

WORKERS AGE

A PAPER DEFENDING THE INTERESTS OF WORKERS AND FARMERS

Vol. V No. 4.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 1936

Five Cents

At First GLANCE

By JAY LOVESTONE

AS THE BROWDER-THOMAS debate-circus continues to roll over the country, it becomes evermore evident that its elements of tragedy will increasingly overshadow those of farce.

Exhibit II at Cleveland brought us to this conclusion. And why? Here, at last, Thomas unequivocally declared himself against the united front with the Communists. For once, the peerless leader abandoned shadow-boxing. He opened his mouth, spoke his mind, and bared his heart in this fashion: "You still have a lack of freedom in Russia to discuss the united front as we do here. We are greatly handicapped in talking about civil liberties here, while in Russia there is still a dictatorship of the top, a dictatorship of a party over the workers."

This is no petty inner organizational excuse for momentarily postponing a united front with Communists. Thomas deserves our thanks for no longer hiding behind strategic considerations of his war on Waldman in his refusal to enter into such a united front. In his aforementioned statement the "militant" standard-bearer declares his opposition to the united front on the basis of a very serious political objection. Thomas demands nothing more and nothing less than the end of the proletarian dictatorship (which he either doesn't understand or slanders) in the U.S.S.R.; he demands its replacement by a bourgeois democracy—basically along the lines of the one now gripping the U. S. These prerequisites set by Thomas must be met before he would allow his flock joint action with Browder's official brethren.

This objection to or prerequisites for, a united front with Communist organizations is not new. Thomas is about fourteen years behind the times. The extreme right wing of the world social democracy (Wels, Vandervelde) raised precisely these prerequisites in April 1922—during the united front conference of the Internationals held in Berlin. Today, even these people wouldn't repeat such arguments. At best only a very chill reception would greet Thomas at an International Socialist Congress, if he were to dare make such a proposal there.

However, shocking as this Thomas pronouncement may be, it is really not surprising. It is an accurate gauge of his militancy. What is most tragic in the whole matter is Browder's response to an evaluation of this anti-Soviet fulmination by Thomas. The Daily Worker, January 13th, makes the following revelation: "Speaking on the necessity of immediately establishing the united front, Browder stated that the difference with Norman Thomas since the Madison Square Garden debate have been still further narrowed." We entertain very serious doubts whether Browder knew what he was talking about when he made this reply. In fact, we are sure he didn't understand the full implication of his

(Continued on Page 3)

LABOR PARTY vs. PEOPLE'S FRONT

By WILL HERBERG

Since the seventh congress of the Communist International, the orientation of the American Communist Party on the Labor party question has undergone some sharp changes. Once rejected outright as an "instrument of American imperialism" and then accepted gingerly in a sectarian form, the Labor party is now being hailed as the characteristic American expression of the People's Front. In this way is the United States to be brought into line with the new policy of the Comintern. In this way are the directives of the Seventh Congress to be given specific form in this country.

The slightest consideration, however, will show how utterly false all this is. Not only is the Labor Party not the People's Front under a different guise but, on the contrary, it stands in direct opposition to the latter in its nature, role and purpose. It is, indeed, a measure of the depths of opportunism to which the official C.P. is sinking that it should find it possible not merely to confuse but even to identify two such completely distinct and even mutually exclusive conceptions.

LABOR PARTY IS NOT PEOPLE'S FRONT

The entire meaning of the Labor party slogan is the political separation of the working class from the bourgeoisie. Today the overwhelming majority of the workers remain in the tow of one or the other of the two capitalist parties and are thus no more than voting cattle in the hands of their exploiters and oppressors. To all intents and purposes, the working class as a class has not yet been born politically. The first big step in the revolutionary development of the proletariat is its constitution as a class politically—the road to which, under American conditions, lies thru an independent Labor party in the form of a political federation of trade unions and other labor organizations. Naturally, the effectiveness of such a movement in furthering the class development of the proletariat is conditioned upon its complete independence from the bourgeoisie.*

That is the sense and meaning of the slogan of a Labor party.

