

the economic determinants that impel the C.P. to support him are almost completely ignored as if the dialectic did not exist as the method of revolutionary criticism. The result is an analysis of Lewis in a vacuum instead of in the flux of economic change. However, amidst such emotional evaluations as "John L. Lewis--than whom there is no blacker figure, no more consistent betrayer," etc., the reader may glean some definite facts on Lewis' career, and for this reason the pamphlet is not without value.

---

RICH LAND, POOR LAND. A pamphlet summary of a book of the same title by Stuart Chase. League For Industrial Democracy, New York City. 27 pp. 15 cents.

The forces that have transformed America into the most powerful nation of the earth have done much to devastate and deplete the land. Lumber companies have destroyed almost nine-tenths of its forests. Erosion, caused principally by the indifferent uprooting of vegetation and the consequent loosening of the soil, has swept, and is sweeping, away one-sixth of the country. Wide waves of dust, checked no longer by grass, transform rich areas into wastelands. The smoke of refineries has destroyed vegetation; mining projects have gutted the earth of its richest minerals; the filth of cities has killed "more fish than all the fishermen, and silt has killed more than pollution.".....And the waste continues. The rate of depletion is indicated by the Natural Resources Board report that in one day, on one field in Texas, enough gas is blown into the air "to supply the United Kingdom twice over." Thus has America's growth been accompanied by a prodigious waste of its natural wealth. (And what shall be said of the waste of human lives?) But though the pamphlet has much to say in condemnation of this destruction of resources, yet of the system that lives by such destruction, it says nothing. The author blames this waste on the desire for individual gain; but he does not consider the economic drive behind the acts of the despoilers. He would balance outflow with inflow, and minimize the use of irreplaceable materials; and to this end, he would replace the mad struggle for profits with collective action. But apparently he would not touch the economic base from which that struggle springs. To abstract individuals from their age and its compulsions, and to analyze their motives without the objective stimuli; to seek to modify their behavior without modifying those objective conditions--is to indulge a most superficial analysis and a most futile effort. Yet beyond this point the petty bourgeois individual cannot go. Though by force of his subordinate economic position he bewails the evils of capitalism, still by force of his class in-

terests he must preserve the system. Not with the petty-bourgeoisie, therefore, is sociologic progress possible, but with the proletariat--with those whom capitalism can now offer nothing but privation and pain, and who, in the collapse of capitalism, have nothing but their boniage to lose.

---

THE TRAGEDY OF SPAIN. by Rudolph Rocker. Freie Arbeiter Stimme, New York City. 47 pp. 15 cents.

The conflicting economic forces in Spain have been here disentangled and traced to their sources. Mussolini and Hitler seek the mineral despoils of Spain, together with areas that will give them control of the Mediterranean. England and France, knowing that a victory by either Franco or the Loyalists may cut them off from their colonies, as well as jeopardize their interests in Spain, protract the war so as to exhaust and render helpless to their domination both sides of the struggle, as well as to prolong the drain on Italy's and Germany's resources. Russia, impelled by the threat of the anti-Soviet alliance combining Japan, Italy and Germany, creates an alliance of her own with France and England, and her interests in Spain become allied with the interests of these countries. Her shipments of arms to Spain began, therefore, only when the Loyalists were losing ground and, though dearly bought with Spanish gold, were thenceforth doled-out in proportions sufficient only to equalize, and thus protract, the war. The anti-Fascist Front, dependent upon Russia for arms, becomes subject to her policies--which are the policies of France and England. The class-war is abandoned; the bourgeois character of the united front becomes more and more manifest; revolutionists are displaced from leading positions. In a word, whatever proletarian character the anti-Fascist Front had, has been emasculated....Thus the whole camouflage of neutrality-pacts, democracy, People's Front, is stripped away from the various powers and we see each nation, Fascist, Democratic, or Bolshevik, as predatory Capitalism, after all.

But though this picture of the Spanish situation is commendably clear and free from the usual confusion of detail, it is not complete. The author has not indicated what the class-conscious workers should do in the face of the bourgeois character of the united front and the treacherous reactionism of the Communist Party. Apparently the murder of revolutionists and the butchery at Barcelona have taught him nothing. Apparently he believes that workers should continue pouring out their blood in a cause that is not their own. But had he reviewed his own facts, he might have seen that the Spanish Civil War



is only a struggle between rival groups for the privilege of exploiting the masses. He might have reasoned that only treachery and betrayal for the proletariat can follow their alliance with either side. He might have seen that if, as he indicates, the slogan of Democracy versus Fascism will be used to betray workers into the next world war, it has been used already to betray them in the struggle in Spain.

After all, democracy and Fascism serve the interests of the same system. Workers must therefore carry the class-war against them both. They must fight Capitalism everywhere regardless of what disguises it wears and what aliases it assumes. If workers must fall on the field of battle, let them fall fighting, not that one group of exploiters instead of another should have domination over their lives--but fighting in the cause of their own liberation.

#### THE POPULAR FRONT from the bourgeoisie to the anarchists

A short time ago, Companys', bourgeois-president of the GENERALITAT of Catalonia announced his decision to resign.

