimage to Ireland to kiss the blarney stone! India? Ireland? Gibraltar? Malta? Ceylon? Malay? Singapore? Borneo? Palestine? Sudan? Uganda? Tanganyika? Rhodesia? South West Africa? Nigeria? Guiana? Egypt? Iraq? An empire? Not at all! Only "sovereign and independent nations," part of one big happy family!

No thinking being can fall prey to this myth. Hence it is no wonder that Angell repeatedly laments that "the world simply does not *know* . . . or does not believe it to be a reality." (p. 152.)

Rejecting Sir Norman's unhistorical "history," we must now examine his "proof" of this "de-imperialization" process. First, as to the contention that Britain has granted Dominion status and a degree of independence to a number of colonies. Berating the Marxists for their "economic interpretation of imperialism," Sir Norman sums up this point:

"Much attention has been directed to exposing the capitalist roots of imperialism. Very little attempt seems to have been made to explain, in terms of economic motive, the capitalist retirement from imperialism, the process by which vast territories like Australia, New Zealand, Canada, . . . have ceased to be in matters of economic imperialist territory, and have become or are about to become economically independent states." (pp. 157-8.)

To treat imperialism in this fashion is to put it in the category of a piece of wearing apparel which can be discarded according to whim. It is to ignore the fact that imperialism is the final stage of capitalist development, that stage in which the rule of monopoly and finance-capital has been established; in which the export of capital has acquired a new and added significance; in which the division of the markets of the world among the powerful cartels and trusts has in the main taken place; and in which all the territories of the earth have already been divided among the most powerful capitalist states.

Capitalism can therefore retire from imperialism no more than a man from his old age!

In the second place, both Angell and Mumford make the fatal error of confining the definition of imperialism to that of "colonial policy" or colonial possessions. Imperialism is that, but *more* than that. It dom-

---

* All citations from Angell, unless otherwise specified, are from his *America's Dilemma: Alone or Allied?*

** Varga and Mendelsohn, *New Data on Lenin's Imperialism*, International Publishers, pp. 172-173.

inates *every* phase of economic and political development of the modern capitalist world. A state may be nominally independent and yet economically and politically subordinated to one or another imperialist power. In fact, every small or weak state today, even if enjoying complete political independence, is subordinated in one degree or another to a larger imperialist power. Thus, even a power with no direct colonial possessions, or with few such possessions, like the United States today, can be a mighty imperialist power maintaining economic and political sway over huge areas of the earth and many peoples. If, therefore, all the smaller nations are under the imperialist influence of one or another of the large powers, for example, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, etc., this is even more true of the Dominions and possessions of the British Empire.

What is true, however, is that every imperialist state strives to establish its *monopoly* over markets, spheres of influence, and sources of raw materials, and that such monopolies can only be completely established and maintained by obtaining outright colonial possessions. Hence, if our apologists can prove that colonial possessions are being voluntarily given up, they have scored a not unimportant point—if they can prove.

As to Dominions

In treating of the colonial possessions of the British Empire these gentlemen fail to understand the distinction between colonies and colonies. They lump all colonies together, without regard to historical origin or development. It is therefore not surprising that they but expose their own ignorance of this most complicated of all questions.

To understand this question at all, one must make the distinction between the following types of colonies:

1. Those originally established over vast, sparsely populated areas, which served as colonizing territories for surplus populations, *e.g.*, Canada and Australia. Over a few generations, the transplanted white populations in these colonies reproduced the class structure of the British homeland and nearly exterminated the native population. These colonies in time became Dominions, which means that they became members of the British imperialist system with equal or nearly equal rights to that of the "mother" country.

2. The countries inhabited by large native populations, like India, on the other hand, are exploited as markets, as sources of raw materials and as spheres for the export of capital.

3. Between these two main types there is a third, a transitory type, in which, alongside of a vast native population, there developed a large population of white colonists, as in South Africa, whose bourgeoisie becomes a colonial extension of the bourgeoisie of the metropolis.

4. There is still another type of colony, that which is used mainly as a strategic military outpost and only secondarily as a point of exploitation.

These distinctions are of prime

importance,* but none of these learned scholars has even taken note of them. That is why they see Dominion status springing Minerva-like from the head of Jupiter. The truth is: (1) Dominion status was reserved in the main for the "White Colonies," where home imperialist class relations were reproduced; and (2) it was never *given,* but *forced from* British imperialism upon the threat of separation. In this respect Britain learned a lesson from the successful American Revolution of the 18th century, after which she made concessions and compromises in order to maintain her huge possessions within her own colonial system; (3) it should not be forgotten that these Dominions are still part of the Empire,** with England taking the bulk of their agricultural products, remaining their chief investor and creditor (except for Canada), and integrating their strategic geographic positions and economic strength with its own military might.

What Angell sees as a process of de-imperialization is really signs of the growing cracks and fissures in the structure of world imperialism due to an intensification of all external and internal contradictions. This is particularly true of British imperialism, which, especially since 1914, has been losing her former dominant position in world affairs.

India Spikes Sir Norman's Thesis

Sir Norman blissfully writes that "What is true of the Dominions will be true of India tomorrow." (p. 151.)

But India cannot be compared with the "White Dominions." Canada with a population of some 12,000,000 is not only a child in age compared to India, but has been even a shorter period of time within the Empire. Yet Canada is today an autonomous imperialist state within the British imperialist system, while India with its 370,000,000 people is still a backward colony, struggling for independence. We have already shown that Canada, formerly a huge unpopulated wilderness, was used as a great colonizing region, thereby reproducing on its soil the class relations of imperialist Britain, with a strong bourgeoisie and a rapidly developing heavy industry. In India, however, it was not a matter of a large transplanted population which could reproduce British class relations. Here, British imperial rule was *superimposed* upon Asiatic feudal social relations and culture.

When, therefore, Angell and Mumford speak of British industrialization of India as proof of her growing independence, they have once again missed the mark by a mile. Mumford even adduces the argument that "the spread of the machine technology into the backward areas of the world, though still incomplete, has made the only

---

* For further material on this matter we refer the reader to the resolution on the colonial question adopted at the 7th World Congress of the Communist International in 1935, as well as to Karl Marx, *Selected Works,* International Publishers, Vol. II, p. 665.

** How precarious even this Dominion status can be is evidenced by Newfoundland, which, in 1933, due to "financial difficulties," was "rescued" from Dominion status and taken back as a daughter colony into the tight embrace of her Britannic mother.

possible relation between peoples a reciprocal relation: *the backward area is passing away almost as fast as the American frontier was fifty years ago.*" * (My emphasis—G.G.)

But these gentlemen know not whereof they speak. It is true that vast amounts of British capital have been invested in India, the total investment approximating some one billion pounds or about $5,000,000,000.** These investments, of course, to an extent, were and are being used for certain productive purposes, but the export of capital did not industrialize India—it chained her to her colonial status!

Finance-capital, in exporting capital to the colonies, does so with the objective of imposing its own economic and political domination. A considerable portion of exported capital either flows into the sphere of trade, functions as usurious loan capital, or goes to strengthen the imperialist state apparatus in the colonies.

While a portion of exported capital is invested in productive enterprises and helps develop capitalist economic relations, this does not take place in the direction of promoting economic *independence*, but of imposing economic *dependence* upon finance-capital. This is so because these investments in colonial production are in the main used: (1) for the extraction of raw materials; (2) for the extension of the system of transportation and communication for strategic military reasons or for more rapid movement of commodities and raw materials to and from the imperialist state; (3) for agriculture, to produce industrial crops and in order to obtain a monopoly over sources of raw material; (4) for light manufacture, where this entails a simple process of production and a low organic composition of capital, such as in cotton, sugar and tobacco, or where due to great distances it becomes unprofitable to transport certain raw materials to the imperialist state; (5) for heavy industry, *but only under special conditions*, such as in wartime, when this may be necessary for strategic military reasons or for the needs of a war economy.

Only a few pertinent facts need be cited to prove that what we have just described applies in full force to India: (1) Modern industry has developed so slowly and the decay of the old handicraft industry been so rapid, that the number of Indian industrial workers continues to decrease both absolutely and relatively. (2) The percentage of the Indian population dependent upon industry has decreased from 5.5 per cent in 1911 to 4.3 per cent in 1931!*

Instead of developing India economically and industrially, British rule has kept her in a backward colonial position; as a huge market for British factory-made goods; as

* *New Leader*, March 15, 1941.

** "This total of 1,000 million would represent no less than one-quarter of the estimated total of 4,000 million of British foreign investments throughout the world . . . in 1911 British capital investments in India represented 11 per cent of the total of British capital investments throughout the world. *The advance from one-ninth to one-quarter, from 11 per cent to 25 per cent, is a measure of the increasing importance of India to British finance-capital today.*" R. Palme Dutt, *India Today*, London, 1940, pp. 147-148.

* R. Palme Dutt, *cited work*, p. 186.

an immense agricultural domain; as a hinterland for raw materials; and as a sphere for the profitable export of capital.

These are reasons that India, with immense human and natural resources, is today a country of archaic social relations, of untold poverty and misery.

Is Colonial Rule Profitable?

Nor will British imperialism relinquish its grip upon India, despite all the asinine predictions which the Angells and Mumfords base upon the assumption that colonial rule "is unprofitable." When Angell tells us that it would make no difference whatsoever "if the United States were to annex the whole of the British Empire," (p. 134) and when Mumford says that the British imperialists "have lost some of their appetite for the White Man's Burden," that colonies serve the main purpose of enabling the aristocracy to send "their surplus sons abroad to serve as soldiers, pro-consuls, or administrators,"* these two brilliant analysts simply overwhelm us.

Is colonial rule profitable for finance-capital? Those who say it is not base themselves on some of the difficulties and reverses suffered by imperialism during the decade of 1929-39. It is true that during this period it was unprofitable to export *new* capital to the colonial countries. At the same time the catastrophic drop in world prices resulting from the economic crisis, plus the large number of defaults on loans to governments, reduced the value of imperialist foreign investments considerably. Furthermore, colonial rule has become far more precarious and costly as a result of the growing, awakening mass movements of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Yet it would be foolhardy to draw conclusions such as those of Angell and Mumford. Imperialism bases itself on the most ruthless colonial exploitation. First, it derives super-profits from the sale of its own industrial goods, taking advantage of monopoly prices and the unequal rate of exchange. Secondly, it makes immense profits by obtaining cheaper raw materials for the use of its home industry. Thirdly, it establishes the most inhuman rate of exploitation of colonial labor, and through this means once again extracts super-profits.

How increasingly profitable colonial rule has been to Britain in the most recent period is proved by the example of India which: "in the three-quarters of a century of British rule up to the taking over by the Crown, the total of tribute withdrawn from India had amounted to 150 million [pounds]. In the modern period, during the last two decades, it is estimated that the total *annual* tribute from India to England is in the neighborhood of 135 million to 150 million. This intensified exploitation of India under the conditions of finance-capitalism underlies the present gathering crisis and intensified revolt against imperialism in India." *

But more than that. The world

* *New Leader*, March 15, 1941.

* R. Palme Dutt, *cited work*, p. 149.

position of British finance-capital is entirely dependent upon its empire, for England is only a small highly industrialized island territory, which under modern capitalist relations demands an ever greater *monopoly* over foreign markets, food growing regions and sources of raw materials. The very fact that Britain, in its struggle for world power, is so hard pressed by rival imperialist systems, makes absolutely essential her continued grip upon those colonial regions over which she does today exercise a monopoly, the most important of which is India. But even if British imperialism won the war, and imposed its power over its vanquished imperialist rival, she would then face another powerful antagonist in American imperialism. Hence, for British finance-capital the empire is not a "burden," but a life-and-death necessity.

British rule over India, however, cannot continue in the old way. The tide of the Indian struggle for national liberation mounts higher and higher. The British imperialists must therefore make concessions, hoping that through *minor* reforms "they will still retain in their hands the decisive citadels of power, with a trained subordinate Indian leadership to protect their interests and hold the people in order, while the smooth flow of imperialist tribute from exploitation continues unimpeded." *

Not in the false theory of "de-imperialization," therefore, is to be found the answer to Mother India's prayer, but in the revolutionary and uncompromising struggle of her awakening millions!

* R. Palme Dutt, *cited work*, p. 496.

Shadow and Substance

Nor does Angell make sense when he argues that the capitalists have agreed "peacefully to surrender the substance" of empire as long as they are permitted to retain the symbol, the shadow (p. 161). We are afraid that such explanations answer nothing in this debate, despite Angell's assertion, "It is vanity which makes the world go around" (p. 162).

If the British ruling class has surrendered the "reality of privilege," the "substance," in order merely "to retain the symbol, the shadow," we have seen no visible signs of this magnanimity as yet. Let us look at this "shadow" in terms of long-term foreign investments alone:*

Estimated Long-Term Foreign Investments of the United Kingdom Outside the United States
(Figures in million pounds)

IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Country	*Total*
Canada	481
Australia	503
New Zealand	146
India	550
British Africa	438
Malaya	84
Other	31
Total	2,233

* Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau's Estimate of British long-term foreign investments, *New York Times*, Jan. 16, 1941. If these figures err at all, they err on the conservative side.

IN LATIN AMERICA

Argentina	390
Brazil	160
Chile	105
Uruguay	42
Mexico	173
Peru	28
Cuba	28
Venezuela	20
Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay, Central America	50
International	6
Total	1,002

IN ASIA

China	200
Japan	50
Netherlands East Indies	50
Philippines	8
Total	308

OTHER AREAS

In Europe	250
In other areas	75
Total	325
Total Long-Term Investments Outside U.S.A.— Nominal Value	3,868

Need more be said about the "substance" being surrendered for the "shadow"? A "shadow" upon which the sun never sets!

What is the reason for Angell's performance in shadow-boxing? It is this: if the British Empire is no longer an empire why does not the British ruling class demonstrate this fact to the satisfaction of even the most sceptical by publicly surrendering its colonial possessions to their inhabitants? But such convincing evidence of "de-imperialization" British imperialism will not give and our apologist does not even request. His job is to keep Britain's rulers from being embarrassed, and to keep the masses from putting such embarrassing demands to them. What then is nicer than to picture these rulers as being ready to give up the "reality of privilege" to "retain the symbol"?

As economic and material considerations are relatively unimportant to Sir Norman, what then explains the desire of German imperialism under Nazi leadership to carve out an empire of its own? Angell explains it by "the non-rational or sub-rational in men; the deliberate cultivation of the human tendency to 'think with your blood,' to prefer guns to butter because guns mean powers over other men, power to dominate, to retaliate for real or imagined humiliations, 'to lord it over the earth.'" (pp. 134-5.)

Thus, refusing to admit that this is a war for empire and spoils on both sides, Sir Norman, who attacks the Nazis for their racial theories, proceeds to create one himself. Speaking of the German people, he refers to the "German mind," and says that "harsh discipline has always come natural [!] to Germans." (p. 140.)

What is the purpose of this if not to smear the entire German people with the brush of Nazism? And what will that accomplish, if not to represent the German people as dull barbarians, who like to be oppressed, and who therefore are an inferior species, especially in comparison with the English speaking "democratic" man? (!)

With great indignation, Sir Norman says: "It is a punishable offense for German settlers in Poland using

Polish laborers," "to sit at table with the Poles or treat them as equals." (p. 139.) And he asks: "If that is the German attitude to Poles, what is it likely to be to the inhabitants of India, or of Africa?" (p. 139.)

Yes, it is a dastardly thing, an unmitigated act of barbarism. But, first of all, why turn it into a racial characteristic of the German people? Secondly, why do you, Sir Norman, take for granted that colonials would be treated worse (if that were possible) than conquered Europeans? Is it not because you yourself think in terms of white supremacy—the right of imperialist powers to subjugate the colored races?

That is why you become incensed at this outrageous treatment of a European white nation, but say not a word about the caste system promoted by British imperialism in India, about the bloody tradition of Amritsar, about the treatment of Natives in South Africa, or about the lot of the Negro people in the United States. Is not the lynching of Negroes in the Southern States of this country even more reprehensible? Are not Negroes forbidden from eating in the same restaurants, riding in the same cars and living in the same neighborhoods as white people in hundreds of communities of America? Have you forgotten the signs which read, "Chinese and Dogs Not Allowed!" that British consulates kept over their parks in China's cities but a few years back? Wax indignant over these outrages as well, and more than that, do something about them, and then you will have the moral right to separate yourself from the barbarism of the Nazis! Until such time we can only make the following distinction between you and them: they are crude and vulgar in their theories of "superiority"; you, as is befitting an English gentleman, wear over your brutish vulgarity the raiment of finesse.

