

Fourth International

Is the U. S. Heading Towards a New Depression?

An Editorial



ANDREW JACKSON

The Jackson Period In American History

By Harry Frankel

THE JEWISH TRAGEDY

By A. Leon

December 1946

25 Cents

Manager's Column

Paul Chelstrom, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL Agent in *St. Paul, Minn.*, reports a method he has found successful in getting subscriptions: "Our recent FOURTH INTERNATIONAL campaign for new subscribers was quite successful, we feel. We used the method of sending out letters to MILITANT subscribers, and then calling on them. We are getting together figures on the subscription percentages and will try to have them ready for the next communication."

* * *

We welcome *Hilda Webster*, new FOURTH INTERNATIONAL Agent in *Boston*, who has asked for information and other data on subscribers in that area so she can bring her files to date and map out her work.

* * *

M. Jones of Youngstown sent in a sub obtained from a friend visiting from Cincinnati.

* * *

Belle Montague of Boston asks for an additional 25 copies of the June issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL: "Enclosed is money for 25 copies of the magazine. Did you say you had 100 extra copies of the June issue? If so, I figure that I have had 75 already, and I think I have paid for 50. Will you please send me the remaining 25 that you have? Honestly, you would print more copies if you fully realized the impression that this article makes upon everyone who reads it. People want more copies to show to their friends and neighbors—everyone agrees that it is *the article of this degenerate age.*"

* * *

A friend from India came to our office to get back issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL containing articles by Lily Roy on India for friends of his in New York. (The article referred to is entitled "Socialism Reaffirmed," a series which appears in the March, April, and May, 1945, issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.)

* * *

Readers are aiding in increasing the circulation of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

G. M. of Danvers, Mass. sent in a one-year combination subscription to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT for a friend in Los Gatos, Calif.

L. C. of Southgate, Calif. sent in a six-month subscription for a neighbor.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 7 December 1946 No. 12 (Whole No. 73)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-9330. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 21c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

CONTENTS

Is the U. S. Heading Towards a New Depression? An Editorial.....	355
The Decline of Capitalism and the Jewish Tragedy By A. Leon....	357
From the Arsenal of Marxism A Documentary History of the Fourth International By Leon Trotsky....	362
The Jackson Period in American History By Harry Frankel....	365

Printed by Criterion Linotyping & Printing Co., Inc.

The following letter was received from *M. M. of Ocean Park, Calif.*: "Read one of your advertisements in a paper and was very much interested in the titles of the articles. Would you please send me your October issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL magazine. Am now debating on whether to take a year subscription or not."

* * *

Jarvis Dusenberry of Perry, N. Y. comments about the October issue: "I enjoyed the October issue of the FI, especially the article, 'The Vatican in World Affairs.' Religion and

Wall Street patriotisms are enemies of labor, supported much by Bibles and flags. When Bibles and flags unite to make labor support parasites, that is a basic condition of fascism. . . . The enclosed \$3 is for eight copies of the FI for October that I wish to pass out to my friends—anything left over is a contribution. I am glad to help the Trotskyists any time I can."

* * *

Readers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in other countries comment about the magazine.

Sheffield, England: "I am deeply

The Editors of *Fourth International* regret to announce that they are forced to issue the December number of the magazine in a reduced format of 16 pages.

Although the circulation of the magazine has risen 50 per cent in the last few years, this increase has been insufficient to make up for the enormous rise in printing and paper costs.

Many periodicals have raised their prices for single copies and subscriptions to offset this inflationary increase. We have considered this step but rejected it. Because the readers of *Fourth International* are working people and any increase in the present subscription price will make it more difficult for many of them to continue receiving the magazine.

We are therefore appealing to our readers, who have never failed us in the past, to help us out of our present difficulty by sending in new subscriptions and financial contributions to Business Manager, *Fourth International*, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

obliged to you for continuing to send me THE MILITANT and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, and as soon as financial relations with the US are restored to normal, I shall be very pleased to pay in full whatever I owe you."

Royal, France: "Here's the list of what I have received from you during the course of the last winter. Bound volumes of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for 1940-41, 1942, 1943 and 1944. These are particularly precious. Of course, I am far from having finished studying them."

Amsterdam, Holland: "Will you send us a bound volume of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for 1945?"

Capetown, South Africa: "The enclosed \$10 will cover the \$5 we already owe you and the remaining \$5 will be for two additional subscriptions to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. Kindly in the future send the 20 copies in one bundle."