Comment of the Barcelona newspapers: (Taken from Comunicat De Premsa, # 212, October 21, 1937. Commissariat De Propaganda, Generalitat De Catalunya)

Dia Grafico: "...The work of the Popular Front must be effectuated....(so that it) may bring about the triumph of the Republic and of Liberty." (Republican)

La Publicitat (Liberal): "...We do know ...that the only possible relationship between the governments of the Republic and the Generalitat is collaboration and cooperation."

Treball (Communist): "Companys is today the man who best represents the unity of the Catalan people in their struggle against Fascism...We believe that all necessary conditions should be created to permit Companys ..to have..the means to assure the highest efficacy in the exercise of his high functions ".

Manana (Syndicalist): "Companys may give up the presidency of Catalonia if that is his desire...but he may not if it is because of hidden pressure...It is the people who have elected him and it is the people who may withdraw their confidence." Catalunya (C.M.T.): "With justice in everything and for anyone, we recognize the high moral authority of Companys, and we recognize that his personality is the greatest existing welder of the forces of anti-Fascism."

#### THE C.I.O. BREAKS A STRIKE

In the latter part of November of this year, a strike was broken by the C.I.O. and the Lovestone group. Four workers were discharged for their militant activities from a General Motors Fisher Body Plant, and several hundred of their fellow-workers went on strike in protest. The strikers took swift possession of the plant, fortified themselves against attack, and refused to surrender without the reinstatement of their dismissed co-workers. Employers and labor leaders condemned the strike with equal vehemence. The head of the United Automobile Workers of America, Homer Martin, denounced the striking workers. Angered by this desertion of their union head, the strikers threatened to do him bodily violence, and one of them declared that if Martin came anywhere near the plant for purposes of negotiation, they would sweep him away with a fire hose.

But the agents of Martin and Lovestone were busy. They circulated among the workers and persuaded them to occupy the plant in split-shifts as strikers had successfully done last winter in Flint, Michigan. Having thus divided the strength of the workers, the agents concentrated all their supporters on one of these shifts, and when negotiations were attempted, there were in the plant only forty workers of which the majority were the associates of Lovestone and Martin. These men readily accepted the overtures of the lawyer who entered the plant first to prepare the way for Martin, and when later Martin entered and, ignoring the abuse of the minority of militant workers present, spoke to the men, they moved out of the plant, and the company guards again assumed possession of it. When the two other shifts of strikers returned to resume their position in the plant, they found themselves locked out. For his work in breaking this "outlaw" strike, Martin was praised by the press.

Such desertion of workers by their leaders, and such betrayal, is not uncommon in the labor movement. The reason for such treachery is simple. The needs of the labor leaders are not the same as those of the workers whom they organize. The income they draw from their organizations frees them from the conditions of privation that render men class-conscious and revolutionary. With an income of at least of middle-class proportions, they become middle-class psychologically, and are impelled by their interests in capitalism to defend the system by which they live. Their interest in working class movements is only as a source of profit and power; but as soon as these movements



threaten those ambitions instead of furthering them, the leaders are of necessity moved to treachery and betrayal.

So we have the case of labor leaders demanding dues from their workers, and using many forms of monetary extraction. We see the case of Lewis, who even as head of the United Mine Workers, demanded that all dues be sent first to him, so that he might return as much as he thought necessary for the functioning of the local unions. And so we see the recent spectacle at Flint, where the gates of all Chevrolet plants were picketed by men bearing signs urging the workers to pay their dues. As long as workers cater to the ambitions of their leaders, they will receive their leaders' support. But whenever the needs of the workers run counter to the interests of their leaders, and are expressed in action, their movement is branded as outlaw.

Since laws are made essentially to protect private property and the property class, those who oppose out-law strikes are, in that very opposition, defending the bosses against the workers, and reveal themselves for what they always are - enemies of the working class. Not to such labor leaders, therefore, may the workers look for their liberation. They must look only to themselves and their own needs as expressed in these very out-law strikes springing spontaneously out of the economic conditions and disdaining professional leadership.

#####

The first issue of LIVING MARXISM will contain:

THE FUTURE OF UNEMPLOYMENT  
NEW ASPECTS OF IMPERIALISM  
MARXISM AND PSYCHOLOGY  
THE MARXIAN IDEOLOGY IN RUSSIA  
THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN 1938  
REVIEWS, -- and other interesting articles.

SUBSCRIBE. Yearly (12 issues) \$ 1.50. Send money order to Council Correspondence, P.O.Box 5343 Chicago, Ill.

#####

VISIT the Groups of International Council Communists.  
NEW YORK: Every Wednesday at 8 P.M. Labor Temple  
Room 39, 342 East 14th Street.  
CHICAGO: Every Monday at 8 P.M. Iderott's Cafe.  
3206 Wilton Avenue, near Belmont Ave.

## ASIA AND WORLD IMPERIALISM

In the previous issue of Council Correspondence we began the publication of a long series of articles dealing with the war in the Far East. Editorial changes connected with the publication of LIVING MARXISM necessitate a breaking up of this long and continuous series into smaller, independent articles. However, the subject matter to be treated will remain the same as outlined in the previous issue.