If today Angell resorts to his own racial explanation for Germany's quest for empire, this was not always the case. In 1921, his work, *The Fruits of Victory*, refuted this very thesis, saying that "Germany's aggression was not due to inherent wickedness, but that any nation [he should have said: capitalist nation] placed in her position would behave in just the same way." (p. 330.)

It seems that the Sir Norman Angell of 1941 could certainly learn something from the untitled Norman Angell of 1921.

Why was Mr. Angell's position—at least in the above-cited statement—closer to the truth in 1921? Because international relations are not determined by "good" and "bad" people but by production relationships, by economic and military strength. But this the Norman Angell of 1941 refuses to admit. His solution for the ills of the world is simple enough. It is his old standby, "Federalism," resuscitated from the days of World War I. He says that "what has made peace possible between the States of the Union is not something economic, the abolition of capitalism, but something political, the introduction of Federalism." (pp. 183-4.)

In 1915, expressing the same thought, he said: "America is no more a 'rival' dangerous or otherwise to Great Britain or Germany, than Virginia is a rival of Missouri." (!) If this were only true, it would be good indeed, but it is not true, and because it is a deception, it is dangerous and must be fought.

Is "Federal Union" the Way Out?

Here, too, the error of Norman Angell stems from his refusal to understand (or admit) the true nature of the imperialist world. In drawing the comparison between the United States and a theoretical European or World Union, he forgets a few rather elementary considerations: (1) The United States is an integrated nation, Federal union having taken place in the formative and ascendant stages of capitalism, before separate nations evolved with their own economic, social and cultural ties and their own ruling classes. (2) If it is "Federalism that made peace possible" all by itself, how does Angell account for the fact that when the interests of the rising industrial class of the North clashed with those of the feudal slavocracy of the South, the conflict was finally resolved by the sword—four years of civil war? (3) In the United States today there is but *one* dominant ruling class, the class of finance-capital, which is complete master in its house of forty-eight states.

How do these facts stack up to those in Europe, or the world? Angell speaks of Federal Union for dozens of different nations not only with separate economic ties, cultures, and traditions, but with separate and conflicting imperialist ruling classes. Would this be Federalism based on the principle of equality? Not at all, and Sir Norman is fully aware of this, for he admits:

"The victors on this occasion will consist of the United States, with Britain dependent upon her, the British dominions and certain states just liberated from Nazi control, dependent in their turn upon Britain, Britain being herself in a position of dependence." (p. 214.)

In the good old tradition, this polished emissary of perfidious Albion is throwing out a bait to the American people who are to be netted into supporting and fighting British imperialism's war, that, with the war ended, Britain will turn herself into a dependency of a victorious Wall Street!

Discounting this obvious bait inserted for Wall Street's benefit, what remains? A new pyramid of oppression with its victors and its vanquished, its overlords and dependents! Europe is not to be simply "liberated," but only "liberated from Nazi control" in order to be placed under British-U.S. control! And this is called "Federalism"!

How does this projected "wave of the future" differ from the Nazi one? Only in respect to which powers are to be the victors and which the vanquished, who are to be "liberated," and who the "liberators."

Sir Norman essentially admits

this: "There can be no such thing as a permanent settlement 'once for all.' For what is just today [just! for whom?] will not be just tomorrow; or someone will not consider it just, . . ." (p. 216.) Why is this so? Because what is "just" and "unjust" under capitalism is determined, not by moral considerations, but by brute strength, by economic, political, and, in the last analysis, military force. Nor does the relative strength of nations remain always the same. It constantly changes. This is an economic law under capitalism, greatly accentuated in its imperialist stage, the law of the uneven development of capitalism. Lenin, in his monumental work *Imperialism,* gave concrete illustrations of this law in operation:

"Half a century ago, Germany was a miserable, insignificant country, as far as its capitalist strength was concerned, compared with the strength of England at that time. Japan was similarly insignificant compared with Russia. Is it 'conceivable' that in ten or twenty years' time the relative strength of the imperialist powers will have remain unchanged? Absolutely inconceivable."

In face of these facts, how can one explain the position of those imperialist apologists that see in British victory a "lesser evil"? It can only be explained as a wily attempt to mislead those masses who know too much of life and history to be taken in by the more blatant school of "de-imperialization."

There is no "lesser evil" in this war because both imperialist camps represent a rotten and decaying social structure. Both camps seek to impose their power and their will upon subject peoples. Both are reactionary to the core, and both must give way to the historic onward sweep of the forces of socialism and world peace.

That British imperialism is slipping from its former position of world dominance, and that the German and American imperialisms wish to occupy that vantage point, do not make the first any the less reactionary. To salve one's conscience by supporting the "less virile" as against the "more virile" imperialist power is only a subterfuge for supporting the imperialist war and the system which inherently breeds conflicts and wars.

There can be no lasting peace in this stage, the imperialist stage, of capitalism. A lasting peace under imperialism is only a theoretical possibility, the mirage of "ultra-imperialism."

The conscious or unconscious goal of every imperialist power is to become the nucleus of that "single world trust" of which Lenin spoke in 1915. This is what the German imperialists mean when they speak of the "New Order." This is what the British and American imperialists mean when they speak of "Federalism" and "Commonwealth."

Like God, who made man in his own image, each imperialism strives to remake the world in its own image. Sir Norman Angell, for example, sees "the transition from imperialism to internationalism" taking place "within the confines of the British Commonwealth." (!) (p. 166.) That is why the apologists

for Anglo-American imperialism can envision the world only in the shape of a "Commonwealth of Nations" modeled after the British Empire, "Federalism" modeled after the United States, or both combined—Clarence Streit's "Union Now."

This is the meaning of the emphasis on "Anglo-Saxon civilization." This is the meaning of the new rights that U.S. imperialism has taken for itself in the Western Hemisphere, rights differing in no essential from those claimed by Germany and Italy in Europe or by Japan in the Far East. This too is the meaning of the thesis produced by Mr. Luce, editor of *Life*, and hailed as a new Declaration of Independence, a thesis which no longer calls for the defense of "Western civilization" or even "Anglo-Saxon civilization," but for good old "American civilization," because the 20th Century is destined to be the first "American Century"!

As Lenin pointed out a quarter of a century ago in his classic article, "The 'United States of Europe' Slogan," Federalism as a *progressive* concept is impossible of realization under capitalism today; it can be realized only as a *reactionary* and counter-revolutionary attempt to band the capitalist world together for a last ditch fight against the revolutionary strivings of the masses and for the destruction of the rising socialist world. This is as true of the "Federal Union" proposed by Angell as of Hitler's "New Order."

These terms are demagogically bandied about by both imperialist camps for an additional reason: they are designed to play on the sentiments of the masses whose perspectives have broadened, who recognize that with the development of world commerce, with the vast centralization of production and distribution on an international scale, with the national economy of every state intertwined with and dependent on world economy—that with these factors obtaining, organization, peace and order must be established on a world scale.

But this cannot be achieved by a decadent capitalist system which is being rent asunder by its own contradictions. This cannot be achieved by an aggressive imperialism, even when masquerading as "de-imperialization." There is but one real alternative to the reactionary strivings of imperialism: the socialist reorganization of society.

Only under the leadership of the proletariat can humanity emancipate itself from recurring imperialist wars; only under socialism can a progressive Federalism become a reality, a Federalism based on the equality of nations and the abolition of exploitation of man by man, a Federalism exemplified in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—harbinger of the World Union of Socialist Republics of tomorrow.

[*This is the first of three articles dealing with the "theory of de-imperialization" now being advanced by pro-imperialist spokesmen in England and in the United States. The concluding articles by Gil Green will appear in the forthcoming issues of* THE COMMUNIST.]

AMERICAN FASCISM SPEAKS OUT

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

IN HIS recent book, *The Dynamics of War and Revolution,* Lawrence Dennis presents the most comprehensive statement, ideologically and programmatically, that has yet been made of the sprouting fascist movement in this country. Coughlin, Long, Pelley, Lindbergh, McWilliams, Smith, Hearst, Pegler, McFadden and many other crude fascist and semi-fascist demagogues have built up a large body of American fascist "theory" and practice; but Mr. Dennis' book represents by far the cleverest and most extended effort in this direction. *The Dynamics of War and Revolution** rounds out many of the conclusions outlined by Dennis in his previous books, *Is Capitalism Doomed?* and *The Coming American Fascism.*

Mr. Dennis, a Harvard graduate, is a native of Georgia, the home of the Ku Klux Klan. He is a World War veteran and he spent a number of years in the United States diplomatic service, in South America. After this he became active in the banking business, setting up many important Wall Street connections. Among his assets Dennis is said to own a 200-acre farm in New England. At present, with an office in New York, he puts in most of his time lecturing, writing books, and editing his *Weekly Foreign News Letter.* The latter publication, price $24 per year, deals with current national and international events. Although Dennis has no organized movement, he has wide contacts among big business and reactionary circles and he is obviously seeking to become the intellectual head of the many spontaneous and confused fascist and semi-fascist tendencies, groups and organizations in the United States. His latest book is intended as a general guide for American fascist development.

I. An Outline of Dennis' Thesis

The main theme of Dennis' book fits in with the general principles of German fascism. There is also a substantial dash of Roosevelt's scarcity policy in it. And many of its major points are in agreement with Social-Democratic concepts.

* *Weekly Foreign Letter,* New York, N. Y. 1940. 289 pp. $3.

The following paragraphs undertake to present only a general outline of Dennis' position. After which, in later sections of this article, a criticism will be made of his theoretical analysis and an estimate will be formulated as to how his (Nazi) program is working out in terms of the world situation.

Dennis begins by completely tying together capitalism and democracy. He asserts that one is impossible without the other. "These are companion terms. They describe two aspects of the same social system," he says (p. xix). What ails capitalism is that its "dynamic," the industrial revolution, is played out. The capitalist-democratic system is no longer expansive and revolutionary. It has fallen into stagnation, manifestations of which are the growth of unemployment, the overdevelopment of industry, the decay of world trade, the rising costs of distribution of industrial products, the decline of the American birth rate, etc. The root of the trouble, he says, is that there is too much democracy; a term which Dennis broadly defines to include competition in industry, international free trade, parliamentarism, and also, by strong inference, trade unionism and mass education.

What is necessary, therefore, says Dennis, is that society must regain its "dynamic." For this a revolution is necessary. The main task is to overcome social stagnation, no matter how. "Actually there is just one thing a revolution has consistently to maintain in order to survive, and that is change. The nature of the change does not matter" (p. 5), "one revolution is as good as another, provided it is revolutionary enough" (p. 6).

It turns out, however, that Dennis' revolution is "Socialist," or national socialist (he uses the term interchangeably), in character. He defines socialism as follows:

"More public ownership in displacement of private ownership, more public control in substitution for private control of industry, trade and agriculture, more progressive taxation aimed at the equalization of fortunes and less individualism, must be all considered socialist trends. Briefly Socialism is a relative and not an absolute term." (P. xxiv.)

Under this all-inclusive definition Dennis lumps together Germany, "Russia" and Italy as socialist countries, with Japan fast becoming so. "Communism, Fascism and Nazism," he says, "are merely different variants of Socialism" (p. xxvi). Roosevelt, he also avers, has driven more nails into the coffin of capitalism than either Hitler or Stalin, and Dennis speaks about "The revolution which has been going on for seven years under the New Deal" (p. 189). According to Dennis, Great Britain is the great world stronghold of capitalism-democracy, an outworn system which it is fighting to preserve in this war; hence, above all, the British Empire must be destroyed.

Dennis' "socialism," he believes, would provide society with the indispensable "dynamic" which it now lacks. This "dynamic" is war, with "pyramid-building" in the intervals between wars. Typically,

fascist Dennis endlessly glorifies war. "Society," he says, "since the beginning of recorded history, has needed war . . . to take it out and keep it out of stagnation" (p. 7). "The probabilities are that war will continue, as in the past, to be a normal and necessary human way" (p. 102), "warfare or conflict is the dynamic principle both of capitalism and socialism" (p. 106). "Capitalist and democratic countries have fought each other in the past, and in all probability, socialistic countries will fight each other in the future" (p. xxvii). Germany, Russia, Italy and Japan are all proceeding on this principle, he says.

"Between wars," says Dennis, "we will have to build pyramids" (p. 222). In "pyramid-building" Dennis includes government construction of parks, housing, roads, health facilities and the like, so familiar to both the Hitler and Roosevelt regimes. Jones Beach in New York, he says, is a perfect example of "pyramid-building." Alternating between wars and "pyramid-building" society will be able to escape stagnation. Sick industries would be subsidized. Thus alone can work be provided for the unemployed. Dennis heaps scorn upon the notion that by rising living standards a lasting stimulus can be given to production. He says (p. 240): "The orthodox assumption of democracy that needs and desires are dynamic is all nonsense." "It is better to mulct the capitalists by losses on foreign loans and periodic domestic crashes than to attempt to mulct them by taxation and artificially maintained wage levels" (p. 80). Dennis also advocates an economy of scarcity, with "incentives for the leaders and compulsions for the led." Scarcity, he says, is indispensable in order to discipline the people and to avoid the otherwise inevitable stagnation that comes from abundance.

Dennis' revolution is in some unexplained manner supposed to be a sort of people's revolution. It is led by a super-class élite, who by demagogy deceive the capitalists, workers and other classes into going along with the revolution. "Capitalism is actually breaking down. Contrary to Marxism, it is not being overthrown by enemies on the outside" (p. 136). "The big point to remember about the new revolution is that it does not have to be sold in advance to the people. They will get it whether they like it or not" (p. 138). "A vital element of the fascist and Nazi way of coming to power was the taking of the businessmen and middle classes into camp without resistance and, even, with enthusiasm on their part for a revolutionary movement which they lacked the social intelligence to understand" (p. xxvii).

Dennis gives the leading revolutionary role to his rather mysterious élite, which, he says, "may be capitalists, politicians, priests and soldiers" (p. 97). He ridicules the theory of classes and class struggle, and he also condemns Marxism generally. Revolutions, he declares, are brought about by élites, not classes. The people are but putty in the hands of these élites. Speaking of the United States, he declares, "If and when a majority of

the élite or ruling minority decide that the time has come for us to go to war, the masses will be made overnight to cry as lustily and innocently for war as a baby cries for milk" (p. ix). "A revolution is essentially a shift in power from an in-élite to an out-élite." "In the Russian revolution it was not the proletariat but the frustrated élite who created the revolution" (p. 187). "The real cause of the American revolution against George III or the later Latin American revolutions against Spain was that the colonial élite resented the favors, jobs and revenues going to the élite of the mother country" (p. 187).

For the United States Dennis foresees a two-sided sort of "socialism." In one sector the economy would be privately owned and in the other publicly owned. Dennis is a bit hazy and contradictory as to just where the dividing line would run between these two sectors; but it appears that the publicly owned sector would deal principally with "the satisfaction individuals will receive from roads, public works, parks and cultural and recreational facilities of every sort provided by the state." The "free" sector, although controlled by the state, would obviously be the major phase and would be owned by private monopolies, for which Dennis has many words of warm defense. Typically, he says, "There never has been and probably never will be a society without subsidies, monopolies and favored classes" (p. 126).

Democracy would play no role in Dennis' "socialist" society. He says (p. 235) "The chief essential for the success of economic planning and social order is the suppression of what we know as democracy or the parliamentary . . . form of government." His élite, or collection of fuehrers, would do all the governing. The state, presumably, would be of the typical corporative character, but Dennis does not enlarge much upon this. He says, however, "I do not believe in democracy or the intelligence of the masses as my critics will generally use these terms." The present period proclaimed is "the twilight of democracy" (p. 125). He says that we have reached the "saturation point" in civil liberties, and that no longer "can one say with plausibility that more democracy is the cure for any major social evil" (p. 124).

Moreover, he says, the problems of the workers—to secure jobs, for instance—do not allow of a democratic solution and the masses know this quite well. Now only the employers, who feel threatened with socialism, are demanding democracy. Dennis informs us that "The cry for civil liberties today is not heard from the underdogs but from the top dogs" (p. 128). "Communists, Fascists and Nazis now leave the term democracy to the capitalist powers" (p. xx). What is necessary is not democracy, but "folk unity"! This would be established by the "party-state" of "Socialism," which is superseding the "nation-state" of capitalism-democracy. "The emphasis," he says, "is shifting away from the winning and assertion of rights to the imposing and fulfillment of duties" (p. 129). "One will hear less about the rights of man

and more about the duties of men and the rights of the American people" (p. 250). Then, typically contradicting himself, Dennis speaks of "the inherent democracy of all (socialist) dictatorships," and argues for totalitarianism on the basis that it is more democratic than the "democracies" themselves.