Ajmer, India: "We are glad to let you know that we are receiving copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and MILITANT regularly. We feel it our duty to popularize your literature in this subcontinent. We are confident FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and MILITANT will be read with keen interest by sympathizers and opponents of your movement alike. We think of announcing through all the premier papers of the country that for the FI literature we should be contacted.

"As you might have read in papers, Indian National Congress is holding its annual session in the month of November 1946, at Meerut. People of all shades of opinion from every corner of the country gather at such occasions. It will be a golden opportunity to distribute our literature there."

* * *

Holland: "The International Institute for Social History was before the war an international centre for the study of social history. The library contained a big and valuable collection of periodicals. During the war all our collections were stolen by the Germans and we do not yet know what will be found again of these in Germany. In any case we are trying to build up once more and we hope that after some time the Institute will again be the library in Western Europe where all the periodicals and interesting documents of social movements and social groups of the divers, tendencies are collected. The Institute is open every day and all the material is free at the disposal of students and research workers."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 7

DECEMBER 1946

NUMBER 12

Is the U. S. Heading Towards a New Depression?

An Editorial

POST-WAR BOOM PASSES PEAK

The post-war boom of U.S. capitalism has passed its peak and the country is now heading for another economic depression. This trend has already found its tell-tale expression in the agonized gyrations of the stock exchange and the cotton market.

In the space of a few days the September selling wave wiped out most of Wall Street's gains during the four years of war boom. The losses totalled the fantastic sum of \$12-billion, wiping out hordes of small speculators. The break in the cotton market followed in October, with the price of cotton declining as much as \$30 a bale. The estimated loss to the cotton farmers was \$200-million. Following the break, the stock exchange and the cotton market staged feeble recoveries, only to sag again despite the unchecked inflationary pressures.

The stock and commodity exchanges play a key role in the mechanics of capitalist economy. Through them the conditions and trends in economic life are registered and verified. These exchanges often anticipate or "discount" future developments. In the given instance, however, the September crash in Wall Street and the October plunge in cotton came not as a prevision of future developments, but rather as a belated reaction to conditions actually unfolding.

Production of both durable and non-durable goods for civilian use has been expanding very rapidly since the latter part of 1945. Branch after branch of industry has been setting all-time highs. A few comparative figures for key consumer durable commodities tell their own eloquent story.

MONTHLY OUTPUT OF CONSUMER DURABLES

	August 1946	Pre-war Monthly Output	Percent of Monthly Increase
Electric ranges	66,000	47,000	44
Gas ranges	168,000	125,000	35
Washing machines	212,000	158,000	34
Vacuum cleaners	218,000	156,000	39
Electric irons	608,000	380,000	60
Radios	1,700,000	1,100,000	54
Truck & bus tires	1,300,000	900,000	44
Passenger tires	5,800,000	4,200,000	37
Trucks	105,500	86,840	21

DOMESTIC MARKET SHRINKING FAST

Only in the output of refrigerators and automobiles has production lagged behind pre-war figures. But expansion is confidently expected here as well. According to Federal Reserve Board estimates, the index of production in consumer durables is supposed to jump from 206 in the third quarter of the current year to 212 in the fourth quarter. From the standpoint of production everything appears in the best possible order.

The profits reported by the corporations likewise keep setting records. Where then is the trouble? *The vast flood of commodities is not being absorbed by the domestic market.* This is not a forecast, but a fact.

In the face of rising production, manufacturers' shipments have not been increasing. These shipments reached their peak in April and then levelled off at approximately \$10-billion a month. This means that the surplus was going into the warehouses. There has been a steady increase in manufacturers' inventories, which at first kept rising at the rate of about 1 per cent a month. A parallel accumulation was taking place in the inventories of wholesalers and retailers. The domestic market was approaching its point of saturation. Early in 1946 came the first unmistakable signs that the absorbing capacity of the market could not keep pace with the expanding production. This was blithely ignored by the manufacturers, the wholesalers and the retailers. The banks and government authorities shut their eyes. The stock market and commodity exchanges spurred on the orgy of speculation. Record-breaking profits kept piling in.

Beginning with July the disproportion between the rate of production and the rate of distribution began to assume menacing proportions. In July the inventories increased fivefold as compared with June, touching an all-time peak of \$30-billion.

WAREHOUSES BULGING WITH GOODS

The warehouses held as much goods as industry had been able to ship in any single quarter in the current year. Of this huge stockpile, manufacturers' inventories held \$18-billion while wholesalers' and retailers' inventories held \$12-billion.

But this is not all. In July, for the first time since V-J Day, there was a decline in the orders received by the manufacturers. Their monthly shipments in July likewise declined 1 per cent from June. In the wholesale and retail field, the decline in the total volume of goods sold had set in much earlier, in February. Only the sharp price rises have masked this decline.