The last issue reviewed the historical, political, and economic development of China, which stands today in the center of world interest, since it is to be regarded as the main field of new imperialistic adventures. Many countries have a "stake" in China, but the Japanese at present obviously believe that theirs is the greatest of all. Since 1933 Japan was in control of Manchuria. Since then she has penetrated deeper and deeper into northern China, and the war, which started in June 1937, has added new territories to those which she had already seized.

The Japanese attack on China, like the war in Spain, has brought new bewilderment into the international labor movement. The reformist movement, comprising bourgeois liberals, advocate an international boycott of Japanese goods, to punish Japan for its aggression. On the other hand, organizations actually or ideologically connected with the imperialism of Russian state-capitalism prepare the workers for a war against Japan, to save China from the "Eastern Menace".

We want to say at the outset that we regard both attitudes as inconsistent with the needs of the international working class, to which the Chinese and Japanese workers also belong. We have shown in our previous analysis of Chinese conditions that the workers of China have nothing in common with their exploiters; that their miserable conditions make senseless a "united front" with their exploiters for purposes of national "liberation".

The revolutionary process operating for many years in China did serve attempts at a development of capitalism. Although the class differentiations already included the differentiations between capital and labor, still there was no movement orientated towards communism. Within the total revolutionary process the proletarian struggle against capitalism played an insignificant, though actual, part. At the



base of the Chinese Revolution was the converting of a semi-feudal agriculture into agricultural production for the market, the latter economy being a prerequisite for a general capitalization of the country. The differences between "Soviet"-China and the Kungtang was not a class struggle, but a violent disagreement as to whether China should ally with Russia in her struggle for national liberation. Neither the forces orientated towards Russia, nor the forces which subordinated themselves to the League of Nations, that is, those who attempted to use and to profit by the rifts between the imperialist nations, had a clear conception of the character of the Chinese Revolution. General Blücher, operating as General Ga-Lin for the Chinese revolution was always wondering as to what was really going on in China! In Hunan", he once said, "the peasant committees distribute the land, but all officers of the revolutionary army are themselves landlords. On the one hand they make the revolution, on the other they demand peace and order. The Chinese revolution is a mystery to me".

China could not have a revolution à la Russia. In only a comparatively small part of China was it possible to get the peasants behind the slogan of the distribution of land. Small proprietorship is overwhelming there and it is unable to conceive a solution to their problems in land distribution. But they felt hampered by heavy taxation on the part of the local and provincial authorities. Whatever government they had exploited them. Their self-sufficiency within their farming communities and the absence of markets made them immune to all nationalistic attitudes. But the trend towards a nationalist government was welcomed because it seemed to promise the elimination of a variety of exploiting groups. Concentration of government, re-organization, and the elimination of sectional and local exploiters living on the peasant masses, so that capital could be accumulated for the industrial process, was the goal of the young Chinese bourgeoisie. This goal also necessitated opposition against foreign exploitation. This was also the goal of the "Communists", for whom the land question was rather a tactical than a problem of principles. Their activities were directed by the Russian imperialistic and defense interests.

The situation of the poor masses of China calls for the capitalization of the country and because this possibility is precluded for the next future, their situation knows no hope, their suffering and correspondingly their class struggles can only increase. This class struggle is not only hidden, but is also intensified by the imperialist onslaught on China.

In China, today, as in Spain, the revolutionary needs of the workers and poor peasants are diverted into capitalist-nationalist channels. Only within the general struggle of imperialist capitalism can the Chinese masses wage their own struggles. The class struggle is thus overshadowed by the struggle imposed upon China by Imperialism. The need of China - within the present world capitalism - would be fulfilled by its rapid transformation into a fullfledged capitalism, a condition, however, which again is at present precluded by the same world capitalism.

Under conditions of world communism, China in spite of its backwardness, would have to conform in order to exist. The incorporation in a communist world economy would be far less difficult than its present struggle for life within world capitalism. Today, under the prevailing backward agricultural system, and with no possibility of further colonization, it can no longer live on its own resources. But the rapid industrialization also is excluded by the decline situation of world capitalism. However, what if, contrary to all reason and opposed to all facts, China should succeed in its capitalization process? It would have to be at once imperialistic. It would have to become that other "Eastern Menace" to other capitalist nations. It would be forced to hinder other capitalist nations in order to safeguard its own progress. It would not change anything on the general situation of world capitalism. It would only sharpen in a somewhat shifted direction the existing contradictions. We maintain - and we shall soon deal with this subject at length - that capitalism is incapable of developing a world economy that can solve the present most direct needs of mankind. Imperialism has ceased to be a "progressive" force, just as capitalism is no longer able to develop further the productive forces of society. Any capitalist activity, regardless of whether it is initiated in the backward or the developed countries, has only one possibility, - to transform given contradictions into greater ones, to change given difficulties into still greater difficulties, to increase the misery and exploitation of the powerless of the world. The defeat of Japanese imperialism would mean the triumph of another imperialism - not China's. But a liberated capitalist China - an obvious impossibility - would mean that China would be placed in Japan's present position, especially because of its lack of essential raw materials and of capital, - and this without doing away with Japan's need for the same things and with this new attempts to regain its former position. The chaos would be increased, and slogans, like "Boycott Japanese goods" or "Defend China" would be



inverted.