According to Dennis, the United States is hastening into his "socialist" revolution. Whether we go into the war or not, he says, "we shall have disintegration and revolution." "The quickest and surest route to an American fascism or Nazism is a war to end Nazism in Europe; the next best route, perhaps, is vigilanteism and witch hunts against subversive movements at home" (p. 139). Speaking of the government's Industrial Mobilization Plan, Dennis says gleefully (p. 243): "I cannot possibly be prosecuted, investigated or even criticized for applauding it with all the enthusiasm of one who sincerely hopes for the revolutionary achievement of the new order which this plan and its governmental agents are eminently well suited to initiate under the smoke-screen of a war to preserve the American system and to check the march of dictatorship abroad."

Despite his conviction that American participation in the war would bring national socialism here Dennis, like Lindbergh, Hearst, Hoover, Coughlin and other more or less conscious fascist or semi-fascist elements, nevertheless opposes the United States becoming a belligerent; he prefers to let Hitler himself dispose of the British Empire, while the United States picks up the pieces and establishes fascism here in doing so.

On an international scale Dennis accepts substantially Hitler's scheme of a new World Order. The big nations should gobble up the little ones, and no tears shed for their disappearance. "The new revolution obviously does not mean the end of imperialism, of political and economic concentration of power, of the rule of the weak by the strong, of the absorption of the small by the larger, or the rule of naked power" (p. 149). "To allow the rule of the stronger is a more humane course than to attempt to impose the will of the weaker or to frustrate the stronger" (p. 214). "The revolution, in its very essence, is the erection of socialist imperialism on the ruins of capitalist imperialism" (p. 149).

The British Empire must be destroyed, while Germany, France, "Russia," Italy and Japan should have great empires. The United States, of course, would get a lion's share—the Western Hemisphere, plus what it can grab of the collapsing British Empire. The several "socialist" empires in Dennis' world order would operate upon the balance of power principle, with presumably great wars among them for domination. Dennis applies Hitler's racial theories in the sense that each of the great nations would, by the fact of its strength, represent an intrinsically superior people.

II. Dennis' False Analysis

Dennis' analysis is an amazing

theoretical hash, but very cleverly stated. It is a concoction of half-truths and outright fabrications, a lumping together of opposites, a mess of glittering generalities, an ignoring of inconvenient facts, a mixture of mysticism, metaphysics, cold-blooded cynicism and blatant demagogy. At first glance a Marxist might be inclined to dismiss the whole thing as fantastic and inconsequential, and let it go at that. But we know that Dennis' central fascist ideas represent the basic trend of finance capital and similarly of the policies of the Roosevelt Government. The growth of fascism in many countries, including the lightning-like spread of the Ku Klux Klan and the "share-the-wealth" movement in the United States, has taught us that among confused and desperate people such a program as Dennis presents, despite all its contradictions and superficialities, constitutes a great social danger. Therefore these ideas have to be countered systematically and patiently and theoretically destroyed. In this sense, therefore, I shall single out for consideration some of the more glaring of Dennis' errors in his fascist system.

One: Dennis presents many facts to show the decline of capitalism, but, significantly, he never indicates, however remotely, the basic cause of this decline; namely, the private ownership of the industries and the land and the exploitation of the workers and farmers. He does not analyze the fundamental contradiction that is wrecking the world capitalist system; that is, the profound antagonism between its socialized mode of production and its private ownership of the social means of production and distribution. This it is which at bottom causes the market problems, the overproduction, mass unemployment, political crises and wars, which evidence the breakdown of capitalism. The failure of Dennis to expose the rotten base of capitalism occurs precisely because fascism leaves this base intact.

Fascism maintains the capitalist system in existence, fortifies capitalist ownership of the social means of production, intensifies the exploitation of the toiling masses, and thereby fails to remove the root of the capitalist crisis.

Two: Dennis' presentation of capitalism and democracy as identical, as constituting but two sides of the same thing (a notion shared in practice by Social-Democrats) is also utterly false. There is capitalism without even a trace of democracy, as in Germany, Italy and Japan; and democracy without capitalism, as in the U.S.S.R. At best democracy is very limited in form under capitalism; it reaches its maximum development only under socialism.

Three: Dennis' theory that society can regain its "dynamic," its power of growth, by "any kind of a revolution," is one of his typically fantastic ideas. The economic stagnation of capitalism that Dennis complains of cannot be cured merely by stirring it up. It must be radically removed by changing society at its base, by the abolition of private property in the means of produc-

tion and distribution and the establishment of socialism.

Four: The grouping together of "Russia," Germany, Italy and Japan as socialist, or national-socialist, countries, by Dennis (which is akin to the practice of the Social-Democrats in designating all these as totalitarian countries) is also utterly without foundation. In the Soviet Union the industries and the land are owned by the people and the government is in the hands of the workers, farmers and working intellectuals; whereas in the fascist countries the industries and the land are privately owned and the government is completely dominated by the big capitalists. The socialism of the U.S.S.R. and the national "socialism" of the fascist lands, contrary to Mr. Dennis and the Social-Democrats, are opposite poles of modern social organization.

Five: Dennis' definition of socialism as "a relative and not an absolute term," as merely the tendency toward "more" government ownership and control of industry (under which broad definition he lumps together Soviet socialism, Nazi fascism and the New Deal as "socialism") is entirely incorrect. The establishment of socialism in a given country requires a revolutionary break economically, politically and socially with capitalism. The trend toward more governmental control over private industry, which Dennis notes in this and other capitalist countries and dubs socialism, is actually the development of state capitalism. It reaches its highest stage under fascism.

State capitalism, especially in its fascist forms, is the chief means by which the hard-pressed capitalists seek to organize their forces to combat the economic crisis, to make war upon each other eventually, and to beat back the advancing forces of socialism. Such state capitalism is not the organization of the socialist revolution, as Dennis would have us believe, but the crystallization of the capitalist counter-revolution.

Contrary to Dennis, there has been no revolution in Germany and that is not a socialist country. As Stalin has pointed out (*Marxism vs. Liberalism,* International Publishers, New York, p. 22), a revolution "means the transference of power from one class to another"—in the case of the socialist revolution, as in the U.S.S.R.—from the capitalist class to the proletariat. There has been no such transference of class power in Germany. The bourgeoisie remains fully in power, both in the industries and the state, as was brilliantly shown by G. S. Jackson in the *New Masses* of February 11. The socialist revolution also means the "expropriation of the expropriators," and this has taken place fully in the Soviet Union. But Jackson clearly shows in the same article that in Germany, "The big (capitalist) concerns are squeezing out the little ones. This is the only kind of expropriation that is taking place."

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (p. 345) says correctly that the U.S.S.R. is founded upon the basic socialist principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to

his work." This is the law in the Soviet Union, where there are no exploiters and no idle rich. But in Germany the old capitalist jungle motto still prevails, of "grab all he who can and the devil take the hindmost," and vast hordes of capitalistic parasites are sucking their sustenance from the toiling masses, without rendering in return any useful services whatsoever.

Six: The élite theory, which is made very much of by Mr. Dennis, is a common attribute of fascism in all countries. It is the *fuehrer* principle. It is built upon a false foundation. Actually the élites which Dennis glorifies so much are only the representatives of social classes. Thus the government heads of tsarist Russia, which Dennis calls an élite, were representatives of the dominant land-owning and capitalist classes and, despite all their personal corruption and dictatorial practices, they defended the interests of those classes against the proletarian workers and peasants. By the same principle the heads of the Soviet Government and other vital institutions of the U.S.S.R. are the representatives—the most capable and devoted—of the cooperating classes of workers, farmers and working intellectuals in the socialist country.

In many capitalist countries the government apparatus is largely made up of middle-class elements. This gives rise to the theory that fascism is a middle-class revolution (a theory held by Social-Democrats as well as by Dennis). Actually these middle-class leaders under fascism are only representatives of the dominant capitalist class. In the United States, for example, although two-thirds of Congress is composed of lawyers this in no way disputes the fact that the big capitalists control the Government and the country. Dennis' "theory" that revolutions are made by "out-élites" against "in-élites" and that the proletariat is not revolutionary, is destroyed by the fact that in the only country where socialism has been established the revolution was led by the working class, and it still is.

Seven: Dennis' arguments to the effect that the masses of the people can be readily deceived and stampeded into war and fascism are also not true. The people's strong resistance to the war is well illustrated by the present world situation where in no country, including the fascist lands, Britain, and the United States, do the masses favor the war*—in spite of their having long been subjected to the greatest deluge of pro-war propaganda in history. Nor has fascism ever gained a majority of the people for its general program in any country by propaganda means alone. Everywhere, whether the reactionaries are setting up a fascist regime or embarking upon imperialist war, they have to supplement their demagogy by the use of terrorism. Characteristically, the Roosevelt Administration is literally forcing the American people into the war. But, opportunistic as ever, Dennis, for fear of antagonizing the masses,

* The Gallup Poll, as reported in the press of March 21, showed popular sentiments 87 per cent against American participation in the war.

says little or nothing about the use of terror, as an indispensable part of his program to force fascism upon the American people.

Eight: Absurd are Dennis' allegations to the effect that the German capitalists were fooled by Hitler into carrying through an anti-capitalist revolution. Norman Thomas, like other Social-Democrats, in his book *Socialism on the Defensive,* joins Dennis in this theory, by saying: "The German industrialists who helped Hitler to power miscalculated. They thought they could use him and his movement." Actually the German big capitalists were and remain the fountain source of Nazism, and Hitler is their agent. They know, even if Thomas does not, that through fascism they have smashed the labor movement and consolidated their control of the state, thereby enabling them more effectively to reap their profits, to carry out their imperialist war adventures, and to fight back the socialist revolution.

The great capitalists of the world, in England, France and the United States, as well as in Germany, Italy and Japan, favor fascism because they fully realize that, as Comrade Dimitroff said at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in August, 1935: "Fascism is not super-class government, nor government of the petty bourgeoisie, or the lumpenproletariat over finance capital. Fascism is the power of finance capital itself."

Nine: Dennis' theory that Great Britain and the United States are fighting for the status quo (which he condemns), while Germany and Japan are carrying on a policy of active expansion, is also fundamentally wrong. It is the fascist converse of the Social-Democratic theory that there are two kinds of imperialism: good (passive) and bad (militant); the good kind being represented by the Anglo-American alliance, and the bad kind by the Axis powers. In reality, all the imperialist powers are expansive, seeking to grab for themselves whatever the given circumstances will permit. Take Great Britain, for example. Its Tory government deliberately built up Nazi Germany, with the triple objective in mind of strengthening world reaction generally, of using Germany as an offset to French continental domination, and especially of organizing a German war against the Soviet Union. Certainly, there was nothing status quo about all that.

We can be sure also that should Great Britain win this war it will seize even greater European and colonial spoils than it did after the World War. The Communist International justly placed the main guilt for the present war at the door of British imperialism. As for that other "status quo" great power, the United States, even Mr. Dennis indicates that in this war situation it is out to establish its control over the Western Hemisphere and to absorb whatever remnants it can of the crumbling British Empire. In other words, that the United States is a militant imperialist state whose aim is precisely to break up the status quo to its own advantage.

Ten: Dennis' assertions to the effect that the toiling masses are no

longer interested in democracy and that only the capitalists are demanding freedom are so wrong as to be fantastic. If we will look at the workers in all the capitalist countries, at the peasants in the colonial and semi-colonial lands, at the oppressed national minorities and conquered states—everywhere we will see that they are linking up all their demands with a militant insistence upon a broader election franchise, upon greater civil liberties generally, upon national independence, upon the abolition of capitalist tyranny and exploitation.

And as for the Communists, far from giving over the slogans of democracy to the capitalists, as Dennis alleges, they are the most militant champions of democracy. The recent cry of dictatorship by the Hoovers and other spokesmen of big business against Roosevelt, which Dennis thinks was a demand for liberty, was in reality only a complaint of finance capitalism against a government which it considered to be making too many concessions to the toilers. But how soon these Wall Street complaints and demands for "liberty" ceased when Roosevelt jettisoned his reform program and headed into the imperialist war! These same people became the greatest champions of the so-called Lend-Lease Bill to set up a war-dictatorship in this country.

Eleven: Dennis' theory that the "nation-state" of capitalism is giving way to the "party-state" of socialism (a notion also shared in by Social-Democrats) is wrong at both ends and in the middle. To begin with, the bourgeois democracies, although having historically come into being as national entities, cannot truly claim to be "nation-states" in the sense of representing the interests of the whole people, but are capitalist states, dominated by the capitalist class in its own interest. Under fascism the state remains a capitalist state, the only major difference being that it is then more completely controlled by the big capitalists, who destroy all other political parties and establish their own one-party dictatorship. In the Soviet Union, the only socialist country, on the reverse, there exists a real "nation-state," or rather a "multi-nation-state." The Soviet Government is fully representative of all the Soviet people. If there is only one party, the Communist Party, in the U.S.S.R., this is because the interests of the friendly and gradually merging classes of workers, farmers and professionals are fully harmonious and can be properly represented only by a single party. Hitler talks of maintaining his one-party, centralized state dictatorship for "a thousand years"; whereas the Soviet people are consciously heading toward the eventual withering away of their Party and the state, and the establishment of a stateless form of society: communism.

Twelve: When Dennis, having in mind the U.S.S.R. along with the fascist states, avers that his "revolution" will bring about "the erection of socialist imperialism on the ruins of capitalist imperialism," he is not only fundamentally wrong, but, as so often happens, he also finds himself in the company of the

Social-Democrats. It is true that under fascism imperialism remains. All the factors that Lenin analyzed as constituting the imperialist, or final stage of capitalism, persist and are greatly intensified. That is, the monopolization of industry, the concentration of finance, the consolidation of industrial and bank capital together and with the state, and the struggle for the re-division of the world, are all enormously increased and speeded up. Fascism is imperialism, and imperialism's era is the era of wars and revolutions, accompanying the general decay of the capitalist system.

But imperialism is totally foreign to the socialism of the U.S.S.R. Under that system there is no imperialism, because there exist none of the requisite conditions for imperialism, because there exists none owned industries nor banks, no ruling class of monopolists and financial oligarchs, no profit-making urge to subjugate colonial peoples and to enslave neighboring states. Consequently there is not and cannot be any imperialism. "Red imperialism" is a contradiction in terms. The liberation of the peoples of Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Bessarabia, and their inclusion into the U.S.S.R., was in no sense imperialism. Contrary to Dennis, socialist countries will not make war against each other, but will live together harmoniously. A fascist world would mean a world endlessly torn with devastating imperialist wars; a socialist world will be a world permanently at peace.

Thirteen: Although he constantly and roundly condemns democracy, Dennis systematically obscures his position regarding trade unionism. This is a typical example of his demagogy. While clearly aiming at a social system in which free trade unions would be non-existent, he nevertheless deems it advisable not to arouse the antagonism of the workers by talking plainly of this matter. It is similar trickery on his part which makes Dennis soft-pedal anti-Semitism and anti-Negroism, which are organic to his fascist thesis. Obviously, he does not care to buck the widespread mass disapproval of such reactionary propaganda.

Fourteen: In Germany we can see in operation the so-called folk unity which Dennis believes is superior to democracy and destined to supplement it. To picture the monstrous fascist orgy of terrorist dictatorship as a system of freedom and unity, as Dennis does, is fantastic. The capitalist exploitation which splits the nation into warring classes is now worse than ever. Beneath the apparently smooth exterior of present-day German political life, class antagonisms are being enormously sharpened and rendered vastly more explosive. Their culmination in revolution is only a matter of the continuation of present trends.

Fifteen: Throughout his book, Dennis pours out a stream of hostile criticism against the "Haves" and speaks sympathetically of the "Have-nots." Occasionally he translates these generalities into terms, on the one hand, of great bankers and industrialists, and, on the other, of workers, farmers and other poor people. But all this is nothing more

than typical fascist demagogy, designed to fool the masses. His criticisms of the exploiters and condolences for the exploited are just as false as the rest of the book. The whole system which he represents, fascism, has no other reason for being than to increase the power, privileges and wealth of the already great capitalists, and to deepen the exploitation, poverty and oppression of the toiling masses.

III. Dennis' Program Tested by Life

Having briefly outlined Dennis' theses and also pointed out the false foundations upon which they rest, let us now turn our attention briefly to the validity of his theses in the crucible of actual life. As we have noted, the main point of Dennis' argument is that the world capitalist system has lost its dynamic force, its expansive power, because the industrial revolution has exhausted itself, and that therefore a new "dynamic" is necessary. This dynamic he attempts to furnish by a program of war, with "pyramid-building" as a sort of stop-gap in the intervals between wars. But this fascist program, based upon unsound principles, as we have seen, cannot and does not work out in practice to give capitalism a new lease of life.