August marked not only a continuation but an acceleration of this process. Total inventories increased half as much again as in July and seven and one-half times as against June. Manufacturers' inventories rose to a new high of \$18.4-billion while wholesale and retail inventories shot up to \$12.8-billion.

Goods were not only piling up at a headlong pace, but what is most noteworthy, they were piling up twice as fast in the distribution field as in the field of production (.8 billion dollars among wholesalers and retailers as against .4 billion dollars

among the manufacturers). Here is striking proof that the market is henceforward able to absorb ever smaller amounts of commodities.

Why then have prices continued rising? Why then has there been no noticeable lag in production? Because of the speculative character of the post-war boom. Because the price structure and production have been propped up by a vast accumulation of inventories. If in 1929 it was the loans to stock brokers that skyrocketed, then today it is the loans to business men that are soaring. They are primarily used to hoard merchandise in the hope of further price rises. These loans have increased by \$2.5-billion since last year, and are still rising. Once the banks start calling in these loans (as they sooner or later must), the bottom will drop out of the price structure.

In the face of the foregoing facts it is clear that the September upheaval in Wall Street did not at all come in anticipation of some future economic difficulties, but because it was no longer possible to ignore or hide the grave disproportions already in existence.

In September the Department of Commerce released the inventory figures for July. Had it also released the figures for August (which were undoubtedly known at the time), the break would have been much more severe. Concurrently, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder issued in September a warning to the banks not to make any more "inflationary or speculative" loans. Refusal by the banks to advance loans would make the maintenance of swollen inventories impossible. Goods would be thrown into the already over-sold market. On the other hand, continuation of the loans means further monstrous dislocations. This is the insoluble contradiction that today confronts American capitalism.

FIRST CRACK IN PRICE STRUCTURE

The first crack in the price structure came in cotton. By October it was no longer possible to conceal the fantastic inventories of the textile industry. The discrepancy between the abnormally high stocks and the shrinking market sent the prices of cotton tumbling. By October 29, the price of cotton had declined \$50 a bale. The handwriting was on the wall.

But it is an open secret that inventories have continued to rise since August. At the same time, manufacturers' shipments and the volume of retail sales have kept steadily declining. Orders to manufacturers, especially in light industry, are being cut more and more drastically. Credit is likewise being gradually tightened.

We are thus definitely on the downward curve of the economic cycle. Upward fluctuations on this downward swing are of course possible. By manipulating the levers at its disposal, particularly the credit system, the bourgeoisie can temporarily retard the downward plunge. This is precisely what we have been witnessing since July. The September liquidation in Wall Street was checked before it assumed run-away proportions. Similarly with the break in cotton. But the bourgeoisie is impotent to forestall the inevitable. The longer the full-blown "bust" is delayed the more destructive will be its ultimate consequences.

The consensus of authoritative capitalist opinion is that a sharp break in the price structure and in production is unavoidable in 1947. This is in reality not a forecast at all but a blueprint of the course the bourgeoisie proposes to follow in the next period. It hopes to make the descent relatively gradual for a period of six to eight months, and then level off on that new lower foundation.

The financial papers and periodicals even have a new name

for the coming depression. The choice at present is between "shake-up," "shakedown," and "shakeout." The last is a brand new word. It is proposed as a new addition to the English language as the one word that is least invidious in its connotations. But the new name will not make the new depression one whit easier for the working people.

A 1920 OR 1929 CRASH?

Will the new depression, whether it comes in the spring of 1947, as some economists predict; or in the fall of 1947, as others believe; or even later—will this new depression be of the 1920-21 variety (which lasted a year and witnessed a 1/3 decline in production), or a profound social crisis of the 1929 variety? The capitalist economists are all sure that the new depression will just be a "mild" one, like that of 1920-21. What makes them so sure? Certainly not any facts they have uncovered. Their assurances are based simply on hope, on babbler-like smugness that somehow or other things will muddle through. How much the assurances of the Wall Street economists or the university professors are worth—we all learned in the 1929 crisis.

Nevertheless it is by no means excluded that the new economic depression—when it strikes—will be of the "mild" variety. In other words, it will "merely" wipe out hundreds of thousands of small business men and farmers, depress the already lowered living standards of the working masses, throw 8 to 10 million people on relief rolls. Then after a year or so of the "shakedown" or "shakeout," a new rise may take place in the economic cycle, proceeding from this lower level. And only after a number of additional years of "boom" will the economy plummet into the depths of a 1929 crisis; or what is more likely, a far graver crisis than 1929.