We accept none of the slogans peddled today in the international labor movement on the war in Asia. We don't exit ourselves in crying "Hands off China", nor are we happy over the present Japanese success. One or the other attitude would mean already the mental alingment with one or the other imperialist cause. We are not imperialists, but workers without any "national feeling", without an abstract sense of justice, without indignation for aggressors and sympathy for defenders. Aggressor and defenders change positions, we have only one position: the real needs of the international working class, which cannot be incorporated into a Chinese cause, or engaged in a boycott against Japanese goods. For in doing either, we would help Japanese competitors, or imperialist forces opposed to Japanese imperialism. For if success accompanies those slogans - and without the success possibility they would be senseless - we would be forced to fight for the Japanese cause and to boycott Chinese goods. Nor are we as revolutionaries interested in safeguarding the status quo. Not only because we favor change, but because the status quo is non-existent. There are only times of comparatively sudden changes and periods of relatively slow changes.

We are not concerned with whether China defeats Japan or vice versa. The workers in China are compelled by force of circumstance to fight with their bourgeoisie and thus for their bourgeoisie, and whatever capitalist allies China has or may find. They can only act as capitalist forces, at present, their action as such is directed against the interests of world revolutionary needs. The development of backward countries - as Russia and other nations have shown - means today the creation of new and strong forces directed against the latent proletarian revolution. National development is no longer progressive, and implies allingment with imperialist forces, it is today reactionary. A unified stronger capitalist China will not only increase capitalist difficulties, but will also increase the difficulties of the coming proletarian revolution. Though it is progressive insofar as it is destructive to world capitalism, it is at the same time also a hindrance to proletarian aspirations. The hindrance weighs more than the advantage, as the process of capitalist decline will, even without the help of the national liberation movement in China, continue at a fast pace. The national liberation of China can not be made to comfort the proletarian struggle for power.

Never should workers forget that they are called upon today to defend the China of Chiang Kai Shek the butcher of the workers of Shanghai in 1927. They also must constantly be reminded of the fact that the Chinese "Soviets" are nothing else but the advance guard of Russian imperialism in China. Their is no sense in fighting Japanese semi-fascism to support the full fledged fascism existing since 1927 in China. There is no sense in choosing the low wages of the Japanese workers against the still lower of the Chinese. The workers must rather realize that capitalism can no longer, not even in the previous miserable way, solve the needs of mankind. The problem of Asia cannot be solved in Asia. To restrict oneself to one or the other policy connected with no more than one or the other specific problem in the Far East means service to one or the other capitalist cause. To stop the slaughter of imperialism in Asia presupposes the overthrow of western capitalism. There is no other way. But the great interest the labor organizations display in regard to China finds its proper parallel in their complete disinterestness in the furthering of the revolutionary forces in western capitalism. This alone shows that their sympathy for China, and their anti-Japanese position is only a mask for their own alliance with their imperialist nations.

Against all nationalistic phraseology we stubbornly maintain the extremely narrow point of view which recognizes nothing but the class needs of the proletariat. We always have only one question: What about the workers? What will the workers of Japan gain by fighting for their imperialist bourgeoisie? What will the workers of China get by fighting for the defense of "their" country? The answer to these questions is death and misery.

## II.

Whatever "independence" China still possesses, she owes to the past and present rivalries among the imperialist powers struggling for spheres of influence in Asia. In our previous article we said that because too many nations were interested in China, it was impossible for any particular one to gain exclusive domination there. Early Russian attempts to swallow parts of Manchuria and Northern China were ended by the Japanese. The latter acted not only in their own interest, but also in the interests of England and the United States. German interests in China were abolished in the course of the world war; France



and Italy maintained their concessions without gaining much additional strength; so that today the powers most directly involved in the Asiatic game are England, Japan, Russia, and America. England, having the biggest investments of all western powers in China and also the most flourishing trade, is most deeply concerned over any change in the Asiatic scene. The strategical considerations of her empire play also an important part. Japan has the largest interests of all capitalist nations, and she influences China as no other nation does. America, contrary to common belief, has a relatively very small interest in China, and the part she plays in the Chinese game is so far a rather insignificant one. China's close connections with the important imperialist powers excludes, at the present stage of development, a Chinese policy exclusively shaped to serve national necessities. The "national liberation" of China is tightly bound to world politics and could - if at all - be facilitated only with the help of other nations, and in opposition to still others. Forced to cooperate with one or the other imperialist nation, or group of nations, China must consequently maintain an economy and policy in conformity with the wishes of the group from which she draws her support. She is unable to resist alone the invasion and domination of any of the large powers. She can only choose among the imperialist rivals, and play the game of her favorite.

It is true that under certain conditions and in a favorable historical situation Russia was able to ward off imperialist invasion and to maintain her national unity, although she did lose her large western provinces. The general exhaustion after the war and the capitalists' conviction that sooner or later all socialist experiment in Russia would collapse, helped

the Bolsheviks - much to their own surprise - to maintain their government and to secure the line of development towards state capitalism. This development brought Russia back to the world scene as an independent imperialistic force. But neither the conditions in China, nor in the world permits such a solution for China. China has to fight for its existence without considerable change in its economic structure. It has to fight under conditions of general preparation for a new world war. Its struggle for "national liberation" must serve at the same time one or the other imperialist group. To support China's emancipation means to support those imperialist powers which "favor" such a liberation! As there are none - the struggle for China is simply a struggle for Imperialism.