That capitalism has lost its dynamic force and expansive power is true. This is due to the fundamental contradiction between the socialized method of production and the private ownership of the means of production. This contradiction, resulting in the exploitation and robbery of the workers, brings about a contradiction between the producing and consuming powers of the masses. This antagonism has become very much worse with the growth of monopoly to the general effect that capitalist society is increasingly paralyzed by economic crises and the various political struggles and wars associated therewith.

Dennis' plan to cure this fundamental chaos and paralysis of capitalism by a program of war and "pyramid-building" can only make confusion worse confounded. In seeking to prove that war is the great necessary "dynamic" for society, Dennis pins his argument largely upon the fact that the present "democratic" capitalist empires, in building themselves up, carried on many wars. He points out that during 150 years England and France respectively waged 54 and 53 wars, big and little, lasting 102 years in one case and 99 years in the other; and that the United States, counting Indian wars and punitive expeditions in Latin America, has been at war almost continuously ever since its foundation. War was a powerful "dynamic" for developing the "democratic" capitalist empires, argues Dennis; therefore it will be an even more potent "dynamic" for building the fascist empires.

But Dennis leaves a most important consideration out of his calculations. It is the fact that wars nowadays are qualitatively different from the wars of capitalism prior to the first decade of the 20th century. This difference is not

merely, as Dennis indicates, with his thumb-hand method of analysis, that the earlier wars were "easy" wars while those of today are "hard" wars. The difference is far more profound and meaningful. Dennis' so-called "easy" wars were typical wars of the period of the "free" development of world capitalism, when England, France and the other empires expanding the world market were making the first division of the world among themselves. Their wars were directed mainly against the weaker, especially colonial, peoples. But during the past quarter of a century the situation has fundamentally changed. With the world already almost entirely divided among the great empires, in order to redivide it these powers must now come into wide and devastating collisions.

Capitalism in its early stages, when it was relatively healthy and broadly expanding, could and did readily use its method of "easy" wars against colonial peoples to extend its sway. But today capitalism is sick and weak from its incurable internal contradictions, which amount in sum to a general crisis, and it cannot withstand the destructive force of the great wars of the imperialist powers, much less prosper by them. The collisions among the imperialist powers are disastrous; the colonial peoples are also more rebellious and harder to conquer, and the breakdown of capitalist economy is making the colonies more difficult to exploit profitably.

The World War of a generation ago, a vast imperialist struggle, did irreparable damage to the capitalist system, especially by the loss of Russia, covering one-sixth of the earth, to socialism; by the discrediting of Social-Democracy and the rise of the Communist Parties. The present imperialist war threatens to wreak even greater havoc to world capitalism. Far from constituting the healthful "dynamic" for the present social order that Dennis presumes it to be, ultra-destructive imperialist war is actually tearing capitalism to pieces. And the eventual response of the people to these ruinous imperialist wars is revolution: the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism.

Dennis' "new world order," which is essentially that of Hitler, offers no prospect of stability, either nationally or internationally. It would be a regime of endless violent and destructive wars. The only way the several great world dominating empires, that Dennis has in mind, could be built up, as we now see by Hitler's course in Europe, would be by ruthlessly conquering and subjugating the weaker capitalist states and colonial peoples. Such a prospect does not appal Mr. Dennis, however, who says in *The Nation* for January 11: "The extinction of the myriad small nations and the integration of the world into a few great systems are probably both inevitable and desirable for the welfare of the world masses." Such empires would be even worse "prison-houses of peoples" than the old British, French, Dutch and Belgian empires, with scores of oppressed peoples, deeply rebellious and eagerly awaiting a

favorable opportunity to smash the whole reactionary structure to bits.

As for the relations between the several fascist empires, these would necessarily be of the most warlike nature. A stable balance of power between them would be unthinkable. The uneven development of capitalism (that is, the varying rates of industrial expansion in the several countries, the different degrees to which the respective capitalist classes are held back by, or have defeated, the workers, etc.) would inevitably bring the great fascist empires into ever more violent collisions with one another. Fascism, and world reaction generally, sharpen all the internal and external contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist system. Hitler's and Dennis' new world order, could it be achieved, would surely plunge humanity into an endless series of the most desperate and devastating wars the world has ever seen.

Dennis, like the fascists, tries to prepare for the acceptance of his "dynamic," war, by glorifying and defending mass slaughter. War with him, as with other fascists, is made to appear as the be-all and end-all of mankind, the one great constructive driving force of society. By periodically butchering one another on a mass basis in the interests of their capitalist rulers the peoples of the world are supposed to find peace, prosperity and freedom. But all of Dennis' glowing advocacy of war cannot change the fundamental fact that the imperialist wars of today are themselves the very climax of all the internal destructive forces within the capitalist system; they inevitably greatly accelerate the tempo of capitalist breakdown and enormously stimulate the revolutionary movements of the masses, who are the historic gravediggers of capitalism and the builders of the new socialist order.

Dennis' secondary "dynamic," "pyramid-building," with which he says society will sort of patch along in the intervals between wars, rests upon a no less shaky foundation than his major "dynamic," war itself. At the most, what Dennis calls "pyramid-building," that is, government make-work schemes and subsidized industries, can serve only as a stop-gap proposition to relieve widespread unemployment and popular distress in times of industrial depression or crisis. It can in no sense expand and develop a nation's economy. Moreover, such "pyramid-building" can be put into effect only as a result of strong mass pressure against the capitalists and the government (and of course Mr. Dennis is opposed to any such democratic pressure).

The big capitalists all over the world are, in the main, opposed to "pyramid-building" as a means to keep their bankrupt capitalist industrial system going. At most they use "pyramid-building" sparingly, unwillingly, and only under heavy mass pressure. Then they accept it only temporarily, until they can once more get on the road to war, which, in this period of capitalist decay, they look upon as the only solution of their industrial problems.

The German example is typical.

The way Hitler was able to "abolish" unemployment was not through "pyramid-building," but by his gigantic armaments program which, according to the *New York Times* of January 9, is now, during the war, burning up 72 per cent of the national income. In England the Tory Government during the thirties reluctantly carried through a housing program as a means to fight off the industrial depression, but now it has arrived at what it really wanted all the time as the "cure" for its troubles—imperialist war.

There has been the same basic experience in the United States. When Roosevelt, facing the unparalleled economic crisis, embarked upon a limited program of "pyramid-building" (W.P.A., P.W.A., etc.), the great capitalists of Wall Street yelled and protested. They condemned his make-work schemes as "boondoggling," denounced him as a Communist, and shouted for a balanced Federal budget. Every billion the government spent for relief and make-work projects was like pulling Wall Street's teeth. But see what a marvelous change has come over the erstwhile big capitalist malcontents since Roosevelt has dropped his "boondoggling" and embarked upon an imperialist war program. Now they are happy. Congress squanders billions in dozen lots, but never a squawk comes out of Wall Street. Business is good, the goose hangs high, everything is hotsy-totsy—at least until the devastating reckoning comes at the end of the war. Contrary to Dennis, the great capitalists of today do not adopt "pyramid-building" even as a second line "dynamic" for their society. They depend upon war as the way to keep things going.

Despite all the contentions of fascist apologists (which are seconded by Norman Thomas and other Social-Democrats) fascism has not found the solution to the industrial crisis. It has not cured unemployment, neither in Germany, nor in Italy, nor in Japan. Actually by intensifying the grip of monopoly capital, by increasing the exploitation of the toilers, by breaking the resistance of the masses and by lowering mass living standards, fascism has fundamentally made much worse the problem of unemployment. The only way the fascists anywhere have put the workers to work is by making armaments and waging war. This does not eradicate unemployment but, in the long run, makes it far more acute.

Dennis draws a fascist picture of "a world of nations all pursuing policies of increasing self-sufficiency and all industrializing, the less industrialized countries, of course, industrializing the most" (p. 151). This is sheer nonsense, as we see from Hitler's activities. Actually, German fascism, by increasing all the contradictions of capitalism and restricting the purchasing power of the people, creates a downward spiral so far as the production of useful goods is concerned. Instead of industrializing the weaker countries it is de-industrializing them. Its policy toward colonial countries is even more stringently against

their industrialization than are the policies of the British and French and American empires. The Nazi aim is to make Germany the world's major industrial country, equipped with great heavy industries, while the rest of the nations, reduced to a colonial, semi-colonial, or otherwise dependent status, serve as suppliers of raw materials and light finished commodities. Here is the scarcity theory, which Dennis (like Roosevelt) ardently champions, brought to its logical conclusion.

Thus we see that Dennis' major "dynamic," war, does not lead to a growth and strengthening of the capitalist system, but to its weakening and eventual destruction through revolution. We also see that his secondary "dynamic," "pyramid-building," is not a dynamic at all, nor does it serve as an effective expedient between wars. All the major trends of fascist society, and of capitalist reaction generally, lead to war, and imperialist war means eventually the destruction of the capitalist system.

Socialism Is the Solution

The false national socialism of Hitler and those in America for whom Dennis speaks does not provide the constructive answer to the present chaos of capitalism, but intensifies it and makes it more malignant. On the other hand, life has completely demonstrated that the socialism of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, crystallized in the U.S.S.R., does provide the solution to the problems and privations growing out of the breakdown of the capitalist system. Dennis' reactionary theories of scarcity and his "dynamics" of "pyramid-building" and war are only destructive expedients of the obsolete capitalist system, which is desperately struggling to prolong its useless existence.

The U.S.S.R., by socializing industry and agriculture and by abolishing human exploitation, has developed the only possible dynamic for a healthful growth and expansion of society. The Soviet Union, contrary to the Hitler-Dennis-Roosevelt theory of scarcity, works upon the principle of abundance. It has proved beyond all question of doubt that the systematic raising of mass living standards as productive capacity increases provides the only way to keep industry and agriculture upon an upward plane of growth and to maintain society generally on a forward march. The U.S.S.R., alone of all countries, has abolished industrial crises and unemployment. While the whole capitalist world was prostrated by the great economic crisis of the past decade Soviet industry and agriculture steadily and rapidly extended. The economic system of the U.S.S.R., spurred on by the constantly increasing demands of the people, goes ahead with an ever-greater expansion, the limits of which are set only by the country's natural resources, the state of human knowledge, and the productive power of man.

With this sound economic system as its base, Soviet socialism brings about real national unity. Instead of the false "folk unity" of Hitler and

Dennis, with its terrorism, demagogy, cultivated ignorance, anti-Semitism, and division of the people into desperately warring classes, the Soviet Union, founded upon a socialized economy, has abolished classes and class hatreds. The Soviet people are the most united and therewith the most democratic in all the world. It is along the path they are treading that the peoples of all countries will eventually find unity, freedom, prosperity and maximum cultural development.

By the same token, the healthy economic system of socialism also lays the basis for international peace. With no monopoly capitalists dominating its life and ruthlessly seeking profits in the four corners of the earth, the U.S.S.R. consequently has no imperialism. Its whole system leads it to live in peaceful collaboration with other nations. That is why it does not participate in imperialist wars. As against the series of ruthless empires contemplated by the fascists in their "new world order," made up of numerous oppressed and rebellious peoples fighting bitterly against their conquerors, the structure of the U.S.S.R. forecasts the future system of world society. It is a union of free republics. Its three scores of peoples, big and little, live together in unity, harmony and freedom. Not toward a fascist "new world order," consisting of imperialist states periodically deluging humanity with blood and terror, but toward a world federation of free peoples, on the type of the U.S.S.R., is the only road along which harassed mankind can eventually establish international peace.

LABOR'S STRIKE-WEAPON: A SESQUI-CENTENNIAL—1791-1941

BY SAMUEL PUTNAM

AMERICAN labor this year—and world labor as well—has an anniversary which it cannot afford to overlook: the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first strike in the United States, so far as the records go, the first strike in the modern sense of the term. Allusion is to the historic Philadelphia carpenters' strike of 1791.

Occurring as it does at the present tense moment of struggle against U.S. participation in the second imperialist war and against the mounting tide of fascist reaction at home, the anniversary in question takes on a deepened significance. It comes at a time when Wall Street, the Roosevelt Administration, and all the reactionary, fascist-tending forces in the land—chambers of commerce and open-shop employers, vigilante terrorists and the labor-hating heads of the army and navy—have banded together in a well planned and determined assault on labor's rights. Above all, the attack of these forces is centered on that most inalienable right which the working class possesses: the right to strike. The objective, clearly, is: to rout labor out of its hard-won key positions, ultimately reducing the workers to a state of Hitlerian peonage.

Every day, as the American people by one precipitous step after another are dragged forward to the very rim of the bloody vortex, the true meaning of the war and of all the furore over "national unity" and "national defense" becomes clearer and clearer. High above the drummed-up hysteria, to which the American masses so stubbornly refuse to succumb, there rises, in the well-known Wall Street accents, the shrill cry of "sacrifice." Sacrifice by whom? By the munitions makers and airplane manufacturers, perhaps? By the Knudsens and Stettiniuses, the Rockefellers, Morgans, Mellons, du Ponts and their kind? No, they are making millions, doubling and redoubling their profits, as the dividend returns will show. It is labor that must do the sacrificing; and anyone who objects to this is at once branded a saboteur and a Fifth-Columnist!

Then, moving up steadily under the smokescreen of a dollar patriot-

ism (one that is far from being as effective today as it was in 1917-18), the imperialist camp proceeds to attack the Wage-and-Hour and Labor Relations Acts. Despite the fact that the nation still has more than 9,000,000 unemployed, representing 52,000,000 "shrunken bellies," the work week must be lengthened, with the nodding and active connivance of the Messrs. Hillman, Green, Dubinsky and other misleaders of labor and Social-Democratic flunkies.

The direction in which all this points should be unmistakable for anyone with eyes to see. It is obviously aimed at nothing less than the emasculation of the trade union movement in America, with its Gompersization (or Hillmanization —its up-to-date brand) under the Roosevelt whip. It is aimed, in particular, at the obliteration of that remarkable advance which American labor has made during the past decade, especially through the C.I.O., in the field of industrial unionism.

In their subversive drive the open-shoppers have had, and continue to have, the unstinted collaboration of the White House and of Mr. Roosevelt's Council of National Defense, which includes the Social-Democratic misleader Sidney Hillman. Not only have huge defense contracts been awarded (on the very day after election) to Henry Ford, Bethlehem Steel and other notorious Wagner Act violators; the Department of Justice has also been mobilized, under Attorney-General Robert H. Jackson and his aide, Thurman Arnold, as a union-busting agency, and union leaders have been indicted and jailed under the so-called anti-trust laws.

From all of this it should be clear that, when all is said, this is not only a war against German imperialism; it is simultaneously a war on the part of American monopoly capital against the American people, against the rights and living standards of the toiling masses. And what is true in America is likewise true on a world scale. The real war today is not only the one that is being fought between the rival gangsters of imperialism. More important than even this war is the one which the Hitlers, Churchills, Mussolinis and Roosevelts—figureheads of finance capital, all of them —are waging against the working people of the world, and, in their visioned plans, against that hope of the international working class, the land of socialism.

It is because the Communist Party of the U.S.A. sees all this and never tires of pointing it out that it is the object of so fierce and lawless a persecution. It is for this reason that Earl Browder and other Communist leaders are being hounded with long prison terms on trumped-up charges. But, as the Party has repeatedly insisted, it is only the first objective in this attack; behind it lie the entire trade union movement in this country and all the liberal and progressive forces, which constitute the real target of the warmongers. This point, surely, hardly needs to be hammered home much longer; life is already rapidly verifying it, day by day, as the struggle passes onto

another plane, and, reaching behind the Communists, the Wall Street cohorts swing into action against organized labor itself.

The sniping at the Wage-and-Hour and Wagner Acts, the awarding of scab contracts, the "anti-trust" prosecution (persecution) of union officials: these, it may now be seen, were no more than the opening wedge. The major attack is now ready to be launched, and, as indicated above, it is one directed at labor's very heart and vitals: the sacred right to strike. As in 1917-18, monopoly capital is taking advantage of the imperialist "war for democracy," and a concerted movement is under way to outlaw labor's essential weapon as "sabotage" and even as military "treason." Nor is this something devised on the spur of the moment; it had been carefully thought out and elaborated long in advance—long before the war started—being an essential part of the infamous "M-Day Plan."