It is impossible to predict such events down to the last decimal point, because too many unknown and unknowable factors enter in. But what is sure is that one year after V-J Day, American capitalism is again heading for a crash. What is sure is that Karl Marx's ghost has again reappeared to plague the Wall Street "brains." What is sure is that they cannot escape the crisis of capitalist "overproduction." What is sure is that America has entered the period of deep-going social and political struggles revolving around the question of how the national wealth is to be divided, and for whose benefit American economy is to be run.

FASCISM

- WHAT IT IS
- HOW TO FIGHT IT

A Compilation

By **LEON TROTSKY**

With An Introduction

By **E. R. Frank**

15 Cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

The Decline of Capitalism and the Jewish Tragedy

By A. LEON

The following article on the Jewish problem is one of the concluding chapters of a still unpublished manuscript, *The Materialist Conception of the Jewish Question*, completed in December, 1942. The author, A. Leon, was the national secretary of the Belgian Trotskyist party and one of the leading spirits of the Fourth International in Europe. He was arrested by the Gestapo in June, 1944 and died a martyr's death in the Nazi concentration camp at Auschwitz.—Ed.

The primary merit of the capitalist regime lay in its tremendous expansion of the productive forces, its creation of a world economy, its permitting an unprecedented development of technology and science. As against the stagnation of the feudal world, capitalism presented an unparalleled dynamism. Hundreds of millions of people, immobilized up to then in a routinized, horizonless existence, suddenly found themselves drawn into the current of a feverish and intensive life.

The Jews lived within the pores of feudal society. When the feudal structure started to crumble, it began expelling these elements which were foreign to it and indispensable to it, at one and the same time. Even before the peasant had left the village for the industrial center, the Jew had abandoned the small medieval town in order to emigrate to the great cities of the universe. The destruction of the secular function of Judaism within feudal society is accompanied by its passive penetration into capitalist society.

But if capitalism has given humanity certain tremendous conquests, only its disappearance can allow humanity to enjoy them. Only Socialism will be able to lift humanity to the height of the material bases of civilization. But capitalism survives and all the enormous acquisitions turn more and more against the most elementary interests of humanity.

The progress of technology and science has become the progress of the science and technology of death. The development of the means of production is nothing but the growth of the means of destruction. The world, become too small for the productive apparatus built up by capitalism, is reduced even further by the desperate efforts of each imperialism to extend its sphere of influence. While unbridled export constitutes an inseparable phenomenon of the capitalist mode of production, decaying capitalism tries to get along without it, that is to say, it adds to its disorders the disorder of its own suppression.

Powerful barriers impede the free circulation of merchandise and men. Insurmountable obstacles arise before the masses deprived of work and bread following the breakdown of the traditional feudal world. The decay of capitalism has not only accelerated the decomposition of feudal society but has multiplied a hundredfold the sufferings which resulted from it. The bearers of civilization, in a blind alley, bar the road to those who wish to become civilized. Unable to attain civilization, the latter are still less able to remain in the stage of barbarism. To the peoples whose traditional bases of existence it has destroyed, capitalism bars the road of the future after having closed the road of the past.

It is with these general phenomena that the Jewish tragedy of the Twentieth century is tied up. The highly tragic situa-

tion of Judaism in our epoch is explained by the extreme precariousness of its social and economic position. The first to be eliminated by decaying feudalism, the Jews were also the first to be rejected by the convulsions of dying capitalism. The Jewish masses find themselves wedged between the anvil of decaying feudalism and the hammer of rotting capitalism.

The entire situation of Judaism in Eastern Europe is explained by the combination of the decline of the old feudal forms and of the degeneration of capitalism. The social differentiation which took place in the village as a result of capitalist penetration brought about an influx into the cities of enriched as well as proletarianized peasants; the former wanted to invest their capital; the latter to offer their labor. But the openings for the placement of capital were as slight as those for work. Hardly born, the capitalist system already showed all the symptoms of senility. The general decay of capitalism manifested itself in crises and unemployment within the countries of Eastern Europe; by the closing of all the outlets for emigration, outside their frontiers. Seven to eight million peasants were landless and almost without work in "independent" Poland. Placed between two fires, the Jews were exposed to the hostility of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, who sought to create a position for themselves at the expense of the Jews. "Jewish positions are particularly threatened by the urban Polish bourgeoisie and by the rich peasants who seek a solution for their difficulties through a fierce economic nationalism, whereas the Polish working class suffering from permanent unemployment, seeks for a remedy in its own position, in economic and political liberation, rather than in a sterile and murderous competition. . . ." (*The Economic Position of the Jews Throughout the World*.) It is precisely in the regions which capitalism had developed most that a non-Jewish commercial class formed most rapidly. It is there that the anti-semitic struggle was fiercest. "The decrease in the number of Jewish shops has been greatest in the central provinces, that is to say, in a region where the population is purely Polish, where the peasants have attained a higher standard of living, where industry is more developed, which is very important for the material and intellectual situation of the village. (*Idem*.)