Up to a recent date, England, like America once, was supporting Japan's endeavors in China. The danger for these countries lay in Russia's imperialism, and Japan was allowed to act as the English watch-dog to keep Russia away from China. Although the Bolsheviks denounced all imperialist ambitions, no one was deluded by the mere announcement of good intentions, and certainly not England. Russian expansion needs could not for the time being be satisfied on the West. She would have to turn with necessity again towards the East. The continuation of the capitalist method of production meant the continuation of capitalist methods of expansion. "Soviet"-Mongolia, the Russian support of the Chinese revolution, as well as its frictions with this country (as for instance the strife in 1929 over the East-China Railway, etc.), were clear signs that Russia still recognized, now as before, that in order to maintain herself, expansion and increase of power and influence were necessary. True, she may explain this condition with her needs for defense, but such an explanation belongs to every capitalist nation. Japan also maintains that its aggressiveness is in reality only a defense measure. And no hypocrisy nor cynicism is here involved, since under capitalist conditions one has to be aggressive to defend what one has. Unless each capitalist nation expands, it will go from stagnation to collapse. The laws of competition among individual capitalists, are repeated on a larger scale among the nations. Those who cannot expand in private industry will sooner or later be driven out of business. To hold what you have means to accumulate. A nation unable to increase its power and influence will sooner or later be under the control of another nation. It will have to share its profits with outsiders, or it will be completely subordinated or even swallowed up by its superiors.

The Russo-Japanese clashes which caused the war of 1905 continued after the Bolshevik revolution, though on a smaller scale, and were recorded as so-called "border-incident's". The growing strength of Russian capitalism aroused Japanese suspicions anew. To England also Russia once more appeared as the great challenger to her future rule in Asia. With a view to the Russian danger, England pampered Japanese imperialism. Even the conquest of Manchuria did not meet with real opposition from England. Instead, that country decided to help the development of Manchukuo with English investments.

Money sweats money; accumulation necessitates larger accumulation; expansion, once started has to continue, to safeguard results of the initial expansion move.



Japan is a land without necessary raw materials to maintain and secure the growth of a profitable industry. It has to import in order to live. It has to export in order to import. The more capitalism declines the control of raw materials becomes an ever greater advantage to those who have them, because the 'automatic' laws of the market are always, but now increasingly, modified by specific national considerations. Monopoly capital made ridiculous the argument of the "have-nations", that raw materials are no reason for war and aggression, as they can be bought at any time; for they don't answer the question as to what conditions, and at what price, etc., they may be bought. The possessions of raw materials is a means to extract profits from those who have none. It hampers the "have-not nations" to an ever greater extent. More than ever imperialism aims at the raw material bases'. Market control is bound to an ever larger degree to political territorial control. To profit by the Chinese markets, for instance, Japan must find favor with the Chinese government. The Chinese government must be practically a Japanese government. To exploit all profit potentialities, the government must not only be controlled; it must also be powerful enough to secure favorable business conditions. The Japanese are not against a strong Chinese government; they are not against "order" in China; but they prefer disorder and provincial rule as the lesser evil in the face of a hostile national government and a hostile unified China. Where outright annexation is inconvenient the establishing of puppet states will bring the desired result. Advantage is taken of sectional interests, of national minorities, of all kinds of friction, to serve one end: additional profits for the Japanese ruling class. Japan's geographical situation - a sad one as regards raw materials is very favorable as regards her business in China. The maintenance and the increase of Japan's influence in China is today vital to her existence. To force Japan to abandon China, means to force her to suicide. (Despite national boundaries economy today is world economy.) The hope that Japan may restrict itself, and cease to establish herself further in China, can be uttered only from an ignorance of all the economic facts involved. As the capitalist development increases the necessity for additional profits, and at the same time, paradoxically, reduces such possibilities, (first, relative to the need and desire, later, absolutely), Japan's "stake" in China must grow, though it leads to increasing difficulties with other nations, as well as with China, as all nations are subject to the same laws of capitalist development.