Now what is the People's Front, as practised in France and as promulgated in Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland? It is, openly and avowedly, a coalition of working class (socialist and communist) and bourgeois parties. In fact, such a coalition is widely heralded in the official communist press as the real virtue of the People's Front. In France, the partner in the coalition is the Radical party of Herriot, the traditional ruling party of the French bourgeoisie; in Czechoslovakia, the "National-Socialists" of Benes, the present government party; in Germany, the remnants of the Democrats and the Catholic Center of

* In the United States, of course, it is important not only to stimulate the independent class organization of the workers but also to cement a firm class alliance between the workers, on the one hand, and the working farmers, on the other. This, however, can be done only if the working class is itself organized politically in complete independence of the bourgeoisie and its parties.

Bruening. The whole idea of the People's Front is rooted in the time-dishonored and thoroughly discredited social-democratic policy of relying upon the so-called democratic bourgeoisie in the struggle against Fascism. The very essence of the People's Front is a coalition with the democratic bourgeois parties, political class collaboration, in plain unvarnished fact.

What, then, has the Labor party to do with the People's Front? The two stand in diametrical opposition to each other. The fundamental meaning of the Labor party is the class separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie and its parties; the fundamental meaning of the People's Front is the class collaboration of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie thru its democratic parties. The significant outcome of the Labor party is the initiation of the process of political

its entire meaning and power in the political development of the American working class. The words "Labor party" remain, but nothing else! What kind of Labor party is it that includes company unions and even fascist organizations? And yet this is precisely the Labor party that William Z. Foster offers us authoritatively as the American embodiment of the People's Front. Declares Foster (The Communist, October 1935):

"The new mass party of toilers should also include sections of the sprouting fascist or partly fascist organizations and tendencies, such as company unions, American Legion posts and groups of the Coughlin or Long movement, etc."

Less than a year before, the Communist Party, then still in the grip of the ultra-left madness, had contemptuously spurned all forms of the Labor party

low" to the "Labor party" including fascist organizations and company unions! Such is the incredible sweep of the right-about-face in policy and orientation of the C.P. within the last year!

C.P. PREPARES FOR SUPPORT OF ROOSEVELT

With the Labor party as the People's Front, the question of supporting Roosevelt in the coming elections takes on a new and disturbing aspect. For the essential logic of the People's Front policy drives inevitably towards the support of bourgeois government of a democratic cast and, under proper circumstances, to actual coalition with bourgeois parties in such governments. In an article in a recent issue of the Workers Age, I tried to show how the current analysis of the political situation in the United States, developed at and immediately after the seventh congress of the C.I., logically implies support of Roosevelt as the representative of an anti-fascist coalition against the allegedly fascist forces of the Liberty League. Everything that has happened recently confirms this analysis only too well. People are already talking openly of supporting Marcantonio in the next elections when he runs on the Republican ticket. And after all, if you can support Herriot in France, Bruening in Germany, Benes in Czechoslovakia, why strain at Roosevelt in the United States? That the ground is already being prepared for such a turn to Roosevelt is indicated by that brazen declaration of the central committee published in the Daily Worker of January 11, 1936, a statement without a vestige of proletarian or socialist content, an indelible disgrace to any Marxist party.

Perhaps there may be those who will insist that it is certainly stretching things too far even to suspect the C.P. of being capable of such a monstrous repudiation of its own principles as would necessarily be involved in supporting Roosevelt in the next elections. But I am afraid that we cannot view things with such assurance any longer. Recent developments in Europe, coupled with what has been happening in this country in the last six months or so, unfortunately give us every reason to fear that virtually nothing is impossible as the opportunist avalanche gathers momentum. We must not wait for the accomplished fact, when it will be too late; we must raise the voice of warning now, while there is still time.