* * *

It is in such an hour as this that the sesquicentennial of America's first recorded strike falls. That strike, a "turnout"* of Philadelphia carpenters, who demanded a living wage for their labor and the right to work "from six to six" instead of "from sun to sun" as was the custom, was an epoch-marking event, even though it would seem to have passed with little notice at the time. The details of the strike are buried in obscurity. Its outcome, even, is unknown. Yet it came as the result, one result, of a long and maturing struggle on the part of the working people of America against the entrenched forces of private property and property-championed reaction on the political field.

* * *

It may, indeed, be looked upon as an integral phase of that "First American Revolution" which began with the preamble of the Declaration of Independence, and which culminated in the Bill of Rights. At the same time, it marked the beginning of a new and more advanced stage in the great people's struggle, one in which the newborn industrial proletariat was soon to take the lead, and, eventually, to achieve the liberation of the working class and the whole of mankind.

It was on Dec. 17, 1791, the year in which the Philadelphia carpenters "turned out," that the Bill of Rights went into effect. Consisting of the first ten Amendments to the Constitution, commonly thought of as the civil rights amendments, the Bill of Rights was much more than a simple guarantee of civil liberties; historically it went much deeper than that. One has but to look at the forces represented in the Constitutional Convention—the Jeffersonian Democrats on the one hand, the Hamiltonian Federalists on the other—and the significance of the popular victory embodied in the Bill of Rights will become clear.

It was in the shadow of this far-reaching victory that labor first arose to spread upon the pages of history its own profound unwritten

* "Turnout" was the early American term for strike.

law, a law not found in the Bill of Rights, but one without which, as experience time and again has proved, the Bill of Rights speedily becomes a dead letter, a theme for the spread-eagle Fourth of July patriot, but of no more real meaning or efficacy than "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

This laying down of tools and doffing of aprons on the part of a handful of Philadelphia artisans a hundred and fifty years ago was an event of more than local importance, It marked the beginning of a struggle, on the day-to-day economic plane, between a newly fledged capitalism and a class which politically was scarcely born as yet, the proletariat. This struggle, frequently a violent and, thanks to ruling class brutality, a sanguinary one, has been going on now for a century and a half, and the end is not yet, cannot be—not until the ultimate working-class goal of world socialism shall have been achieved.

In short, the Philadelphia carpenters' strike of 1791 was, in a manner of speaking, the first Declaration of the Rights of Labor in the United States. A part of the vast struggle for human liberation which, at the end of the eighteenth century, was being dialectically effected back and forth between the Old World and the New, it came as an expression and enunciation of labor's instinctive ("spontaneous") and most deeply cherished right, the one without which all its struggles would be those of a helpless, and hopeless, slave. This right is one which history, life itself, has sanctified, and has lifted into an unwritten but none the less inviolable law.

It is this fact, the inviolable character of this unwritten law, which the workers of today must grasp; and for this reason it is indispensable to go back and study the origins, the slow, painful process of the evolution of this right over the last century and a half. It is essential, also, to make a study of the devious weapons which the employing class, with the state power in its grasp, has found or forged in an effort to combat this bright and shining blade as wielded by the toil-hardened, mighty hands of labor.

For the ruling class is now, in this its life-and-death crisis, ransacking its arsenal of past weapons in the hope of producing one which the workers will not recognize for what it is: the same old blood-stained dagger which for one hundred and fifty years has been aimed at labor's back, in the form of an attack on labor's right to organize and right to strike. In this the despicable Social-Democratic flunkies of imperialism are playing their wonted role. This makes it all the more imperative that the workers get their values straight and clear.

* * *

It has been stated that little is known as to the details of this historic first strike. A solitary reference in Commons and Associates* would appear to be the only record. The Philadelphia *Gazette* and other newspapers of the period are silent

* Commons and Associates: *History of Labor in the United States,* Vol. I, pp. 69-70.

on the subject.* This is not so strange as it may seem. After all, when a few Philadelphia carpenters quit work because they were dissatisfied with their wages and hours, could the prosperous, well-fed burghers of William Penn's city be expected to see in this the beginning of a great historic struggle?

With their class all over the country, they had contrived, following the Revolution, snugly to ensconce themselves in political power; was it not against them that the plain people, who for the most part owned no property, had had to contend in winning the Bill of Rights? And so they doubtless looked upon these pioneer strikers as a lot of "malcontents"—a favorite vocable of theirs corresponding to our "agitator" of today in describing anyone who objected to being exploited.

They perhaps did not realize that this movement which was beginning under their very eyes was one which, within a few years, would strike terror in their hearts and would cause them to take the most active and sternest of repressive measures. Before long their newspapers were to be printing accounts of these "turnouts," with lurid hints of imminent riot and revolution and the prospect of good citizens being murdered in their beds.

However, if the details of the strike itself are scant—and there were probably not a great many to report—it is by no means impossible to reconstruct the event in its historic-economic-social significance, against the background of the times.

Why did the Philadelphia carpenters strike? What were the conditions which impelled them to do so? In answering this question it is necessary to look at the economic status of the entire working class in Pennsylvania at this period; and these conditions were more or less typical of those which prevailed in the nation as a whole during the post-Revolutionary era. The Revolution had been fought to win freedom for the Colonists, freedom from the tyrannous British yoke, and the right to an independent life as a people. But the masses, those who had done the fighting and who had starved and shivered with Washington at Valley Forge, were soon enough to discover that the fruits of this freedom were not for them, but for their "betters," the well-to-do classes. Thanks to the system of indenture or bonded-debt-slavery, a carryover from the old colonial slaveship days, even physical freedom was in good part denied them; and historians tell us that, in the year 1804, thirteen years after the adoption of the Bill of Rights, two-thirds of the population of Pennsylvania were white chattel slaves, a ratio which had existed since 1785.

As for those workers who were

* On behalf of the writer of this article, Comrade Adolph Heller, Director of the Philadelphia Workers' School, made an extensive search among the records of the Pennsylvania Historical Society and elsewhere, without uncovering any material beyond the Commons reference. It is by no means impossible, however, that among the as yet unexplored manuscript diaries, letters, etc., in various Philadelphia collections, such as that of Girard College, something on the subject might be found.

nominally "free," they were compelled to toil from sun-up to sundown for an average wage of 50 cents a day. The result was that they and their families were forced to live in the most abject poverty. "On such a pittance," says the historian John Bach McMasters, "it was only by the strictest economy that a mechanic kept his children from starvation and himself from jail."* Even this "pittance" was something the worker could not be sure of; it was being constantly threatened by the exploiters of labor. In the meantime, food prices were soaring and the cost of living generally was going up, as the big profiteers, then as now, waxed fat and held the posts of honor and political power.

It is in the light of these conditions that the walkout of the carpenters must be viewed; for, as Engels says, the workers

". . . must protest against every reduction, even if dictated by necessity; because they feel bound to proclaim that they, as human beings, shall not be made to bow to social circumstances, but social conditions ought to yield to them as human beings; because silence on their part would be a recognition of these social conditions, an admission of the right of the bourgeoisie to exploit the workers in good times and let them starve in bad ones. Against this the workingmen must rebel so long as they have not lost all human feeling." (*Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*, p. 218.)

* McMasters: *History of the People of the United States*, Vol. I, pp. 96-8.

Marx, too, stressed the vital character of the right to strike:

"The very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favor of the capitalist against the working man, and consequently the general tendency of the capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages, or to push the value of labor more or less to its minimum limit. Such being the tendency of things in this system, is this to say that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital and abandon their attempt at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken-down wretches past salvation." (*Value, Price, and Profit*, International Publishers, New York, p. 61.)

In the view of Marx and Engels, it is not merely the right, but the *duty* of the workers to strike against "every reduction" in their standard of living, even when this reduction is "dictated by necessity"—*i.e.*, by the "necessity" of the boss to show a profit for himself and stay in business. Not only should they "protest against every reduction"; they should, further, "make the best of occasional chances for their temporary improvement," for it is only by so doing that the working class can hope to hold its own and keep from going backward until finally its members shall have been "degraded to one level mass of broken-down wretches past salvation."

Survivals of pre-capitalist rela-

tions and their ideological reflections proved one of the major stumbling-blocks in labor's early p th. The old guild type of organization, of which the Carpenters' Company of Philadelphia was a characteristic example, with its admixture of employer (master) and employee (journeyman) elements, played its part here.

The confusion of the workers on the subject of class relations at this period is indicated by the frequent debates which took place in their organizations, with a not infrequent reversal of decisions on the point. Thus, in 1802, the Philadelphia typographers decided that employers and employees had mutual interests; while three years later (1805) the New York cordwainers (shoemakers) took an opposite stand. In 1809, the New York printers favored "mutual interests," but eight years later (1817) they expelled their one employer member, and declared that "as the interests of the journeymen are separate and in some respects opposite to those of the employers, we deem it improper that they (the employers) should have any voice or influence in our deliberations. . . ."

The class struggle, however, is a great teacher and, with its close-to-earth and close-to-the-belly realities, is in the end labor's one unfailing mentor. And the class struggle has long since taught labor that its interests are not identical with those of capital. But the employers at all times, and especially in times of a capitalist created "emergency," such as a "depression" or an imperialist war, persist in their endeavors to pull the wool over labor's eyes. By way of doing so, they appeal demagogically to the workers' "patriotism," to their "Americanism," to their "loyalty," etc., etc., ringing the change on every idealistic phrase and slogan which the capitalists themselves have time and again dragged in the mire for their own purposes of private aggrandizement. If the worker, called upon to "sacrifice," would but study the dividend returns he would soon see if his interests, at this or any other time, are identical with those of the boss. And why should he not have a larger share of those profits, produced by his own labor?

Even at this early stage, at the dawn of the labor movement, the employing class resorted to the weapon of demagogy, raising among other catchwords the issue of "liberty." "Liberty" meant the unlimited right of the employer to hire whomsoever he pleased, at whatever wage and for as many hours as he pleased, under conditions of the employer's own choosing, along with the unlimited right to discharge whomever and whenever he, the employer, saw fit, for any reason that he chose, or for no reason at all. Or, it meant the right to scab: the spokesmen for the employers would inquire, as they do still, what about the worker's (*i.e.*, the scab's) right to determine individually the price at which he shall sell his labor power, and what hours and under what conditions he shall work?

These are questions which are still raised every day by the employers and by the ideologists of

capitalism, in their efforts to confuse the working class, to befuddle the "general public," and to sow division in the ranks of the toiling, exploited masses. They are questions which, following this first strike, were speedily raised by the American employing class, in the 1790's and the decades that followed. An appropriate and effective reply to this question of liberty was given by that "notorious foreign agitator" Abraham Lincoln, in the resounding words that he uttered in his speech at the Baltimore Sanitary Fair, on April 18, 1864:

"The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor; while for others the same word may mean for others to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor. Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things, called by the same name liberty, and it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names—liberty and tyranny."

With his sure instinct as a son of the toiling people, the Great Railsplitter saw that the "liberty" of the exploiter could not be that of the exploited, that the latter has an ethics and standard of values which are his own, derived from the stern realities of the day-to-day class struggle; and, hitting out at the Southern Bourbons, who were bewailing the recent loss of their slave property, he goes on, with his customary vivid folk imagery, to depict the essential character of capitalist slavery:

"The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly, the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing under the yoke of bondage hailed by some as the advance of liberty, and bewailed by others as the destruction of all liberty. . . . The wolf's dictionary has been repudiated."

It is out of this "wolf's dictionary" that the imperialist warmakers of 1941 gathered about the Roosevelt Administration speak; it was from it that the bloodsucking employers of the 1790's drew their vocabulary. Men of good will, like Lincoln—all true democrats, all true progressives—will repudiate this dictionary. As for the workers, they have a dictionary of their own; they began to develop it then and they have greatly enriched it since; and in that lexicon "strike" is synonymous with labor's right to live.

* * *

Marx has pointed out that "the

very development of modern industry" serves to "turn the scale" against the worker, in favor of the capitalist. This is found to be true at all important transitional stages in the growth of capitalist production. Each of those stages has brought fresh hardship and suffering to the mass of the toilers, as did the introduction of machines in place of hand looms in the weaving industry in the nineteenth century; but on the other hand, each change has likewise driven the workers to find new and higher forms of organization and of struggle.

With each new stage, capitalism as a system has grown older, first toward the maturity of its powers, and then (the stage we are in now) toward decline, senile debility and ultimate extinction, as the contradictions of the system reach their final, nodal extreme, where the only solution lies in a revolutionary leap.

On the other hand, the growth of the proletariat all this while is that of a lusty infant toward the fullness of its youthful strength; and in each of the day-to-day struggles of the young, ascending, social class with the old and decaying one, the former is daily trained for its great historic role of the socialist transformation of society.

It is only in the light of the changes in the mode of production which were then taking place in the U. S. that this first strike can be fully understood. Those changes were to alter the future both of capital and of labor, and nowhere were they more highly visible than in the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia. The old medieval system of master and journeymen workers and apprentices was fast breaking up and disappearing, and what was to be seen now was factories springing up on all sides—breweries, shoe factories, textile mills, etc.—in Philadelphia and its suburbs.* Merchant capital, in brief, was being transformed into industrial capital, and the modern bourgeoisie and proletariat were being born.

These changes were at first all to the benefit of the new industrial employers, who were strong and banded together, while the workers remained weak and isolated. As a result, labor was forced (as it always is) to enter upon a prolonged and intense struggle for its rights: for a higher wage level, a shorter working day and better working conditions.

In this developing struggle we might perhaps have expected to find the new industrial proletariat, the factory workers, rather than handicraftsmen such as the carpenters, taking the lead. The fact, however, that the initiative came from the members of an old craft guild type of organization is not so surprising as it may at first appear. In the factories, it is true, the workers were brought into that close and daily association which was to prove the salvation of the working class (and of society as a whole), and which at the same time spelled the doom of capitalism; but they were as yet a disorganized mass, with no unions to protect them, and subject

* This is based upon material gathered by the research department of the Federal Writers' Project of Pennsylvania for the Philadelphia and Pennsylvania *Guides*.

to the ruthless exploitation of the budding industrialists.

In contrast to the factory hands, the craftsmen had their guilds, even though these were of the mixed employer-employee type. They thus had behind them a long-fostered spirit of solidarity despite the fact that they as yet drew no sharp line between their interests and those of their employers. If they brought nothing else to the new-looming struggle, the crafts-guildsmen at least were imbued with a sense of the worth and dignity of human labor and a conviction of the laboring man's right to a place in the sun.

There was more than this, however, that accounted for their taking the lead. While they were not members of the new industrial proletariat, their own economic interests were none the less vitally affected by the change that was occurring in the mode of production. The low-pay-long-hours herding of the workers in the factories could not but worsen the condition of the handicraftsmen, including the masters, or employers, who were simply small-scale producers, and who were finding it increasingly difficult to compete with the factory product.* As a consequence, the masters felt compelled to slash the wages of their journeymen.

Among those of the old craft trades who were hardest hit were the cordwainers, or shoemakers, and the tailors; and it is instructive to note that, while it chanced to be the carpenters who staged the first walkout, it was the cordwainers who were soon to take the lead in these early struggles. The following year, in 1792, the latter formed an association for the maintenance and raising of wages; and two years later, in 1794, the Federal Society of Journeymen Cordwainers of Philadelphia, which may be regarded as the first real trade union in the United States, was organized. Five years after the formation of their union (1799), the cordwainers staged a ten-week militant and successful strike, which resulted in the winning of the first closed shop in America. It was the cordwainers, also, who in 1806 were made the first victims of "criminal conspiracy" charges, when they were indicted for "combination and conspiracy to raise their wages."

While it is the carpenters' strike of 1791 with which we are here specifically concerned, it may not be amiss to quote the statement which the cordwainers, in 1806, published in the Philadelphia *Aurora*, by way of laying their case before the people of the city. This statement not only reveals the fighting spirit which animated these pioneers of the labor movement; it also raises the ever vital issue of civil liberties, in connection with the right of the workers to assemble, to organize and to strike.

"In the constitution of this state it is declared . . . 'that the citizens have the right in a peaceable manner to assemble together for the common good.'. . . These masters, as

* The labor historian David Saposs observes that "the wages of the unskilled were going up while those of the skilled were kept down by the merchant-capitalist." See Commons, work cited, pp. 104-5.

they are called, and who would be masters and tyrants if they could, or the law would allow them, have their associations, their meetings, and they pass their resolutions; but as they are rich and we are poor—they seem to think that we are not protected by the constitution in meeting peaceably together and pursuing our own business.

"They suppose that they have a right to limit us at all times, and whatever may be the misfortune of society, the changes in the value of necessaries, the increase or the decrease in trade, they think they have a right to determine for us the value of our labor; but that we have no right to determine for ourselves what we will or what we will not take in exchange for our labor. . . . The name of freedom is but a shadow . . . if we are to be treated as felons and murderers only for asserting the right to take or refuse what we deem an adequate reward for our labor."