England recognizes quite well the force of necessity behind Japan's activity. She has been willing, at the expense of Russian expansion needs, to grant Japan exceptional concessions in China. The U.S.A. was not alarmed either, till the closing of the "Open Door" in Manchuria. Since the imperialist hysteria of early American capitalism, shouting for the control of the Pacific, American capitalism has sobered up and found it more desirable to operate on the field of "pure" business. The "Open Door" would in due time give America the upper hand, it hoped, by way of her advanced technic and the cheapness of her production. The space advantage for Japan could be outdone with the efficiency and the richness of raw material resources in America. The stagnating European powers would sooner or later anyway be forced to recognize in America the new world financier, and optimism prevailed in regard to the potential "400 Million" costumers. But reality was not consistent with these hopes. Chinese business proved to be too small; 400 Million paupers are no costumers. The surplus labor of the Chinese could not be extracted by way of commercial and industrial competition. It was scarcely enough for the provincial exploiters, controlling the sources of surplus value, and left little for the efficiency experts. Business was much better with Japan. Once for a mature capitalism, a developing capitalist nation means good business. That is - for a time. The Chinese raw materials, which, compared to its capitalization needs, were very scarce, and which were situated only in specific places, had also little attraction for the U.S.A. No country for the time being could therefore drive China much farther than the point it had reached. The danger existed only for the future. And it consisted in the possibility that Japan might take from China - as it did - precisely those sections containing the raw materials which Japan needed. Japan did not go into China with the desire to give it the wonders and blessings of a capitalist economy. It went there to make secure its own wonders and blessings. But by doing so it stands a good chance of becoming a first-rate power in the Pacific and a first-rate competitor to other capitalist nations, including America. But this danger is not an immediate one; it belongs to the future, which, however, is still gray. Yes, there are the Philippines, which can be endangered by Japanese advance, but the danger is not an immediate one. America's present stake in China is not large enough to warrant a war in its defense.

But the situation is different with England. If American policy in the Far East is inconsistent and unclear because of the unripe conditions, England



policy only seems to be unclear and inconsistent. Like Götze's magician apprentice, it cannot get rid of the ghost it has conjured up. It begins to fear the Japanese imperialism which it has helped to nourish. It is not so much the Chinese problem proper that bothers England and brings about a change of its relations to Japan; it is the whole question of supremacy in the Pacific. This question has been raised by Japanese imperialism and demands a new settlement. Great Britain is not so much disturbed by Japan's present push in the North of China as by the potential danger of a southward expansion of Japan's imperialism. British India, Ceylon, the Dutch Indies, Australia, New Zealand, Siam, and Malaya are Japan's larger imperialistic perspectives. For a long time already, and especially since it acquired Formosa, Japan has prepared for this southward push. There is in Japan open agitation for a shift of the course of imperialist advancement towards the Indian Ocean. Books are written there dealing "with Japan's mission to open up the boundless storehouse of the South seas for the benefit of humanity". The menace of a southward expansion by Japan explains largely England's general armament program and her feverish activity to increase her fleet. This situation gives Japan for a time a free hand in China, for time is necessary to England. A Japan continuously engaged in China offers ample opportunities for England to prepare to meet the Japanese challenge. Even a Russian engagement now would not be unwelcome to England, although she herself would most probably continue to keep free from the present Asiatic scramble. In this way she could weaken all her adversaries. England has to save herself and prepare for the decisive struggle for the maintenance of her supremacy as the first world power. To ally herself at present to either side, to Russia or Japan, would solve no problem for England, for both nations stand in opposition to British interests. The continuation of the silent partnership with Japan will continue for awhile, but it will be accompanied by preparations to kill the partner at the first opportunity. The "anti-Japanese" propaganda in America is England-orientated and not to be taken seriously. It will exercise no effect on Japan, as it will not be followed by action. America will not start a war with Japan over China; it will not initiate the world war; it will be "dragged" into it as in the last war, and will hope to emerge out of it as the first world power. The English policy attempts at present to line up the different powers in such a way that nothing essential will happen in the world scene until England is ready for action. So far this policy—as dangerous as it is—has met with success. This policy contains also the secret for the bombastic activity of the so-called aggressor nations, which now feel sure that no one will

call their bluff. The policy of England is clear because it is double-faced. On the one hand England will, for example, support Germany to keep Russia in check, but she will also support France against Germany, and again will do nothing to hinder Italian aggression as a threat against France. She will, together with America, encourage Chinese resistance, but she will not follow any suggestion of blocking Japanese progress. The possibility of a Russian-American alignment to crush Japan would also mean the end of England's world supremacy. This possibility is checked by pressure brought upon Russia. In order to gain time the English policy is one of every-day opportunism, and for some time peace will be maintained so that the world war may find England better prepared. Thus the position England takes in relation to Spain is repeated on a larger scale in her world policy.

But for the present Japan is bound to win. It is her day. China will have to accept some sort of unfavorable peace. But other days will come.

The workers should not be deluded by the present hesitancy of the decisive capitalist nations to enter the battlefield. Many more American gunboats may be sunk before the war will come; many more "insults" will be taken by England before she answers with steel; many more countries will speed-up rearmament; many more "old Bolsheviks" will be killed; much more "planned economy" will be propagated; much more misery will stink to the heavens, more and more people will cry for a Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin to end madness with insanity. Masses will crave for action and will not act unless ordered. —But the coming world war is inevitable. The labor organizations of "significance" will continue to prepare for this war as well as their masters. All the "established" labor organizations even now become recruiting grounds for the imperialist armies. They vote and will continue to vote for more and more instruments to kill, for they have to swim with the stream in order to exist. They will find all kinds of excuses: "For Democracy against Fascism" —Against Japanese Aggression for the Chinese People", etc., but all these slogans will have only one purpose —the preparation of the workers for the next world war.

The workers, however, should not fall victims to "the brand of the time". They should not listen to the "realists", who declare that certain concessions are necessary, that choosing between greater and lesser evils makes for concreteness. Shanghai is far away, and the workers will reach it only in the uniforms provided for them by their masters. But Exploitation is near. The end of the slaughter in Asia presupposes the end of capitalism in Europe and America.