AGREEMENT IN CONFUSION

It is more than significant that, between the morbid sectarianism of the Trotskyites, on the one hand, and the reckless opportunism of the official C.P., on the other, there exists an inner bond of unity, expressed in the underlying similarity of analysis and estimation. Both the Trotskyites and the C.P. theoreticians envisage the Labor party as merely another name for the People's Front in America. But, whereas the official C.P. uses this alleged identity to justify the People's Front, the Trotskyites use it to condemn the Labor party. With both it is the starting point that is so hopelessly false. The Labor party is not the People's Front. In a fundamental political sense, it is its very opposite.

V. I. LENIN—1870-1924



al class emancipation of the proletariat from bourgeois influence; the significant outcome of the People's Front is the political subordination of the proletariat to the so-called democratic sections of the bourgeoisie. A wider disparity in every important respect could hardly be imagined!

When the Labor party is confused with the People's Front, as it is by the official C.P. today, the slogan is robbed of its entire class content; it is deprived of

except the notorious "Type D": "a Labor party built up from below on a trade union basis but in conflict with the bureaucracy, putting forward a program of demands closely connected with mass struggles, strikes, etc., with the leading role played by the militant elements, including the communists" (resolution of Central Committee, January 18, 1935)! From the one extreme of sectarian sterility to the opposite of opportunist degeneration—from the "Labor party from be-

Zimmerman Rejects Plan of Ransoming Jews From Nazis

Sharp condemnation of the "transfer plan about to be brought to this country by a delegation of three prominent English Jews, Sir Herbert Samuel, Simon Marks and Viscount Birstead, was voiced today in a vigorous statement by Charles S. Zimmerman, head of Dressmakers Union Local 22, I. L. G. W. U., an organization of over 30,000 workers. The statement follows:

In a frantic effort to get out of their desperate economic situation and to break thru the world boycott, the German Hitlerites have concocted a cunning plan truly worthy of the Nazi mind. As it is to be brought to this country by three leading Anglo-Jewish financiers, this plan urges the Jews all over the world to raise a gigantic fund in order to finance the removal of properties Jews from Germany to Palestine by leaving huge credits in the hands of the German government. Otherwise—the Nazi barbarians threaten—they will unleash another, even more frightful campaign of ruthless extermination against the Jews in Germany.

What is this but the brazen demand of the bandit for tribute, of the kidnaper for ransom? The Nazi gangsters have the Jews in their murderous grip and, with utter shamelessness, they call for their blood-money, threatening to let it out on their helpless victims if they are

We Keep a Promise

By JAY LOVESTONE

THIS IS THE LAST issue of the Workers Age—in its present form. Beginning February 1st (the next number) we will be no more—in our present limited space and size.

Though we haven't raised todate more than 25% of the \$5,000 we must secure, yet, we are fulfilling completely and immediately one of three objectives of the campaign. This is a daring venture on our part—to start publishing a bigger—and we hope better—paper. Why such audacity on our part?

The answer is simple: We have faith in you, in your pledge, in your promise. We have a hunch that once you see us keeping our promise ahead of time, you'll do likewise.

More than that: Every penny due to our German comrades, due to the rebuilders of genuine trade unions in the Hitler Reich, has been rushed over by us—the quota for underground Germany is still very far from complete.

So the line we hew to is clear to all: No empty promises.

refused. In this way Hitler hopes to save the tottering German economy from approaching disaster. In this way he hopes to get the Jews themselves to undermine the boycott against Germany and to supply him with the credits he needs to save the Nazi regime from impending ruin!