Whereas in 1914, 72 per cent of the stores in the villages were Jewish, they fell to 34 per cent in 1935, that is to say, by more than one-half. The situation was better for the Jews in territories less developed economically. "The participation of Jews in commerce is more important in the most backward provinces" (Lipovski). "The eastern sections, belonging to White Russians, are, in their economic, intellectual and political relations, the most backward part of Poland. In these regions, the absolute majority of Jewish businessmen has increased by a third." (*The Economic Position of the Jews Throughout the World*.) In 1938, 82.6 per cent of the shops in the backward regions of Poland were in the hands of Jews. (*Yiddische Ekonomik Review*, September-October, 1938.)

All of these facts are further proof that the destruction of feudalism is at the bottom of the Jewish question in Eastern

Europe. The more backward a region is, the more easily are the Jews able to preserve their secular positions. But it is the general decay of capitalism which renders the Jewish question impossible of solution. The crisis and chronic unemployment make it impossible for the Jews to go into other professions; producing a frightful crowding in the professions which they follow, and unceasingly augmenting anti-semitic violence. The governments of the provincial nobles and large capitalists naturally endeavored to organize the anti-Jewish current and thereby divert the masses from their real enemy. "Resolve the Jewish question" became for them a synonym for the solution of the social question. In order to make place for the "national forces," the State organized a systematic struggle for "dejudifying" all the professions. The methods of "Polanizing" business in Poland proceeded from simple boycotting of Jewish stores by means of propaganda, right up to pogroms and incendiaryism. Here, by way of example, was the "victory bulletin" published June 14, 1936, in the governmental paper *Ilustrowany Kurjer codzienny*: "160 Polish business positions were conquered during the first months of this year in the Madom district. At Przektyk alone (notorious pogrom city) 50 business licenses were purchased by Poles. All in all, 2,500 Polish business positions were conquered in the various districts."*

Jewish craftsmanship was no more tenderly handled by the Polish governments. Boycott, exorbitant taxes, Polish examinations (thousands of Jewish craftsmen did not know this language), contributed to grinding down the Jewish artisans. Deprived of unemployment relief, the craft proletariat was one of the most disinherited. The wages of Jewish workers were very low and their living conditions frightful (work day up to 18 hours).

The universities constituted the favorite arena for the anti-semitic struggle. The Polish bourgeoisie exerted all its efforts to prevent Jews from entering the intellectual professions. The Polish universities became places of veritable pogroms, throwing people out of windows, etc. Well before Hitler's stars of David, the Polish bourgeoisie initiated ghetto benches in the universities. "Legal" measures, more circumspect but no less effective, rendered entry into the universities almost impossible for the Jewish youth, whose ancestral heritage had strongly developed their intellectual faculties. The percentage of Jewish students in Poland declined from 24.5 per cent in 1923-1933 to 13.2 per cent in 1933-1936. (In the period when Jewish and non-Jewish petty bourgeois intellectuals represent Hitler as the sole responsible party for anti-semitism in our time, in the period when the United Nations, among them Poland, lay claim to being defenders of the "rights of man"—recalling this fact will most certainly not be devoid of usefulness. Of course Hitler organized, in a premeditated way, the destruction of European Judaism and personified capitalist barbarism, in this sphere, as in others. But the various more or less "democratic" governments which followed each other in Poland could not have learned very much from him. The disappearance of Hitler can change nothing fundamental in the situation of the Jews. A transitory improvement of their condition will in no wise alter the profound roots of Twentieth century anti-semitism.)

The same policy of evicting Jewish students was followed in Lithuania and Hungary. The percentage of Jewish students in Lithuania declined from 15.7 per cent in 1920 to 8.5 per cent in 1931; in Hungary, from 31 per cent in 1918 to 10.5 per cent in 1931. In general the situation of the Jews in Hungary had for centuries resembled in every way that of Poland.

*At Warsaw in 1882, 79.3 per cent of businessmen were Jews; in 1931, 51 per cent of the businessmen were Jews. (Jacob Lesczinski, "The Economic Catastrophe of the Jews in Germany and Poland.")