## "STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM"

Not long ago, INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS issued Leon Trotsky's new pamphlet STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM. Trotsky is worried that the end of the 'Russian Dream' might lead workers to abandon Bolshevism altogether. The "lower ideological level of the movement" (9)#) might lead workers to identify Stalinism with Bolshevism and reject both. He, however, wants to prove: 1) Bolshevism is not to be judged by Stalinism, which is a 'degeneration' of Bolshevism. 2) Anyway, no one has demonstrated by word or deed that power can be seized without a party of Bolshevik character.

If we may not judge Bolshevism by Stalinism, let us judge Bolshevism by Bolshevism. As soon as the Bolsheviks were in power they found themselves in opposition to the soviets, still organizing the industries in their way, and thus compelling the "vanguard" to pass a series of decrees devitalizing the soviets, not only where they were backwards, but especially where they were advanced. The first of these decrees was directed against the expropriation of the factories by the soviets, for the Bolsheviks were disposed to cooperate with the capitalist owners in the process of building -- socialism. The Bolshevik expropriation of capital went only as far as the nationalization of key industries and banks. The later appearing nationalization of all industries was forced upon the Bolsheviks by the continuation of expropriation on the part of the workers. Becoming stronger, the party took all power from the soviets and transferred it to the trade unions, which, as a centralized body, they could more easily control. Later robbing the trade unions of all influence, the party concentrated power into the State. Not under Stalin, but under Lenin and Trotsky, did a group of delegates representing more than 25 important industries issue on March, 20, 1918, the following protest in Novaia Zhizn, # 46.: "The workers have supported the new government which calls itself the government of the workers and peasants, and promised to do our will, and work for our welfare. All our organizations stood back of it, and our sons and brothers shed their blood for it. We bear patiently both want and famine... Four months have passed and we find ourselves without faith

#) All numbers refer to pages in Trotsky's pamphlet. The price of the pamphlet is 10 cents, and may be obtained from the Publishers, located at 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

and without hope. The government which calls itself a Soviet of Workers and Peasants has done everything to oppose the will of the workers. It has blocked every attempt to hold elections to new soviets. It has threatened to use machine-guns against workers, and it has broken up meetings and demonstrations....".

But let us continue to judge Bolshevism by Bolshevism. In the face of such facts as the incident mentioned above, Trotsky declares that bureaucracy triumphed because the masses "became tired of internal privations and of waiting too long for the world revolution." (17) But an "Old Bolshevik" expressing himself in 1921 stated that "The danger exists that Russia may be cut out as the motive power of the International revolution... There are Communists in Russia who are grown tired of waiting for the European Revolution and wish to make the best of their national isolation." This is Varga speaking in ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP, and speaking without contradiction by his heads, Lenin and Trotsky. Thus, instead of Trotsky's "weary masses", we have weary leaders who are quite willing to adjust themselves to perpetuating the bureaucratic dictatorship over the masses. The fact is that the Bolsheviks were compelled to take over large layers of the old bureaucratic apparatus of Tsarism until they could develop their own state-capitalist one, and that in the transition, Lenin was continually checking and opposing the one in the interest of the other. That is the content of Lenin's "opposition" to bureaucracy. These were the days when Trotsky, as military commander, was advocating a militarization of the entire population in the manner of G6hring. (See: Dictatorship versus Democracy, by Le Trotsky, 1923.) ta

But let us continue to judge Bolshevism by Bolshevism. Of the slaughter at Kronstadt Trotsky has only a few words. "The revolutionary government naturally could not 'present' to the insurrectionary sailors the fortress which protected the capital only because the reactionary peasant-soldier rebellion was joined by a few doubtful anarchists." (23) But Trotsky forgets to mention that not only the large peasant masses, but the workers of Petrograd also were in a state of rebellion; that the atmosphere was charged with protest against the new state's dictatorship over the workers and peasants. Trotsky says, "A concrete historical analysis of the events leaves not the slightest room for the legends, built up on ignorance and sentimentality, concerning Kronstadt, Makhno, and other episodes of the Revolution." (23) But Trotsky doesn't go



into such an analysis, beyond making that empty statement. He doesn't even take up the incident of Kronstadt. Let us recall it briefly to him.

The Kronstadt Revolutionary Committee consisted of nine sailors, four workers, one school director, and one doctor. As soon as they were attacked by the armies of Tuchatschewski, under orders from Trotsky, they telegraphed this message to the workers of the world:

"The first shot has been fired. The world must know; wading to his hips in blood, Field Marshal Trotsky opened fire on revolutionary Kronstadt, which opposes the communist government in order to restore real soviet power. We will either win, or die under the ruins of Kronstadt in the struggle for the cause of the workers. Long live the Soviets! Long live the World Revolution!"