But how about the Jews, in Germany as well as in the rest of the world? How about the workers? What will this insidious plan mean for them? As a method of saving the Jews of Germany, it is worse than futile. To the vast mass of propertless Jews, it can bring no relief whatsoever, while the Jews as a

whole will find the screws of oppression tightened against them as soon as they become hostages in a gigantic robber scheme to extort ransom from the world. German Nazism and fascism in general will gain a fresh lease of life from this injection of foreign credits and the deadly menace threatening the whole of mankind will thereby be greatly intensified and prolonged. Every fascist or semi-fascist regime in the world will be encouraged to try to work the same racket of extortion and blood-money. From an economic standpoint, the entire scheme is bound to lead to a flooding of the markets of the world with the

products of Nazi industry, working under conditions of virtually prison or serf labor. The mass dumping of such goods into the outside world is bound to bring with it consequences disastrous to labor, for whom it will mean wage-cutting and increased unemployment, and to the Jews, against whom it will only stir up resentment and anti-semitic prejudice. Truly a scheme worthy of its Nazi authors!

It is significant that this vicious plan is being sponsored in this country by three Anglo-Jewish bankers. It is not even impossible that it will find support

(Continued on Page 4)

Dodge Opens Drive Against Communist Press In New York

The Daily Worker was subpoenaed last week for investigation under the "criminal anarchy" laws of New York State. Hathaway, editor of the Daily, was not permitted to learn who had preferred the charges, but stated that he suspected the influence of Hearst.

The secretiveness maintained by the D.A.'s office indicates that in all probability the powers that be are not sure of their ground. Neary, assistant to the D.A., was thinking of prosecuting on the basis of a quotation from the Communist Manifesto, written in 1848! It is not yet clear if this case is part of a real campaign of labor-hating open shoppism on a nation-wide scale, or is a local Hearst anti-red drive. The frame-up of the Omaha street-car workers, reported in these columns last week, would seem to indicate that the former is being prepared by the ruling class, and that the calling to account of the Communist press is a first feeler.

The answer to such a move can only be of one type—the mobilization of the forces of organized labor against this attack on the workers. The lessons of European defeats must teach the American workers that an anti-red drive is the smoke-screen for an attack on the labor movement.

Books of the Age

THE SOVIET UNION AND WORLD PROBLEMS. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 254 pages. \$2.50.

Reviewed by Ellen Ward

This book reproduces the series of lectures delivered last summer at the eleventh Institute under the Harris foundation at Chicago University. The lectures included: Ambassador Alexander Troyanovsky, Ivan Boyeff, Chairman of Amtorg, Vladimir Romm, correspondent of Izvestia, Hans Kohn of Smith College and Malbone Graham, of California University.

Their respective topics were: (1) Basic Principles of Soviet Foreign Policy, (2) Soviet State Monopoly of Foreign Trade, (3) Geographic Tendencies in the Soviet Union, (4) The Nationality Policy of the Soviet, (5) The Peace Policy of the Soviet.

In his discussion of Soviet Foreign Policy, Ambassador Troyanovsky points out again and again that the keystone of Soviet diplomacy has been world peace. He cites in great detail, example after example, proving his thesis. His material contains very little that is new to the close student of Soviet affairs but it is all very useful and convincing material to the average American who is just beginning to acquire an interest in the Soviet Union.

The second lecture deals with the history and principles of the foreign trade monopoly and outlines the subordinate role of foreign trade in the economic development of the Soviet Union, pointing out that the fundamental task has been the establishment of the technical and economic independence of the USSR with respect to the capitalist world. The lecture also traces the growth of foreign trade from pre-Bolshevik control to our own day.

"Geographic Tendencies" in the Soviet Union is the title of the third lecture and it is the most delightful chapter in the book. It is wonderful, indeed, to behold

the magic wrought by the mind and hand of men when he plans for society and not for profits. The redistribution of productive forces and the creation of industrial centers closer to the sources of raw materials have immeasurably increased the output in agriculture, iron, copper, oil, locomotives and in other fields.

The lecture on the Nationality Policy of the Soviet draws a vivid picture of the whole complicated problem and shows with what felicity it is being solved in the midst of so many difficulties. These pages are full of rich lessons for the rest of the capitalist world where so much race hatred endures and flourishes.