In the country of great feudal magnates, the Jews for a long time played the role of an intermediary class between the lords and the peasants. "One of our correspondents reminds us that at the end of the Nineteenth century, a certain Count de Palugyay had great trouble in avoiding expulsion from the National Circle of Hungarian nobility at Budapest, because he wanted to personally take charge of the industrial transformation of his agricultural products, particularly the distillation of alcohol and whiskey from potatoes; he had even gone so far as to take charge of their sale."

The liberal professions were likewise not unaffected by this prejudice, which was as widespread among the high aristocracy as among the petty nobility. Shortly before the fall of the dual monarchy, a Hungarian magnate expressed his disgust of noblemen, who "for money, examined the throats of individuals whom they did not know." A natural consequence of this attitude was that the Jews had to form the intermediary class between the peasantry and the nobility, particularly in the towns. Trade, and especially petty trade, was a Jewish matter in the eyes of the people.

Even today, in the minds of the masses of the Magyar population, the shop, and in a general way everything connected with the exploitation of the shop, are thought of as Jewish, even if this shop has become an instrument of economic struggle against the Jews.

Here is a story which strikingly illustrates this state of mind: A peasant sent her son on some purchasing errands. She wanted them taken care of at the semi-State-ized *Mangya* cooperative and not at a Jewish shop, so she said to him: "Piesta, go to the Jew; not to the Jew who is a Jew, but to the new shop." (o.c., *The Economic Position of the Jews Throughout the World.*)

The process of elimination of the Jews from their economic positions took place in all of Eastern Europe. The situation of the Jewish masses became hopeless. A declassed youth, having no possibility of integrating itself into economic life, lived in black despair. Prior to the second war, 40 per cent of the Jewish population of Poland had to resort to philanthropic institutions. Tuberculosis raged.

Let us give the floor to correspondents of the Economic and Statistical Section of the Jewish Scientific Institute residing in regions where despair and the complete absence of a better future were stifling the Jewish youth. Here is what one wrote of Miedzyrzace: "The condition of the Jewish youth is very difficult, notably that of the sons and daughters of tradesmen who are without work because their parents do not require assistance. It is impossible to open new businesses. 75 boys and 120 young girls, aged 15 to 28 years, have no hope whatever of integrating themselves into the economic life of the country." Of Sulejow (province of Lodz) we are in possession of a more detailed picture, which is characteristic of the small towns of Poland: Almost 50 per cent of the children of Jewish business people work with their parents, but solely because they are unable to find another job. 25 per cent are learning some sort of trade and 25 per cent remain idle. 70 per cent of the children of artisans remain in the workshops of their parents even though the latter are almost without work and can very well get along without assistants. 10 per cent are learning new trades; 20 per cent have nothing to do. The sons of rabbis and of employees of Jewish communities are trying to attain a livelihood by learning a trade. The entire youth desires to emigrate, 90 per cent to Palestine, but because of the limited number of emigration certificates, their chances are slim. And yet they are ready to go to the North Pole or the South Pole, just so

long as they can tear themselves out of this stagnation. More and more the youth is turning towards the crafts and the number of young people in business is on the decline. (*The Economic Position of the Jews Throughout the World.*)

Western Europe

The condition of Judaism, rendered hopeless in Eastern Europe by the combined decline of feudalism and decay of capitalism—which created a stifling atmosphere filled with insane antagonisms—became the theater of a frightful rise of anti-semitism. Whereas the reduction in Jewish emigration, whose average annual rate declined from 155,000 between 1901 and 1914 to 43,657 between 1926 and 1935, greatly aggravated the situation of the Jews in Eastern Europe, the general crisis of capitalism made even this reduced emigration an intolerable burden to the western countries. (*Yiddische Ekonomik*, May-June 1938.) The Jewish question reached unprecedented sharpness not only in the countries of emigration but in the countries of immigration as well. Even before the first imperialist war, the mass arrival of Jewish immigrants created a strong anti-semitic movement among the middle classes of several Central and West-European countries. We need only recall the great successes of the anti-semitic Social-Christian party at Vienna and of its leader Lueger; the sweeping rise of anti-semitism in Germany (Treitschke), the Dreyfus Affair. Anti-semitism showed its roots most clearly in Vienna, one of the great centers of Jewish immigration before the first imperialist war. The petty bourgeoisie, ruined by the development of monopoly capitalism and headed for proletarianization, was exasperated by the mass arrival of the Jewish element, traditionally petty bourgeois and artisan.