Against this workers Trotsky instructed Tuchatschewski to "spare no ammunition; to shoot down the sailors of Kronstadt like pheasants". And Tuchatschewski did as he was instructed, bombing from the air and killing combatants and non-combatants alike. When Tuchatschewski, returning from the butchery, reported to Trotsky that this slaughter exceeded anything he had ever beheld, Trotsky replied, "Yes, it is not so simple, but then Kronstadt belongs already to history." The Kronstadt massacre was symptomatic of a general struggle between the soviets and the party for power. Yet, in the face of the above-mentioned facts, Trotsky still distinguishes the brutality of Bolshevism from that of Stalinism in the same cynical manner that Stalin distinguishes his brutality from that of the other totalitarian leaders: - all this is done in the "interest of the masses."

We are unable to see any basic difference between Bolshevism and Stalinism. Both are opposed to the interests of the workers, both serve one end: - the organized development of a backward country into a highly industrialized capitalism for the purpose of meeting world competition. In such a process, workers, regardless of who is in power, must suffer the misery and exploitation that inevitably follow.

Also, far from judging Bolshevism by Stalinism, revolutionists recognized the evils of Bolshevism long before Stalinism was known. Though Trotsky warns against deducing Stalinism from a "few political sins" of Bolshevism, he will find in Rosa Luxemburg's pamphlet, MARXISM AND LENINISM, a criticism of Bolshevism that goes far beyond a "few political sins"; a criticism that is just as valid against Stalinism today. And as far asorter and Pannekoek in Holland, and

"certain German Spartakists", and the Bordigists in Italy (not to mention the opposition movement in France, the shop-steward movement in England, and the whole Communist Labor Party in Germany), they could not possibly deduce Stalinism from Bolshevism because then Stalinism was not known. And Trotsky will perhaps remember the discussions in Moscow of the second and third Congress of the International, in which the whole criticism against Bolshevism was stated.

"No one has shown in practice or demonstrated articulately on paper how the proletariat can seize power without the political leadership of a party that knows what it wants", says Trotsky. (22) But no one has shown practically or theoretically that with a party and leadership the proletariat can seize power for themselves. All that Bolshevism has proved is that Bolshevik methods have not caused a proletarian revolution. The workers still have to make their revolution. They still have to convince Trotsky of their strength and their aggressiveness. When they do so, they will convince all professional revolutionists.

"One cannot achieve the liquidation of the state simply by ignoring it", says Trotsky (19). We reply, no, not by ignoring it - but by liquidating it; by building up the power of the soviets. Bolshevism was so afraid that it would ignore the state that it built up an entire bureaucracy to combat it. Even Stalin employs this method of not ignoring the state. And Stalin, with precisely the same authority as Trotsky, could claim that his method of not ignoring the state will lead "ultimately" to its abolition. But until that ultimate period, the workers, subject to the same oppression as the workers of all other countries, will continue to rebel - even as they did under Trotsky in 1921. They apparently are unable to distinguish between Trotsky's oppression and Stalin's oppression, between Trotsky's ultimate intentions and Stalin's.

And Trotsky himself, when he leaves the fog of his political abstractions and looks for factual differences, can't find any. He writes, "Even if the Stalinist bureaucracy should succeed in destroying the economic foundation of the new society, the experience of planned economy under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party will have entered history for all time as one of the greatest teachings of mankind." (27) He forgets that these experiences in planned economy, which so far has been planned exploitation and misery, took place under Stalin's era, and is the concrete content of that phase of Bolshevism which Trotsky calls Stalinism.



Is this Bolshevism, Stalinism, or Hitlerism ?

In his book "Dictatorship vs. Democracy" (Terrorism and Communism), written in 1920, published in America two years later, Leon Trotsky writes the following:

"...the principle of compulsory labor service has just so radically and permanently replaced the principle of free hiring as the socialization of the means of production has replaced capitalist property." (137)

The Militarization of Labor

"The foundations of the militarization of labor are those forms of State compulsion without which the replacement of capitalist economy by the Socialist will for ever remain an empty sound. (p.141) "We can have no way to Socialism except by the authoritative regulation of the economic forces and resources of the country, and the centralized distribution of labor power in harmony with the general State plan. The Labor State considers itself empowered to send every worker to the place where his work is necessary. And not one serious Socialist will begin to deny to the Labor State the right to lay its hand upon the worker who refuses to execute his labor duty." (145) "the young Socialist State requires trade unions, not for a struggle for better conditions of labor- that is the task of the social and State organizations as a whole -but to organize the working class for the needs of production, to educate, discipline...-in a word, hand in hand with the State exercise their authority in order to lead the workers into the framework of a single economic plan. (p.143) "...We still retain, and for a long time will retain, the system of wages. The further we go, the more will its importance become simply to guarantee to all members of society all the necessities of life; and thereby it will cease to be a system of wages. But at present we are not sufficiently rich for this. Our main problem is to raise the quantity of products turned out, and to this problem all the remainder must be subordinated. In the present difficult period the system of wages is for us, first and foremost, not a method for guaranteeing the personal existence of any separate worker, but a method of estimating what that individual worker brings by his labor to the Labor Republic. Consequently, wages, in the form of money and of goods, must be brought into the closest possible touch with the productivity of individual labor. ...Under Socialist production, piece-work, bonuses, etc., have as their problem to increase the volume of social product, and consequently to raise the general well-being. Those workers who do more for the general interest than others receive the right to a greater quantity of the social product than the lazy, the careless, and the disorganizers." (p.149).