The last lecture, dealing with the peace policy of the Soviet, traces its development from the very beginning of Bolshevik rule and contains many amusing passages—especially those relating to the difference in the policies of Chicherin and Litvinoff. While Chicherin was flooding the world with blazing manifestoes calling upon all the workers of the world to overthrow their imperialist governments and form workers republics, Litvinoff was proceeding, step by step, to build up a series of sober peace pacts with those same governments; first with those of the so-called buffer states and later with the more distant lands.

The book also contains a series of useful notes on the peace policies of the Soviet Union both in Lenin's day and since; and appendices on: Litvinoff's speech of acceptance of membership in the League, 1934; Treaty between Germany and the Soviet, 1926; Non-aggression pact between the Soviet and Finland, 1932; Soviet-French Treaty of Mutual Assistance, 1935; Soviet-Czechoslovakian Treaty of Mutual Assistance, 1935; Stalin's Report to the 16th Party Congress on Nationality, 1930; Graphs on transport, raw materials, population, etc; Maps on new and reconstructed towns and industrial centers.

Herberg Answers His Critics

To the Editor of the Workers Age:

In the last issue of the Workers Age, there is a brief article by Edward Peters, taking issue in some points with the analysis of fascism made by me in a previous article (Workers Age, Jan. 4, 1936). A good deal of what Comrade Peters says is quite interesting but I am afraid I cannot altogether agree with his main contentions and conclusions.

1. The definition of fascism developed in my article is, unfortunately, not "an orthodox communist formulation," as Comrade Peters too readily assumes. On the contrary, it is a conception originally developed by the theoreticians of the German Communist Opposition in sharp disagreement with the then views of the C.I. It is a thoroughly correct and Marxist conception, of course, but, in these days, this is not enough to make it "orthodox communist," if thereby is meant "official communist."

2. Comrade Peters declares that: "It is incorrect to say that this fascist (Hitler) government displays contempt for conventional bourgeois legality," that it employs "unintended violence," and exhibits "parliamentarism in decay and discredit." Comrade Peters simply hasn't read my article carefully enough. I never said a word about "this fascist government" or about other fascist governments. My remarks were entirely limited to the fascist movement before it takes power, such a movement, I said, arises under conditions in which "parliamentarism is in decay and discredit"; such a movement displays "contempt for conventional bourgeois legality"; such a movement employs "unintended violence" against the working class and its organizations. I specifically emphasized that, upon taking power, fascism undergoes a very significant transformation. My very words were: "We will leave to another occasion an examination of the fundamental changes that it (fascism) undergoes once it has vaulted into the throne." I am afraid Comrade Peters, on his part does not fully appreciate the profound and very vital distinction between fascism "on the make" and fascism in the saddle.

3. The classification of state-types Comrade Peters makes is hardly one that will appeal to a Marxist. "There are three basic definitives of the relation of the state to the citizen and vice versa. The first is Hegel-Hitler—that the state is master and the citizen a slave. The second is Jefferson-Mattei-Bellarmino—that the state is a slave of the citizen. The third is that both the state and citizen are slaves of God, who by metonymy, is the Church. . . ." The trouble with this classification is that it is utterly abstract, unhistorical and superficial. Under what head would Comrade Peters place the soviet state? Surely not under the third (theocratic) or the second (Jeffersonian) type. Then it must fall under type one—along with the Hitlerite state! It certainly is a very curious scheme of classification that can place two such diametrically opposed state forms under the same rubric. I am really afraid it will not do as a Marxist analysis; it unfortunately ignores entirely the concrete class content of the state!

4. Nor do I think that the matter of the church and fascism is really quite so simple as it appears to Comrade Peters.

I cannot deal with this matter at length here altho I do intend to discuss it in a future article on American fascism. I merely want to suggest one or two ideas. Religion, it seems to me, may very well be put to use by the fascist movement or the fascist state, after it has been given the proper nationalist or racialist cast. But fascism is bound, by the very law of its nature, to regard the church (a socio-ecclesiastical organization, as an essential challenge to its totalitarian claims. In some form or manner, the church as an institution must be subordinated to the fascist state and, in the end, "coordinated". I could very well call attention to the relations between fascism and the church in Italy, where a temporary truce has been reached, or to the situation in Germany, where there is open war. Nor are things in Austria fundamentally different, in spite of the specifically "clerical" character of Austrian fascism. The church and fascism are hardly to be identified as Comrade Peters seems to believe.