We have here the old issue, so picturesquely phrased by Lincoln, of "liberty" and the "wolf," with the "wolves" insisting that they be left free "to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor," while the worker insists on the right "to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor" and to determine "the value of our labor . . . what we will or what we will not take in exchange for our labor."

There can be no doubt that this was the spirit which animated the carpenters, also. As far back as 1786, some five years previously, there had been "labor trouble" of some sort in Philadelphia; and while history is vague as to just what occurred, the printers would appear to have been at the bottom of it. This, however, seems to have been merely the first stirrings, and nothing came of it; the workers were not yet conscious enough or were not sufficiently cohesive to be able to express their will in action. But resistance to capitalist exploitation was in the air and was bound to find an outlet sooner or later.

The age-old enslavement of the laboring man was assuming a new, still more, oppressive, and, then, bewildering form, and against this the workers had nothing to do but to rebel. That it happened to be the carpenters who took the first militant step does not alter the historic picture. They with all the other members of their class were equally victims of the transformation of the mode of production, and their strike was an accompaniment and outgrowth of that transformation. A new force had arisen in the world, a force that was in its turn to transform history, by bringing to an end the exploitation of man by man.

* * *

One thing we do know about the carpenters' strike of 1791 is the specific grievances which led to it. As stated in the passage from Commons, cited above, the carpenters had

". . . heretofore been obliged to toil through the whole course of the longest summer's day, and that, too, in many instances, without even the consolation of having our labor

sweetened by the reviving hope of an immediate reward."

That is to say, these workers were compelled to follow the old routine: "from sun to sun." The allusion to a "summer's day" is to be noted. The carpenter's occupation in those days was a seasonal one, as it still is in good part; and it is on the basis of a few months' work out of the year that his meager pittance of 50 cents a day is to be computed. The low wage received is a grievance, but the principal stress would seem to be on the hours, on the length of the working day. The carpenters bound themselves

". . . by the sacred ties of honor to abide by the following resolution: That, in future, a day's work, amongst us, shall be deemed to commence at 6 o'clock in the morning, and terminate at 6 in the evening of each day."

Thus, with these few lines, penned by a handful of Philadelphia carpenters, the great struggle for the shorter working day was begun. It seems all but unbelievable to us now that the working class actually had to begin by battling for a twelve-hour day! This was a struggle which, in the course of the century following, was to assume such tremendous proportions, finally attaining a historic culmination in the Eight-Hour Day movement symbolized by the glorious Haymarket Martyrs of 1886, whose memory is now permanently consecrated in the May Day of the international working class.

As Marx and Engels have pointed out, the struggle for the shorter working day is a vital one, being in a manner even more important than the struggle for a higher wage, important as the latter is. This is so because the hours of leisure thus gained—thus wrested from the grasp of the exploiter—not only spell rest and healthful recreation for the worker, not only afford him more time for family and social intercourse, but mean for the working class that cultural and political development which enhances its fighting capacity for further struggle with the robber barons of capitalism, and ultimately enables the working class to challenge the rule of the capitalist class, until the world of organized robbery shall at last have been done away with, and shall have been replaced with a bright new world of human brotherhood and truly creative social endeavor.

It is precisely on this front, on the issue of the working hours, that the greedy war profiteers and the whole imperialist camp have been preparing to launch their first attack on labor. This was true in the first imperialist World War, and it is true today. It has been true in Churchill's England, and it is true in Mr. Roosevelt's United States. The first cry that goes up is for the lengthening of the work-week, to "speed up defense." Despite the fact that there are millions unemployed, starving, yet willing and able to work, those that are given the crumbs of employment are expected, as the war fever mounts, to go back to a long, health-sapping workday. How is this glaring contradiction to be explained? What explana-

tion is there, except that the employing class is once more taking advantage of a war situation in the attempt to smash labor's hard-won gains and steal back all that the workers by their blood and sweat and tears have secured in a century and a half of struggle?

From all of this it may be seen how very close to our own struggle today is that of the Philadelphia carpenters, which now lives only in a few scant lines on the historian's yellowing page. Yet that is not true. Their struggle lives in shop and factory and mine and mill, and was never more of a living reality than it is at this present hour of the rising will of the working class to defend its living standards and basic rights.

* * *

Although they did not realize it, the 1791 strikers were aiming a body blow at capitalism, one close to the heart of the ruthless and inhuman system of exploitation against which they were protesting. The initial blow, it is true, was a feeble one; but this does not in the least detract from its symbolic and historic significance. Without knowing it, these carpenters were striking at the basic ruling class policy with respect to the toiling masses, a policy that is summed up in the phrase: divide and rule. Against this they were asserting a counter-principle: that of working class cohesion, working class solidarity; and by so doing—by thus attempting to abolish working class disunity—they were, as Engels puts it, attacking "the vital nerve of the present social order" and at the same time predicating, however unconsciously, a new, non-competitive social order:

"If the competition of the workers among themselves is destroyed, if all determine not to be further exploited by the bourgeoisie, the rule of property is at an end." (*Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844,* pp. 218-19.)

This is, in reality, the significance of every strike struggle; and this, according to Engels, is the thing that gives labor unions and strike struggles their "real importance." This is the ultimate meaning that lies behind that stirring slogan of the organized workers:

"Solidarity forever;
The Union makes us strong."

Without an organized union of the workers, labor's weapon, the strike, loses its potency, and labor's mighty arm drops paralyzed to its side. This is why it is that the fight for the establishment of the right of collective bargaining, for union recognition, and for the closed shop is of such vital importance, if the right to strike is to mean anything. American workers in the 1790's were not slow in learning this lesson. The carpenters had begun by challenging the principle of competition in labor's ranks, and the cordwainers or shoemakers, through their union formed three years later (1794), were to carry on the fight for the next decade or so.

Backed by a union consciousness, labor was now becoming militant, and was beginning to affirm its place in the life of the American nation that was being born. This is evident in such struggles as those which the Philadelphia shoemakers staged in 1799 and in 1806. At the same time, by insisting on a closed shop contract as the cordwainers did with their employers in 1799, they showed that they had come to realize the nature of the struggle in which they were engaged and the character of the adversary with whom henceforth they would have to contend.

The employing class, meanwhile, alarmed by this challenge of its vested "rights," was casting about for an effective counter-weapon. This weapon it believed it had found when, in connection with the cordwainers' strike of 1806, it dug up from the English common law a doctrine of "criminal conspiracy" to serve its purposes, and proceeded to have the strike leaders indicted for a "combination and conspiracy to raise their wages." The court, in its instructions to the jury, declared:

"A combination of workers to raise their wages may be considered in a twofold point of view: one is benefit to themselves . . . the other is to injure those who do not join the society. The rule of the law condemns both." *

In other words, the law condemns any effort of the workers to better their condition! Here we have class justice, pure and simple, speaking through the class state with its systemized violence, and with no effort at concealment. Later, when labor had begun flexing its sinews, and when America's industrial empire had entered upon its period of imperialist expansion, it became materially possible for capitalism to divert a portion of its imperialist super-profits for bribing labor leaders and for creating an "aristocracy of labor" as a means of dividing and thereby defeating its historical antagonist—the working class. Side by side with this dependence on reformist labor betrayers and labor splitters, the bourgeoisie and its state power, as capitalism entered its decline and then its general crisis, and as the working class advanced in struggle more and more militantly, resorted to increasing brute repression.

The judge who sat in the shoemakers' case in 1806 was simply a mouthpiece of his class; and that class was bent upon outlawing trade unions, and with them strikes, once and for all. That was the intended effect of the jury's verdict which read: "We find defendants guilty of a combination to raise wages"; and a "combination to raise wages" thereby became synonymous with "criminal conspiracy"—a conspiracy against the capitalist-owned state, and therefore against the capitalist system. This was the real beginning of the rule of the courts in labor cases, of "criminal conspiracy," "criminal syndicalism" charges, etc.

That American workers were fully alive to the dangers inherent in this new and unscrupulous class weapon in the hands of their em-

* *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, Vol. III, p. 233.

ployers is evidenced by a sentence from their statement, already quoted in part, in the Philadelphia *Aurora:*

"If the association of men to regulate the price of their own labor is to be converted into a crime and libeled with the same reproachful terms as a design against the freedom of the nation, the prospect is a very sad one for Pennsylvania."

In those days it was "a design against the freedom of the nation"; today it is "sabotage" of "national defense."

As we have seen, the question of civil rights for trade unionists and strikers—the right of free speech, free assemblage, etc.—had already come up.

The hoary old charge of "criminal conspiracy"—in its modern form "criminal syndicalism"—was to be revived time and again. The Philadelphia tailors were victims of it in 1827, the spinners in 1829, the plasterers in 1836, etc. During the first imperialist World War it was widely employed against the I.W.W., and "criminal syndicalism" acts still exist on the statute books of a number of states.

* * *

From earliest colonial times the militia, the constabulary and citizen vigilante groups had been utilized in putting down slave uprisings, rebellions, and, later, strikes.* The "deputy," the thug and the Black Legion gangster are by no means new types; and there is little doubt that today President Roosevelt and the Wall Street warmakers are planning to use in a similar capacity the various "home guard" units that are being formed about the country. It was not until the post-Civil War period, with the beginning of the modern trade union movement and the beginning of the development of American monopoly capitalism, that the Federal Government became an open accomplice in strike-breaking efforts of big business. The first use of Federal troops was in the railroad strike at Pittsburgh in 1877—after the state militia had refused to fire on the workers. By the same means President Cleveland broke the Pullman strike in 1894. State militias, meantime, continued to be subject to call for "strike duty"; and in the miners' strike of 1922 we find that reactionary tool of the steel and coal barons, Pennsylvania's Governor Sproul, calling out the militia in advance and issuing his notorious "suppress revolts before they start" order.

The calling out of troops and shooting down of workers—the open showing of the mailed fist—is not, however, a technique that the ruling class prefers, if it can be avoided and the same end accomplished by other and more subtle means; for such an expedient exposes too openly the true character of the bourgeois state. The capitalist rulers prefer the marshalling of armed thugs in the guise of deputies, such as occurred at the famous battle of Homestead, in 1892. But better still,

* According to the Baltimore *Gazette* of April 11, 1800, such a group had succeeded in breaking a seamen's strike at Fell's Point, a few days before.

from their point of view, is the avoidance of any open clash and the outwitting of the workers through "mediation" proposals, court injunctions, such as the one issued in the Pullman strike, anti-picketing injunctions, the enactment of anti-strike legislation, etc., etc. Above all, at the present day, they rely upon their Social-Democratic lieutenants, their Hillmans and their Greens.

The first example of "mediation" on a large scale was afforded by the late Theodore Roosevelt, of "big stick" fame, in connection with the miners' strike of 1902. The resulting sellout of the workers—an open-shop contract and strikes prohibited for a three-year period—has long since gone down in labor history. "Mediation" and "rule by injunction" continued to be the favorite resort of the bosses in "normal" times, down to the first imperialist World War and post-war period, and have by no means been abandoned.

It was during the first imperialist World War and the period of intensive labor struggles that immediately followed that the American capitalist class first raised blatantly the cry: "You can't strike against the government" (meaning the munitions makers and other war profiteers). Indeed, it may be said that practically every ruse and device which the Roosevelt warmakers of today are cautiously trying out or pondering was resorted to, in one form or another, by Woodrow Wilson and his Wall Street backers. Wilson even went so far as to threaten strikers with military conscription. Space here does not allow a detailed account of all these methods and subterfuges; they have been described in a book which every American worker and all interested in the labor movement ought to read: John Steuben's *Labor in Wartime*.* But, as Steuben points out, in spite of it all, and considering the prevailing lack of a militant top leadership, American labor stood its ground remarkably well, and more than 2,000 "unauthorized" strikes occurred during the war period! Labor was not fooled then; and as Comrade Roy Hudson recently observed,** the indications are clear that it is not going to permit itself to be fooled today.

* * *

The situation today, for one thing, is in a number of ways basically different from what it was in 1917 and the years following. Not only is there a politically conscious and incorruptible vanguard in the small but important Communist Party, there is also a militant trade union vanguard, in the C.I.O. and the basic industries, and among the rank and file of the A. F. of L., who in large numbers are not being taken in by the pro-war sellout tactics of their leaders of the Executive Council. Also, the American working class as a whole has learned more than one invaluable lesson in the course of the two decades of dubious peace, false prosperity and terrible

---

* *Labor in Wartime*, by John Steuben, International Publishers, New York, 1940.

** See article "Labor Is Finding Its Way," *Daily Worker*, March 4, 1941.

depression that have formed the intermission between the imperialist world conflicts.

Add to this the fact that the war-makers this time have not succeeded in "selling" the war to the American people to the degree that they did in 1917, and we begin to see why it is that President Roosevelt and his aides are treading and speaking softly—but none the less, like the Roosevelt of another day, they carry behind their backs a "big stick," for use on labor. This will explain why it is that William S. Knudsen, within the space of twenty-four hours, completely reversed himself on the question of labor's right to strike. One day he appears before a Senate Committee to deplore any anti-strike legislation; the next day he comes forward with an insidious plan for compulsory "mediation" and a compulsory "cooling-off period" of some six weeks, in the case of any industrial controversy.

One day the President in his press conference puts forth a feeler with regard to a "labor board" for the settlement of disputes, and this brings a dutiful response from William Green and his fellow executives. Green, like Hillman and Dubinsky, is all for "voluntarily" giving up the right to strike, for the sake of "national unity" and "defense." *But the workers continue to demonstrate in mounting strike action their repudiation of the policy of the class-collaborationist leaders.* Then the fascist-minded Secretary of the Navy Knox proceeds to take the bull by the horns, and proposes the "freezing" of wages in the navy yards, and by implication in the defense setup as a whole. This, while the cost of living is constantly mounting, and the real wages of the workers are falling, with inflation just around the corner.

Nevertheless, out of all this fumbling on the part of the Administration-Wall Street forces—a fumbling that is more apparent than real; for there is distinct method to their madness—there emerges the one clearly defined purpose: to outlaw labor's weapon, the strike, and to break the backbone of the American trade-union movement. The groundwork for such an assault on labor's rights has been long and carefully laid. The Chief Executive has dropped his veiled threats and innuendoes, as the reactionaries in Congress bided their time.

Meanwhile, Attorney-General Jackson's men have been busy. Not only have they prosecuted and jailed trade union leaders; but now and again, in learned law reviews not meant for the public eye, the Attorney-General's aides and other of the best legal brains which the capitalist class possesses have revealed the exact far-reaching character of this conspiracy, which looks to a "work-or-fight" mobilization of labor at such a wage as the fat profit-takers may see fit to give.

What is important for American labor to realize is that even these legal fine points may be dispensed with under the Lend-Lease Act, with its broad, sweeping dictatorial powers for the President. Under this Act the chief executive is definitely given the power to forbid strikes

and to break them by military means.

Yes, there can be no doubt about it: the Administration, the reactionaries in Congress, and the big business forces that are behind it all are definitely resolved to abolish labor's right to strike, as a prelude to or accompaniment of the plunging of the American people into the ghastly imperialist slaughter in behalf of the expansionist designs of American imperialism and for the greater profit of Wall Street and of Wall Street's "ally," the Bank of England.

In resisting this conspiracy of the warmongers, the long-range objective of which is the complete enslavement of their class, American workers must vigilantly guard their major weapon. That is the weapon which the Philadelphia carpenters found and used in 1791.

Let the workers, then, arise and declare, in the deep full-throated voice of a united labor movement, one that shall echo from the White House and Capitol Hill to the inmost board of directors' room in Wall Street:

To strike, to organize, to protect the living standards of the working people, to safeguard its hard-won gains, is labor's sacred right, and nothing shall ever deprive American labor of this right.

PHILOSOPHERS OF CAPITALISM IN DECAY

BY FRANK MEYER

AN EXAMINATION of American thought during the epoch of imperialism will show that one philosophical position lies at the root of all the ideologies of American capitalism, whatever their form, "liberal," "conservative," or just plain reactionary. It will reveal the reason why the spokesmen of bourgeois ideology see eye to eye at critical moments when the basic interests of capitalism are threatened. It will help explain the ease with which the Lewis Mumfords, the Malcolm Cowleys and the *New Republics* of 1940 have followed the Walter Lippmanns of 1917 from the liberal camp into support of the imperialist war.

The Philosophy of American Imperialism

That philosophical position includes all the varieties of the broad trend which, for the sake of an inclusive name, I shall in this article call "pragmatism-positivism"—pragmatism, instrumentalism, Neo-Kantianism, positivism proper, logical positivism, operationalism, etc.