After the first imperialist war, the countries of Western and Central Europe: Germany, Austria, France and Belgium, saw tens of thousands of Jewish immigrants, in tatters, lacking all resources, pour in from Eastern Europe. The seeming post-war prosperity permitted these elements to penetrate into all branches of business and artisanry. But even the Jewish immigrants who had penetrated into the plants did not remain there for long.

The long commercial past of the Jews weighed heavily on their descendants and the favorable postwar economic conditions brought about a perceptible process of de-proletarianization in Western Europe as well as in the United States. The Jewish workers retained their artisan position in the countries of immigration. In Paris in 1936 out of 21,083 Jewish workers belonging to trade unions, 9,253 worked at home (*IWO Blaetter*, May 1937).

The economic catastrophe of 1929 threw the petty bourgeois masses into a hopeless situation. The overcrowding in small business, artisanry and the intellectual professions took on unheard of proportions. The petty bourgeois regarded his Jewish competitor with growing hostility; for the latter's professional cleverness, the result of centuries of practice, often enabled him to survive "hard times" more easily. Anti-semitism even gained the ear of wide layers of worker-artisans, who traditionally had been under petty bourgeois influence.

It is consequently incorrect to accuse Big Business of having brought about anti-semitism. Big Business only proceeded to make use of the elementary anti-semitism of the petty bourgeois masses. It fashioned it into a major component of fascist ideology. By the myth of "Jewish capitalism," Big Business endeavored to divert and control the anti-capitalist hatred of the masses for its own exclusive profit. The real possibility of an agitation against Jewish capitalists lay in the antagonism

between monopoly capital and speculative-commercial capital, which Jewish capital was in the main. The relatively greater permeability of speculative capital (stock exchange scandal) allowed monopoly capital to channelize the hatred of the petty-bourgeois masses and even of a part of the workers against "Jewish capitalism."

"Ideology is a process which the so-called thinker does indeed achieve with consciousness, but with false consciousness. The real motive forces which move him remain unknown to him, otherwise this would not at all be an ideological process. In this way does he imagine false or apparent motive forces." (Engels to Mehring.)

Up to now we have tried to understand the real bases of anti-semitism in our time. But it is sufficient to consider the role played in the development of anti-semitism by the wretched document fabricated by the Czarist Okhrana, *The Protocols Of Zion*, to become aware of the importance of the "false or apparent motive forces" of anti-semitism. In Hitlerite propaganda today, the real motivation of anti-semitism in Western Europe—the economic competition of the petty bourgeoisie—no longer plays any role. On the contrary, the most fantastic allegations of the *Protocols Of Zion*—"the plans of universal domination by international Judaism" reappear in every speech and manifesto of Hitler. We must therefore analyze this mythical ideological element of anti-semitism.

Religion constitutes the most characteristic example of an ideology. Its true motive forces must be sought in the very prosaic domain of the material interests of a class, but it is in the most ethereal spheres that its apparent motive forces are found. Nevertheless, the God who launched the Puritan fanatics of Cromwell against the English aristocracy and Charles I was nothing but the reflection or symbol of the interests of the English peasantry and bourgeoisie. Every religious revolution is in reality a social revolution.

It is the unbridled development of the productive forces knocking against the narrow limits of consumption which constitute the true motive force of imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism. But it is the "Race" which seems to be its most characteristic apparent force. Racism is therefore in the first place the ideological disguise of modern imperialism. The "race struggling for its living space" is nothing but the reflection of the permanent necessity for expansion which characterizes finance or monopoly capitalism.

While the fundamental contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between production and consumption, involves for the big bourgeoisie the necessity to struggle for the conquest of foreign markets, it compels the petty bourgeoisie to struggle for the expansion of the domestic market. The lack of foreign markets for the big capitalists proceeds hand in hand with the lack of domestic markets for the small capitalists. Whereas the big bourgeoisie struggles furiously against its competitors on the foreign market, the petty bourgeoisie combats its competitors on the domestic market not a whit less fiercely. "Racism" abroad is consequently accompanied by "racism" at home. The unprecedented aggravation of capitalist contradictions in the Twentieth century brings with it a growing exacerbation of foreign "racism" as it does of domestic "racism."

The primarily commercial and artisan character of Judaism, heritage of a long historical past, makes it Enemy Number One of the petty bourgeoisie on the domestic market. It is therefore the petty bourgeois character of Judaism which makes it so odious to the petty bourgeoisie. But while the historical past of Judaism exercises a determining influence on its present social composition, it has effects no less important on the repre-

sentation of the Jews in the consciousness of the popular masses. For the latter, the Jew remains the traditional representative of the "money power."