5. It is surely hard to take seriously Comrade Peters' contention that in America the two chief sources of fascism are: "the theories of the Catholic Church as represented by Coughlin; and anti-semitism. . . ." The Coughlin movement is undoubtedly fascist and anti-semitism will obviously be a constituent element of any genuine American fascism. But I think the roots of fascism lie a little deeper and extend a little farther.

I cannot close without expressing the hope that Comrade Peters will think better of the rather abrupt and cavalier way in which he treats the necessity of a Marxist analysis of our experiences with fascism abroad. "All the foregoing characterizations," he writes, referring to my examination of fascism "are valid in point of time and place but they are of no value in determining just what and where fascism exists in the United States." Really—"no value" at all?

WILL HERBERG

January 15, 1936.

Zimmerman Rejects Nazi Proposal

(Continued from Page 1)

here in the United States among a handful of Jewish bankers and financiers. For what concern have the big Jewish capitalists in the fate of the masses of their race? What interest have they in a genuine and effective struggle against fascism? They are bound by a thousand golden threads of selfish interest to German capitalism and to the Jewish bankers of Germany, who, in spite of years of humiliation and persecution, are still crawling at the feet of Hitler, literally begging him to be allowed to do his dirty work for him. In sponsoring or defending this nefarious plan of extortion and blood-money, the Jewish bankers are openly acting as go-between for the murderous Nazi bandits! In this country we are accustomed to regard kidnapping and holding for ransom as most heinous offences, frequently punished with death. This is the crime that the Hitler regime is brazenly committing in the face of the word. And those who, for whatever

LOSING THEIR CHAINS...by James Sand

The Anarchists in America

(Continued from last issue)

"Propaganda by deed" was in for a bad time in 1886. Out of a sympathetic march in behalf of workers striking against the horrible conditions in the McCormack Harvester Company, there came a terrible tragedy in Haymarket Square, Chicago, in May of that year. A bomb was thrown into the midst of the crowd of sympathizers who had gathered there, and whom the police had come to disperse. No one knows who threw the bomb; no one has ever found out. It looked like an attempt to "get" the anarchists. Instead, it got a goodly number of policemen. The leaders of the Chicago group of anarchists were arrested. Anarchism was thrown into disrepute by the garbled reports of the newspapers. The name of Johann Most conjured up horrendous visions in the minds of the "respectable" people of America.

Fischer, Engel, Spies, and Parsons were sentenced to death and executed. Several others were sentenced to life imprisonment. Later Governor John P. Altgeld who was to prove such a firm friend of labor in the "Debs Rebellion" pardoned those imprisoned for the crime.

Most was a hounded man after this. Every public crime committed while he lived was more than likely to be charged to him, either directly or indirectly. But he did not remain quiet about Haymarket and the execution of his comrades. Emma Goldman described a speech he made on the subject, —the first time she ever saw or heard Most. "His speech was a scorching denunciation of American conditions, a biting satire on the injustice and brutality of the dominant powers, a passionate tirade against those responsible for the Haymarket tragedy and the execution of the Chicago anarchists in November 1887. He spoke eloquently and picturesquely. As if by magic his disfigurement disappeared, his lack of physical distinction was forgotten. He seemed transformed into some primitive power, radiating hatred and love, strength and inspiration. The rapid current of his speech, the music of his voice, and his sparkling wit, all combined to produce an effect almost overwhelming. He stirred me to my depths." Johann Most had made his most profound impression upon American life.

There is little else that need be said of him for the next twenty years. He spent two terms on Blackwell's Island for terroristic agitation, but he was not stopped by this. Morris Hillquit, in his autobiography, has a graphic description of Most and of a case in which he defended him. It is worth reading. Of course, the assassination of McKinley by Czolgosz caused Most to be hunted as an accessory, which he was not. It caused even greater hardship to Emma Goldman.