It is and has been in America for decades the world outlook congenial not only to big business and its "liberal" apologists, but also to Social-Democracy and the Gompers-Green labor bureaucracy. Among its leading exponents are supporters of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism like John Dewey and his satellite, Sidney Hook.

It is in America that this philosophical position has had its most widespread acceptance and its fullest development. However, not in America alone, but wherever imperialism holds sway, the pragmatist-positivist philosophy has its vogue. The particular brand known as Neo-Kantianism, with all its subdivisions, has been widely accepted by European Social-Democracy, as it was by the revisionists in Russian Social-Democracy against whom Lenin wrote his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Likewise, Mussolini himself attests the great influence which pragmatism played in the development of his fascist ideology, in one place directly acknowledging his debt to William James.

There are two main currents of this philosophical tendency, what can be called the "positivist" and the "pragmatic-instrumentalist," the one primarily European in its origin,

the other primarily American. Both spring from the philosophical positions of David Hume and Immanuel Kant.

The positivist current, beginning with the original positivist, Auguste Comte, is continued in the 19th century by the Neo-Kantians, Mach, Avenarius, etc., and in the 20th century by the "realistic" philosophy of, for example, Bertrand Russell and the "logical positivism" of Wittgenstein and the "Vienna circle" of Carnap, Neurath, etc.

The American school, the pragmatic current, begins with Peirce and William James and is continued in the form of "instrumentalism" by John Dewey and his followers. Among the offshoots and popularizers of these theories, influenced by both currents of the pragmatist-positivist stream, are such men as the "operationalist" Professor Bridgman, the psychiatrist Korzybski, and such writers on social questions as Thurman Arnold, Jerome Frank, and Stuart Chase.

It is the aim of this article to consider the fundamental position which is common to all of these trends, to bare its idealism, its anti-scientific, anti-Marxist character, and to show its role as an ideological weapon of reactionary, dying capitalism—imperialism.

Idealism or Materialism?

The decisive question, the answer to which is the criterion of the truth of any philosophy, is

". . . that concerning the relation of thinking and being. . . .

"The answers which the philosophers gave to this question split them into two great camps. Those who asserted the primacy of spirit to nature and, therefore, in the last instance, assumed world creation in some form or other . . . comprised the camp of idealism. The others, who regarded nature as primary, belong to the various schools of materialism." (Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach.* International Publishers, New York, 1935, pp. 30-31.)

The position of Marxism-Leninism, the science of society, and the position of all scientists in their scientific work (as distinguished from the idealistic nonsense some of them utter as academic philosophers) is

". . . that matter, nature, being, is an objective reality existing outside and independent of our mind; that matter is primary, since it is the source of sensations, ideas, mind, and that mind is secondary, derivative, since it is a reflection of matter, a reflection of being; that thought is a product of matter which in its development has reached a high degree of perfection, namely, of the brain, and the brain is the organ of thought; and that therefore one cannot separate thought from matter without committing a grave error." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* International Publishers, 1939, p. 112.)

The correctness of this position is proved by every advance of natural and social science. The contrary position, the idealist world outlook, has been driven from retreat to retreat with every development of scientific thought. Today idealists are forced to find new and obscure ways of "reconciling" scientific ad-

vance with its antagonistic opposite —idealism.

Motivated by the desire of preserving idealism—in one form or another — the positivist-pragmatist "schools of thought" emerged to save the world from materialism. The destruction of materialism becomes ever more necessary to the bourgeoisie as that class fights against the historical necessity that spells its doom. Science, dialectical materialism, which correctly understands the direction of social movement, is an invincible weapon in the hands of the working class. It gives that class the consciousness of its task—the transformation of the capitalist world into a socialist world.

Idealism gives the bourgeoisie material blessing, materialism a picture of its doom. While materialism portrays the true state of affairs, idealism turns away from reality.

The key question by which the pragmatic-positivist school must be judged is the one posed by Engels—the relation of being and thought. That question is just as basic today as it was when Lenin exposed the positivists of 1908.

". . . Behind the mass of new terminological devices, behind the litter of erudite scholasticism, we invariably discerned *two* principal alignments, two fundamental trends in the solution of philosophical problems. Whether nature, matter, the physical, the external world be taken as primary, and mind, spirit, sensation (experience—as the widespread terminology of our time has it), the psychical, etc., be regarded as secondary—that is the root question which *in fact* continues to divide the philosophers into *two great camps*. The source of thousands upon thousands of mistakes and of the confusion reigning in this sphere is the fact that beneath the envelope of terms, definitions, scholastic devices and verbal artifices, these two fundamental trends are *overlooked*. . . . The verbal nature of such attempts, the scholastic play with new philosophical 'isms,' the clogging of the issue by pretentious devices, the inability to comprehend and clearly present the struggle between the two fundamental epistemological [pertaining to theory of knowledge]trends—this is what Marx and Engels persistently pursued and combatted throughout their entire activity." ("Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," Lenin, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, Vol. XI, pp. 385-86.)

The pragmatist-positivists, despite their trumpeting about "scientific objectivity" and "anti-dogmatic struggle against metaphysics," merely try to deck out idealism with new finery.

Not having the courage to admit this, they hold that the struggle between idealism and materialism is meaningless, that it is anachronistic metaphysics.

This position is clearly stated by Carnap:

"It is true that we reject the thesis of the Reality of the physical world; but we do not reject it as false, but as having no sense, and its Idealistic *anti*-thesis is subject to exactly the same objection. We neither assert nor deny these theses, we reject the whole question." (Ru-

dolf Carnap, *Philosophy and Logical Syntax*. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London, 1935, pp. 20-21.)

Rejecting all propositions affirming the independent existence of a material world, Carnap holds that these propositions have no sense. He is concerned only with "sentences," the statements made by human beings about their experience. Objective reality can have no meaning for reason. His position is the portal for the religionist to enter. The latter would say: "Carnap is correct. This question of objective reality can be answered, not by finite reason, but only by faith which comes from divine revelation."

This denial that we can *know* objective reality, the affirmation that *all* we know is "our experience" or our conceptual operations, ends in subjective idealism.

Our knowledge is based on experience *of* the material world, on human practice *in* the material world, which enables us to understand, to reflect the world existing outside ourselves.

This process of reflection and action is not what the pragmatist-positivists mean by experience. They mean by experience a process abstracted from objective reality and regarded *as itself the object of knowledge.*

Considering conceptions, ideas, as simply the reflection of experience, operations, the pragmatist-positivist limits existence to that of which we are conscious. As Lenin points out, this denies what natural science has proved—the earth's existence outside of and before human experience.

Since, for the pragmatist-positivist, "experience" is the criterion of truth, then the mystic's experience (!) of God is as true as the experience that water boils under normal conditions at 212°F. In fact, this is precisely what William James affirms:

"On pragmatistic principles, if the hypothesis of God works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true . . . experience shows that it certainly does work, . . ." (William James, *Pragmatism,* Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, 1916, p. 299.)

One "advantage" of this rejection of the material world and acceptance of experience as the only reality is that one can be tautological without shame. The operationalist Bridgman is pleased with this "philosophical" device:

"For if experience is always described in terms of experience, there must always be correspondence between experience and our description of it, and we need never be embarrassed. . . ." (*Logic of Modern Physics,* Macmillan, New York, 1927, p. 6.

Here we arrive at the *inevitable outcome of any non-materialist world outlook,* no matter how disguised—that anything is true for it which the subject accepts as true, either today or tomorrow.

As Dewey says:

"The best definition of *truth* from

the logical standpoint which is known to me is that of Peirce: 'The opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate is what we mean by the truth, and the object represented by this opinion is the real.' " (*Logic, the Theory of Inquiry,* Henry Holt, New York, 1938, p. 345.)

For Dewey and Peirce objective reality is not objective truth. Truth is dependent on subjectivity. If, according to this doctrine, the learned doctors of the Middle Ages who investigated the nature of demons and witches were agreed as to their findings, the truth of the existence of demons and witches was established. The objection might be raised, however, that these findings were not "ultimately" established. But this objection implies that no truth has yet been established, since the world is still unfinished business, as the pragmatists love to state. However, pragmatists put their own time-limitations upon the word *ultimately,* as we saw in the case of William James with his hypothesis of God working so satisfactorily. Clearly, behind the Dewey-Peirce pose of objectivity, there slinks about the discredited spectre of subjective idealism.

Carnap, pretending to be more scientific about the question of objective truth, differs only in form from the pragmatists. Thus, he says:

"If in natural philosophy, we deal, for instance, with the structure of space and time, then we are occupied in fact with the syntactical analysis of the rules which determine the formation or transformation of space-and-time expressions. . . . The question: 'Has space a Euclidean or a non-Euclidean structure?' becomes . . . 'Are the syntactical rules according to which from certain distances others can be calculated, of the Euclidean type or of one of the non-Euclidean types?' " (Cited work, p. 85.)

Carnap's position is really that of denying that space is a material structure and that our thoughts must conform to this structure. He subtly maintains that space and time are nothing but convenient syntactical rules, that is, mental constructs. However "modern" and "scientific" Carnap's procedure seems to be, it is at one with pragmatism in being nothing but the old subjective idealism, adulterated to suit the two contradictory needs of the bourgeoisie—the affirmation of science for profit and the rejection of science as a menace to the profit system. Carnap's special nuance but illustrates Lenin's statement:

". . . Thousands of shades of varieties of philosophical idealism are possible and it is always possible to create a thousand and first shade; and to the author of this thousand and first little system (empiriomonism, for example) what distinguishes it from the rest may appear to be momentous. From the standpoint of materialism, however, these distinctions are absolutely unessential. What is essential is the point of departure. What is essential is that the attempt to *think* of motion without matter smuggles in *thought* divorced from matter—and that is philosophical idealism." (Cited work, p. 324.)

The test of the truth of a concept varies in the different currents of the pragmatic-positivist school. But none takes the material world as the starting point of our concepts which reflect, on the basis of human practice, the material world and whose truth is verified by practice.

The pragmatic - instrumentalist school exploits the idea of "practice" which in one way or another is put forward as the test of truth. This stress on the word *practice* has misled some intellectuals into seeing a similarity to the Marxist position, stated nearly a hundred years ago in the second thesis on Feuerbach:

"The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. In practice man must prove the truth, *i.e.*, the reality and power, the 'this-sidedness' of his thinking. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking which is isolated from practice is a purely scholastic question." (Engels, cited work, p. 73.)

Compare this statement with Dewey's definition of truth quoted above; or with William James' statement: "'The true,' to put it very briefly, is only the expedient in the way of our thinking. . . ." (Cited work, p. 222); or, as he puts it elsewhere, "that ideas . . . become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relation with other parts of our experience" (*Ibid.*, p. 58)—that a belief is true if it works.

It is clear that the pragmatic position and the Marxist demand for the proving of the objective truth of our ideas in practice are in fact worlds apart. For the Marxist, concepts are tested by human practice, *which proves whether they adequately reflect the objective material world.* Ideas, as Lenin pointed out, work in practice *because* they are true, *because* they reflect the material world. The pragmatist adopts a diametrically opposed position: *our ideas are true because they work for us.* And the criterion of workability is our own subjectivity.

So long as an idea works for me it is true. On this basis there is no way of choosing between, let us say, the Marxist theory of value and the bourgeois apologist's theory of marginal utility. Since it is useful to the ideological flunkeys of the bourgeoisie to deny the Marxist theory of value, that theory is untrue. This is a convenient philosophy for the exploiters.

Lenin brushed aside the verbal cobwebs spun by pragmatism, with the following remark:

". . . Knowledge can be useful biologically, useful in human practice, useful for the preservation of life, for the preservation of the species, only when it reflects an objective truth independent of man." (Cited work, p. 202.)

And Engels showed how human, material, scientific practice is the answer to all forms of surreptitious idealism, including pragmatism, which has a close affinity with Kantianism:

". . . The most telling refutation of this as of all other philosophical

fancies is practice, *viz.*, experiment and industry. If we are able to prove the correctness of our conception of a natural process by making it ourselves, bringing it into being out of its conditions and using it for our own purposes into the bargain, then there is an end of the Kantian incomprehensible 'thing-in-itself.' The chemical substances produced in the bodies of plants and animals remained just such 'things-in-themselves' until organic chemistry began to produce them one after another, whereupon the 'thing-in-itself' becomes a thing for us, as, for instance, alizarin, the coloring matter of the madder, which we no longer trouble to grow in the madder roots in the field, but produce much more cheaply and simply from coal tar. For three hundred years the Copernican solar system was an hypothesis with a hundred, a thousand, or ten thousand chances to one in its favor, but still always an hypothesis. But when Leverrier, by means of the data provided by this system, not only deduced the necessity of the existence of an unknown planet, but also calculated the position in the heavens which this planet must necessarily occupy, and when Galle really found this planet, the Copernican system was proved. If, nevertheless, the Neo-Kantians are attempting to resurrect the Kantian conception in Germany and the agnostics that of Hume in England (where in fact it had never ceased to survive), this is—in view of their theoretical and practical refutation accomplished long ago—scientifically a regression and practically merely a shame-faced way of surreptitiously accepting materialism, while denying it before the world." (Engels, cited work, pp. 32-33.)

In practice, all men, if they are to live a day, must act as materialists, that is, as human beings. Otherwise, they would neither eat nor love, nor avoid being hit by an automobile the first time they stepped out in the street; and all scientists when they enter the laboratory acknowledge thereby that the things with which they deal are real things that exist materially and objectively.

The Relative Becomes an Absolute

But the pragmatist-positivists maintain that the assumption of a material world involves the dogma of a metaphysical absolute. This specious contention is based on a metaphysical contrast between relative and absolute. A few words on this point are necessary.

Marxism denies a fixed and final absolute principle, eternally valid for a static universe. It shows that all that is, is in motion, in constant change, in contradiction; that the human brain, matter with the specific quality of thinking, of reflecting the rest of the material world, proceeds constantly to turn the unknown into the known. It shows further that our knowledge is historically conditioned and to that degree relative; but within the limits of that historical conditioning, scientific concepts proved in practice are absolutely true. The geometry of Euclid was and remains absolutely true *within certain limits* of terrestrial human practice. The discovery of non-Euclidean geometry is a further approximation, absolutely true within wider limits on the basis of a further developed

human technology and practice. Far from turning Euclidean geometry into absolute untruth, and from "proving" that all science is "purely relative," it is a more adequate reflection of a reality now known to be wider than Euclid conceived. It is thus a closer approximation to objective, absolute truth, the deepening of our knowledge from essence to deeper essence.

Thus, Lenin wrote:

". . . the *limits* of approximation of our knowledge to the objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the existence of such truth is *unconditional,* and the fact that we are approaching nearer to it is also unconditional. The contours of the picture are historically conditional, but the fact that this picture depicts an objectively existing model is unconditional. When and under what circumstances we reached, in our knowledge of the essential nature of things, the discovery of alizarin in coal tar or the discovery of electrons in the atom is historically conditional; but that every such discovery is an advance of 'absolutely objective knowledge' is unconditional. In a word, every ideology is historically conditional, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology), there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature. You will say that this distinction between relative and absolute truth is indefinite. And I shall reply: yes, it is sufficiently 'indefinite' to prevent science from becoming a dogma in the bad sense of the term, from becoming something dead, frozen, ossified; but it is at the same time sufficiently 'definite' to enable us to dissociate ourselves in the most emphatic and irrevocable manner from fideism [faith-ism, mysticism] and agnosticism, from philosophical idealism and the sophistry of the followers of Hume and Kant. . . . Relativism as the basis of the theory of knowledge is not only the recognition of the relativity of our knowledge but also a denial of any objective measure or model existing independently of humanity to which our relative knowledge approximates. . . . The materialist dialectics of Marx and Engels certainly does contain relativism, but is not reducible to relativism, that is, it recognizes the relativity of all our knowledge, not in the sense of the denial of objective truth, but in the sense of the historically conditional nature of the limits of the approximation of our knowledge of this truth." *(Cited work,* pp. 198-99).