Before he died Most had broken with Berkman on the question of individual terror, and had estranged himself from Emma Goldman too. But Most's death called forth a tribute from her at a memorial meeting to him. In her he lived on.

No more trenchant criticism can be made of Emma Goldman and her position in the American labor movement than the mere statement of the fact that she is now *persona grata* among the bourgeoisie. She is today a topic of conversation for rich dowagers, and a sales-talk asset for circulation managers. Her value is immeasurably enhanced in these twilight days of American capitalism by the fact that she detests the Soviet Union. Since she is thought to be a "radical," criticism of the proletarian state in action from her pen becomes a weapon ten-fold more powerful for the bourgeoisie than any they have. That her criticism of the first workers' society is based on either complete ignorance or conscious distortion of the ideas of Marx and Lenin does not trouble her in the least. But, then, this is nothing new with "philosophical anarchism." Since Bakunin clashed with Marx in the First International, the two ideas have not met on any common ground.

With Emma Goldman the difference becomes much clearer, since she alone among the leading anarchists has seen the Soviet Union come into existence and progress. She thinks that Bill Haywood's going over to Marx was treason to anarchism. So it was; but it also happened to be acknowledgement of the fundamental correctness of Lenin and the

Bolsheviks. In an article in the "new" devitalized American Mercury, she dilates on a theme now sixteen years old with her; to wit, "There is no communism in Russia." It is one of the most inane articles ever written on the subject of the Soviet Union. Communism is the ultimate aim of the social revolution. But it is the third stage in the march; the first being that of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the second, that of the withering away of the state: Then and only then, does the classless communist society come into being. Emma Goldman neither says this nor understands it. She calls the Soviet economy "state capitalism." One might as well call Hitler a Leninist; it would make about as much sense. To expect, as she does, that communism is going to spring full-panoplied from the head of capitalism is to believe in a divine spark in human nature which will suddenly burst forth without any urging. Emma Goldman is sitting and waiting for the emergence of that divine spark. Hindoo philosophers are also sitting and waiting for the emergence of Nirvana from their navels.

That Emma Goldman's anarchism would end thus was evident as early as 1919, when she arrived in Russia after her deportation from the United States with Alexander Berkman. Because men did not become angels as soon as the Bolsheviks seized power in November 1917, she thinks Lenin "a false Messiah." She denounced the incarceration of the old anarchist warrior, Peter Kropotkin. She says nothing of the fact that Kropotkin had urged the continuance of the war against Germany and had denounced the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Had the Bolsheviks done as Kropotkin wanted, they would have been utterly defeated by Germany and Czarism would have come back over the bodies of the Russian workers. But worse yet, Kropotkin denied the necessity for a proletarian dictatorship. He wanted the organization of small autonomous groups, self-contained and self-sufficient. Emma Goldman also wanted that and still does. But this is nothing more than a reversion to a medieval economy. It means turning back the march of civilization. It means a denial of the objective world. It is day-dreaming, at which anarchists are unusually adept.

What she wanted was no government at all. In what the editors of Harpers Magazine call her "last will and testament" Emma Goldman, now sixty-six years old, reiterates her stand on this matter.

Emma Goldman expected the revolution to be something like a lawn-party. So it might have been if the bourgeoisie had not wanted to retain their power, if the foreign imperialists had not intervened to save their investments, if the Russian nobility had surrendered their barbaric privileges without a murmur. So it might have been, in short, if not men, but mummies had been implicated in it. When human beings cease to be active creatures, life will be what Emma Goldman wants it to be. At present we still have to come to some compromise with an external environment if we expect to do anything towards changing the social system. All Emma Goldman can see is the society she wants. Marxists also see the society they want; only they know what they have to overcome before they can achieve it.