The Philosophical Struggle Is Part of the Class Struggle

The struggle on the philosophical front is a partisan struggle. It has been and remains the struggle between the capitalist class and the working class; between reactionary and misleading idealism and revolutionary, scientific dialectical materialism. This is the meaning behind all the word-play of pragmatism, logical positivism, instrumentalism, operationalism, which are nothing but rehashings of discredited idealism in the service of capitalism. As Lenin wrote in 1908:

". . . behind the epistemological scholasticism of empirio-criticism [one of the schools of positivism

which flourished thirty years ago] it is impossible not to see the struggle of parties in philosophy, a struggle which in the last analysis reflects the tendencies and ideology of the antagonistic classes in modern society. Recent philosophy is as partisan as was philosophy two thousand years ago. The contending parties essentially, although concealed by a pseudo-erudite quackery of new terms or by a feeble-minded non-partisanship, are materialism and idealism. The latter is merely a subtle, refined form of fideism, which stands fully armed, commands vast organizations and steadily continues to exercise influence on the masses, turning the slightest vacillation in philosophical thought to its own advantage. The objective, class role played by empirio-criticism entirely consists in rendering faithful service to the fideists in their struggle against materialism in general and historical materialism in particular." (Cited work, p. 406.)

SPACE AND TIME—FORMS OF THE EXISTENCE OF MATTER

BY GEORGE KURSANOV

THE universe is matter in motion. Matter and motion are inseparable. There is no matter without motion as there is no motion without matter. Moving matter exists in space and time.

"There is nothing in the world but matter in motion, and matter in motion cannot move otherwise than in space and time." (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* International Publishers, New York. Vol. XI, p. 236.)

Space and time are the objectively real forms of the existence of matter. Their existence is not dependent either on man's conceptions of them or on his methods of measuring them. Their properties are conditioned solely and exclusively by objectively existing matter.

Space and time are closely interrelated. Matter cannot move in space only or in time only. The unity of time and space is manifested immediately in the motion of the material world. The divorcing of time and space is but a metaphysical attempt to destroy the oneness and indissolubility of matter which exists always and everywhere both in space and in time.

These are some of the most general conceptions of dialectical materialism about space and time. They are the generalization of the development of this problem both in natural science and in philosophy. They are the results of a stern struggle against idealistic as well as metaphysical-materialist doctrines, which appeared in the past and continue to appear in our own day.

1. The Problem of Space and Time in Metaphysical Materialism and Idealistic Philosophy

Let us begin by examining the idealistic and metaphysical theories of time and space.

The metaphysical - materialistic theory of space goes back to Democritus.

Democritus regards matter as the fundamental principle of the universe, matter in the form of particles, indivisible and without qualities—atoms, existing and moving in an absolute Void. Atoms and the Void are to him the prime principle of the universe. All else exists only in opinion.

"Since all the atoms are minute bodies, they have no qualities, and the void is a kind of place in which

all these bodies, as they move up and down through all time, either become somehow entangled with each other, or collide and rebound, and they separate and mix again with each other by reason of such contacts, and in this way produce all other combinations including our own bodies with their affections and sensations." (M. C. Nahm, editor, *Selections from Early Greek Philosophy*, Crofts, 1934, p. 173.)

Atoms, being integral and dense, are conceived by Democritus as material, in distinction to the Void, the non-material (in the physical sense) space.

Democritus thus disunites matter and space, conceiving the two to be opposed to each other: matter as being, and space (the Void) as non-being.

However, the Void is, according to Democritus, necessary for the motion of the atoms. ". . . motion exists because of the Void." (*Ibid.*, p. 175.) It is in this connection that Democritus' Void ceases to be mere fiction, sheer non-entity, and assumes definite meaning. In his opinion, the Void "has a certain nature and its own essence." Democritus asserts that the Void "is no less actual than body." From this follows his extremely important thesis: space is a reality and is the condition for the motion of material bodies.

Space, according to Democritus, is infinite:

"An infinite number of worlds exist in the infinite Void and . . . they take form out of an infinite number of atoms." The atoms sweep "in an infinite void which has neither highest, lowest, middle, farthest, nor limit." (*Ibid*, p. 174.)

Democritus deduces the infinity of space from the infinity of matter. It is impossible, he holds, to conceive an infinite number of worlds existing in finite, limited space. The recognition of the infinity of space constitutes unquestionably a tremendous contribution on the part of that great Greek materialist. There is no place in his conception for a transcendental world or for transcendental forces, and the properties of space are determined immediately by the properties of matter.

Democritus' conception of the nature of time is known to us only from the testimony of Aristotle. According to Democritus, time exists eternally; it is without origin and is not transitory; it has neither beginning nor end. This signifies recognition of the objective existence of time and of its eternity. On the other hand, time in Democritus' conception is unrelated to space, as also to the motion of matter. This constitutes the metaphysical aspect of Democritus' conception of time.

Thus, in his ideas of space and time, Democritus takes a materialist position: space and time exist objectively and are, moreover, infinite. But his materialism is metaphysical: space and time are detached from matter and from each other; they are represented as self-existent realities, independent of matter and separated from it.

* * *

Atomism was again espoused by Gassendi, in the seventeenth century. He asserted the objective

existence of space, but he conceived it as motionless, insubstantial, and unrelated to matter. This conception was challenged by Descartes.

The philospohy of Descartes is dualistic. Descartes conceives two distinct substances: the spiritual and the corporeal. These substances are independent of each other. Each possesses its own specific attributes (general inalienable properties) and its own modes (properties through which substance manifests itself).

In his conception of space Descartes is a materialist. He relates space to the attributes of the corporeal, material substance.

Cartesian space is inseparably connected with material bodies, this connection being thus established: the fundamental attribute of corporeal (material) substance is extension, which is conceived as extension in space; thus, space is in essence undifferentiated from the material substance. "Space or internal place and the corporeal substance which is contained in it, are not different otherwise than in the mode in which they are conceived by us. For, in truth, the same extension in length, breadth, and depth, which constitutes space, constitutes body...." (*The Philosophical Works of Descartes*, translated by Elizabeth S. Haldane and G. R. T. Ross, Cambridge, England, 1931, Vol. I, p. 259.) The difference between the extension of individual bodies and that of space in general is but the difference between the particular and the general.

Descartes denies the existence of empty space:

"As regards a vacuum in the philosophic sense of the word, *i.e.*, a space in which there is no substance, it is evident that such cannot exist, because the extension of space or internal place, is not different from that of body." (*Ibid.*, p. 262.)

He makes clear the necessity for distinguishing between the apparentness of "empty" space—like an "empty" pitcher which is not filled with water or a cargo ship which is not loaded with the cargo—from the real essence of "empty" space which is always filled with one or another material substance, a material medium.

Cartesian space is a general property of extended material bodies, manifesting itself in close connection with them. It is material space.

Cartesian space is illimitable. "This world, or the totality of corporeal substance, is extended without limit. . . ." (*Ibid., p. 264.*) Beyond the imagined boundaries of space, other, illimitable, spaces may exist. Matter has illimitable and objective extension; space, too, is illimitably extended. Descartes' denial of empty space is connected with the limitless divisibility of matter in depth (hence, also of spatial extension). Descartes thus takes issue with the atomistic conceptions.

Descartes' conception of space is materialistic. His idea of the inseparable connection between space and matter was very fruitful. But he went beyond the idea of the inseparable unity of matter and space, incorrectly assuming their identity —an extreme which was the opposite to the extreme of Democritus, but equally metaphysical.

Time, in the Cartesian conception, differs in principle from space; it is separated not only from space but also from matter. Time is related to the spiritual substance; it is represented as a mode of thought: "Thus time . . . which we describe as the measure of movement, is only a mode of thinking. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 242.) The spiritual substance is separated from the material, and time is the mode of the former, whence follows the separation of time from matter, from (the objective) motion of material bodies. This is an idealistic conception of the nature of time and a metaphysical separation of space from time and time from matter. Descartes' conjecture about duration as a mode of things remains only a guess which becomes insignificant in relation to his assertion of time as a mode of thought.

* * *

Newton's ideas of space and time were formed in the struggle against the Cartesian concepts, and they became the foundation of classical physics.

Space and time exist objectively, according to Newton, and their existence is in no way dependent on man's conception of them. This is the materialistic aspect of Newton's theory.

However, Newton's materialism is metaphysical. He views matter as independent of space and time, which are separated from it and exist independently, isolated from matter and each other. The motion of matter proceeds independently of space and time, apart from them. Newton states:

"I. Absolute, true, and mathematical time, of itself, and from its own nature flows equably without relation to anything external, and by another name is called duration. . . .

"II. Absolute space, in its own nature without relation to anything external remains always similar and immovable." (Sir Isaac Newton, *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy,* translated by Andrew Motte in 1929, revised by Florian Cajori, University of California Press, 1934, p. 6.)

Newton differentiates absolute, true, space and time from the relative, the apparent. Through our senses we can comprehend only relative space and time. Cognition of absolute space and time is possible only through philosophy and mathematical science.

Newtonian space is empty space divorced from matter. Motion of matter proceeds in empty space devoid of all materiality. The motion of one body proceeds not with respect to other bodies but with respect to empty (absolute) space. Newton writes of the possibility of the motion of the spheres, "of this circular motion, even in an immense vacuum, where there was nothing external or sensible with which the globes could be compared." (*Ibid.*, p. 12.) He conceives the motion of the celestial bodies as proceeding in empty (absolute) space, which offers no resistance to it; for which reason the planets move in their regular orbits.

"Bodies projected in our air suf-

fer no resistance but from the air. Withdraw the air, as is done in Mr. Boyle's vacuum, and the resistance ceases; for in this void a bit of fine down and a piece of solid gold descend with equal velocity. And the same argument must apply to the celestial spaces above the earth's atmosphere; in these spaces, where there is no air to resist their motions, all bodies will move with the greatest freedom; and the planets and comets will constantly pursue their revolutions in orbits given in kind and position, according to the laws above explained. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 543.)

Newton regarded gravitation as remote action through empty space (*actio in distans*). He declined to indicate the cause of the gravitational force, since he could not infer it from observations and, he said, "*Hypotheses non fingo*" (I frame no hypotheses). It must be pointed out that although Newton assumed the existence of "a very fine ether" permeating all bodies, he restricted this assumption exclusively to solid bodies, electrified bodies, the bodies of animal organisms, and to certain phenomena of light; therefore it did not imply the idea that space is filled with matter.

Thus, as a whole, the Newtonian conception of space and time is metaphysical-materialist. The metaphysical character of Newton's materialism led him to assume the existence of active forces independent of matter which he conceived as inert; these forces are the source of all motion of matter. Thus, Newton was led to the assumption of a divine initial impulse without which the universe could not have originated. Space in this "consistent" theory becomes, as Newton termed it, "the sensorium of God." His metaphysical materialism led Newton to idealism and religion.

* * *

The idealistic conception of space and time, in its most consistent form, was developed by Kant.

Space and time constitute the foundation and content of Kant's transcendental aesthetic which is "the science of all the principles of sensibility a priori." Space and time represent "two pure forms of sensuous intuition, as principles of knowledge a priori." (Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, translated by Meiklejohn, New York, 1899, p. 22.) In this general definition, space and time appear as a priori, abstract forms of pure, *i.e.*, inner, subjective intuition. Therein is manifest the unqualified subjective idealism of Kant.

Kantian space is a priori, separated from the things-in-themselves. It exists only as a pure sensuous intuition of the subject and not in the things-in-themselves.

"Now, how," asks Kant, "can an external intuition anterior to objects themselves, and in which our conception of objects can be determined *a priori*, exist in the human mind? Obviously not otherwise than in so far as it has its seat in the subject only. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 25.)

And further:

"1. Space does not represent any property of objects as things in

themselves, nor does it represent them in their relations to each other; in other words, space does not represent to us any determination of objects such as attaches to the objects themselves. . . .

"2. Space is nothing else than the form of all phenomena of the external sense, that is, the subjective condition of the sensibility, under which alone external intuition is possible." (*Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.)

Time, like space, is a representation within our mind, our internal sense and intuition:

"1. Time is not something which subsists of itself, or which inheres in things as an objective determination. . . .

"2. Time is nothing else than the form of the internal sense, that is, of the intuitions of self and of our internal state." (*Ibid.*, p. 30.)

Kant's conception of space and time, as a whole, is subjective-idealist; space and time are a priori forms of representation of the subject.

Kant states that he does not deny the empirical reality of space and time; he only denies that they can be given to us as the objects of our senses. Thus, although in an inverted form, Kant's subjective idealism but reaffirms itself in this statement.

The infinity of the Kantian space and time follows from the fact that in our original conceptions of them they are postulated as unlimited. This attribute is thus antecedently given as existing a priori, which is naturally connected with the entire Kantian a priori conception of space and time.

* * *

The various conceptions of space and time which were developed by Mach and the whole school of empirio-criticism are also subjective and idealistic.

Space and time are interpreted by empirio-criticism as the subjective representations of man, as completely conditioned by the system of sensations of the subject; they have no objective, real existence.

In his *Mechanics,* Mach writes: "Space and time are well-ordered systems of sets of sensations." (Ernst Mach, *The Science of Mechanics,* translated by T. J. McCormack, Chicago, 1893, p. 506.)

Lenin comments on this as follows:

"This is palpable idealist nonsense, such as inevitably follows from the doctrine that bodies are complexes of sensations. According to Mach it is not man with his sensations that exists in space and time, but space and time that exist in man, that depend upon man and are generated by man." (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. XI, p. 238.)

Elsewhere Mach writes that "time and space are interdependences of physical elements." (Ernst Mach, *Erkenntnis und Irrtum,* Leipzig, 1926, p. 434.) Since, according to Mach, the "elements" are sensations, therefore, here again, time and space are the sum total of various combinations of our sensations and not the objective forms of matter existing in reality.

Mach goes so far as to speak of the existence of chemical elements, atoms and elements, outside of real, three-dimensional space. He writes that "we need not necessarily represent to ourselves molecular-processes spatially, at least not of three dimensions." (Ernst Mach, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy,* translated by P. E. B. Jourdain, Chicago, 1911, p. 86.)

He further states:

"When, however, we operate with purely abstract things, such as atoms and molecules, which by their nature *cannot be disclosed to our senses,* we have no longer any right necessarily to think of these things in relationships, in relative positions which conform to Euclidean three-dimensional space. . . ." (*Erkenntnis und Irrtum,* p. 418.)

Lenin says in this connection:

"If Mach is entitled to seek atoms of electricity, or atoms in general, *outside* three-dimensional space, why should the majority of mankind not be entitled to seek the atoms, or the foundations of morals, *outside* three-dimensional space?" (V. I. Lenin, *cited place,* p. 242.)

Truly, it is but one step from such Machian reasoning to spiritualism.

The views on space and time of the other exponents of empirio-criticism were not distinguished by originality.

Poincaré: Space and time are the conceptions which "we . . . impose . . . upon nature because we find them convenient." (Henri Poincaré, *The Foundations of Science,* translated by G. B. Halsted, New York, 1913, p. 207.)

Pearson: "Of time as of space we cann t assert a real existence: it is not in things but is our mode of perceiving them." And further: "Space and time are not realities of the phenomenal world, but the modes under which we perceive things apart. They are not infinitely large nor infinitely divisible, but are essentially limited by the contents of our perceptions." (Karl Pearson, *The Grammar of Science,* London, 1900, pp. 184, 191.)

Bogdanov: Concerning space, the same deduction must be made as concerning time: it is "a form of social coordination of the experiences of different people." (A. Bogdanov, *Empirio-Monism,* Book I, p. 26, Russian.)

However different in form, the subjective-idealist point of view is common to all these speculations concerning time and space. According to exponents of this school, space and time are fictions created by our senses and possess no reality.

Lenin points out:

"The mutability of human conceptions of space and time no more refutes the objective reality of space and time than the mutability of scientific knowledge of the structure and forms of matter in motion refutes the objective reality of the external world." (*Cited place,* p. 236.)

It is precisely on this point that many of the empirio-criticists became utterly confused (Mach and Poincaré above all), assuming that the relativity of our knowledge of space and time could be taken as proof that we ourselves ascribe to nature our conceptions which we

establish and construct arbitrarily. Lenin points out that Machism leads to the rejection of the cognition of space and time as the objective forms of the material world.

The sterility of Machism can be illustrated by the following example: Considering the question of three-dimensional space, Poincaré declines to determine the objective dimensions (the number of dimensions) of space. The three-dimensional character of space is conditioned, according to Poincaré, by the fact that our sensations group themselves in three categories and the human mind selects among the spaces of various dimensions:

"It is mind which constructs it . . . it may choose, for instance, between space of four and space of three dimensions." (*Foundations of Science*, p. 276.)

Machism is at a loss. It cannot solve the question of the objective dimensional character of space. In this, Machism further evidences its reactionary idealistic nature.

[*This is the first of three instalments constituting an essay that appeared in the Soviet periodical* Pod Znamieniem Marxizma (*"Under the Banner of Marxism") for June, 1940, which is published here for its valuable scientific interest. The source references in this translation are given by us. The concluding two sections of the essay will appear in the May and June issues of* The Communist.—*The Editor.*]