She was born in 1869 in Kurland, Russia. In January 1886 she came to America. Her childhood was a living hell for her, and much of her later agitation for freedom dates back to her hatred for the authoritarian cruelty of her father. Her early years here were marred by an unhappy marriage, which she finally sundered. Then she gave herself to anarchism. She became a lecturer, edited *Mother Earth*, and became known as the leading exponent of anarchism in America. The fact that she was a woman cast a romantic halo about her. Her life forms an integral part of the story of social revolt in America, but hers is a story of fruitless revolt leading nowhere. It is explosive, coruscating, wild, and energetic. As far as the social revolution is concerned, it might as well have taken place on the planet of Mars. Today she finds herself an old woman, leading a leisurely, hum-drum existence, completely outside any significant social movement.

Next Week

DANIEL DE LEON AND THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

reasons, act as his intermediaries share this same guilt before mankind!

American labor and the masses of the American Jews will give this insulting scheme the only answer it deserves. We must not allow ourselves to be blackmailed by the threats of the Nazi bullies or fooled by the "promise" of the Nazi perjurers. Under no circumstances must we loosen the economic noose which is slowly but surely strangling the gang-

ster regime in Berlin. We are certainly not ready to help the German capitalists worsen our conditions and throw hundreds of thousands of our workers out of jobs. We cannot afford to slacken for an instant our war to the death against Nazism and fascism. On the contrary, we must increase and extend our assistance to the victims of fascism and to the heroic underground labor movements of the fascist-ridden countries. For the German people will be freed and the Jews snatched from the claws of their tormentors only by the complete overthrow of fascism and fascism can be overthrown only by an uncompromising

and unyielding fight on all fronts, inside of Germany and outside, a fight in which a united labor movement will lead the masses to victory! Only labor can supply the necessary foundation and the necessary driving force in this great historical struggle for the very future of mankind!

• SWEDISH MINERS have been threatened with a lockout because of wage disputes. Wages in three other allied industries have been in question. Approximately 90,000 workers are involved. What the Socialist government will do remains to be seen.

PHILADELPHIA
BERNARD HERMAN
speaks on
"Fascism and Democracy"
On
Sunday Feb. 2, 8 p. m.
at
329 PINE STREET
Phila., Pa.
Auspices: Phila. Section C.P.O.

JOIN!
Communist Party U. S. A.
(Opposition)
For information on the activity and policies of the Communist Opposition write to
COMMUNIST PARTY
(OPPOSITION)
Box 68 Station "O"
New York City

HAVE YOU CONTRIBUTED TO \$5,000 FUND?

NEW WORKERS SCHOOL OPENS TERM

An array of America's outstanding Marxists, Jay Lovestone, Bertram D. Wolfe, Will Herberg, George F. Miles, Jim Cork and D. Benjamin, open a sensational series of courses in many aspects of Marxism and its application to social realities. These begin on Monday, January 20th, at the New Workers School, 51 W. 14 Street. Jay Lovestone headlines with a series of lectures on Europe Today. His predictions years ago on the victory of Fascism in Ger-

many has intensified interest in the forthcoming lectures dealing with France, Germany, England, Soviet Union, etc., seen through Marxian eyes. Bertram D. Wolfe projects an outline for the further development of a Marxist theory of esthetics; applies Marxism to an analysis of literature and criticism which will be strikingly illustrated by reference to the literary products of the United States and the Soviet Union. Other courses equally provocative are listed below. Sign up immediately.

C L A S S	INSTRUCTOR	DAY	TIME
Modern Political Thought	Will Herberg	Mondays	7:30 P. M.
Present Problems of The Trade Unions	George F. Miles	Tuesdays	7:30 P. M.
Dialectical Materialism	Jim Cork	Tuesdays	8:30 P. M.
Fundamentals of Communism	D. Benjamin	Thursdays	7:30 P. M.
Marxism, Literature and Art	B. D. Wolfe	Fridays	7:30 P. M.
Europe Today	Jay Lovestone	Fridays	8:30 P. M.