This fact is of great importance because the petty bourgeoisie is not only a "capitalist" class, that is to say, a depositary "in miniature" of all capitalist tendencies; it is also "anti-capitalist." It has a strong, through vague, consciousness of being ruined and despoiled by Big Business. But its hybrid character, its inter-class position, does not permit it to understand the true structure of society nor the real character of Big Business. It is incapable of understanding the true tendencies of social evolution, for it has a presentiment that this evolution cannot help but be fatal for it. It wants to be anti-capitalist without ceasing to be capitalist. It wants to destroy the "bad" character of capitalism, that is to say, the tendencies which are ruining it, while preserving the "good" character of capitalism which permits it to live and get rich. But since there does not exist a capitalism which has the "good" tendencies without also possessing the "bad," the petty bourgeoisie is forced to dream it up. It is no accident that the petty bourgeoisie has invented "super-capitalism," the "bad" deviation of capitalism, its evil spirit. It is no accident that its theoreticians have struggled mightily for over a century (Proudhon) against "bad speculative capitalism" and defended "useful productive capitalism." The attempt of Nazi theoreticians to distinguish between "national productive capital" and "Jewish parasitic capital" is probably the last attempt of this kind. "Jewish capitalism" can best represent the myth of "bad capitalism." The concept of "Jewish wealth" is in truth solidly entrenched in the consciousness of the popular masses. It is only a question of reawakening and giving "presence" to the image of the "usurious" Jew, against whom peasant, petty bourgeois and lord, had struggled over a long period, by means of a well-orchestrated propaganda. The petty bourgeoisie and a layer of workers remaining under its sway are easily influenced by such propaganda and fall into this trap of "Jewish capitalism."

Historically, the success of racism means that capitalism has managed to channelize the anti-capitalist consciousness of the masses into a form that antedates capitalism and which no longer exists except in a vestigial state; this vestige is nevertheless still sufficiently great to give a certain appearance of reality to the myth.

Racism and Anti-Semitism

We see that racism is made up of rather strange elements. It reflects the expansionist will of big capital. It expresses the hatred of the petty bourgeoisie for "foreign" elements within the domestic market as well as its anti-capitalist tendencies.

It is in its aspect as a capitalist element that the petty bourgeoisie fights its Jewish competitor, and in its anti-capitalist aspect that it struggles against "Jewish capital." Racism finally diverts the anti-capitalist struggle of the masses into a form that antedates capitalism, persisting only in a vestigial state.

But while scientific analysis permits us to reveal its component parts, racist ideology must appear as an absolutely homogeneous "doctrine." Racism serves precisely to cast all classes into the crucible of a "racial community" opposed to other races. The racist myth strives to appear as a whole, having only vague connections with its origins which are often very different. It endeavors to fuse its different elements together in perfect fashion.

Thus, for example, "foreign" racism, the ideological disguise of imperialism, is not compelled, in and of itself, to adopt a strong anti-semitic coloration. But from the necessity

of synchronization, it generally does take on this character. The anti-capitalism of the masses, first channelized in the direction of Judaism, is then carried over against the "foreign enemy," which is identified with Judaism. The "Germanic race" will find itself faced with the duty of fighting the "Jew," his principal enemy, in all his disguises: that of domestic Bolshevism and liberalism, of Anglo-Saxon plutocracy and of foreign Bolshevism. Hitler states in *Mein Kampf* that it is indispensable to present the various enemies under a common aspect, otherwise there is a danger that the masses will think too much about the differences which exist between those enemies. That is why racism is a myth and not a doctrine. It demands faith, and fears reason like the plague. Anti-semitism contributes most to cementing the different elements of racism.

Just as it is necessary to cast the different classes into *one single race*, so is it also necessary that this "race" have only a single enemy: "the international Jew." The myth of race is necessarily accompanied by its "negative"—the anti-race, the Jew. The racial "community" is built on hatred of the Jews, a hatred of which the most solid "racial" foundation is buried in history in a period when the Jew was in effect a foreign body and hostile to all classes. The irony of history wills that the most radical anti-semitic ideology in all history should triumph precisely in the period when Judaism is on the road of economic and social assimilation. But like all "ironies of history" this seeming paradox is very understandable. At the time when the Jew was unassimilable, at a time when he really represented "capital," he was indispensable to society. There could be no question of destroying him. At the present time, capitalist society, on the edge of the abyss, tries to save itself by resurrecting the Jew and the hatred of the Jews. But it is precisely because the Jews do not play the role which is attributed to them that anti-semitic persecution can take on such an amplitude. Jewish capitalism is a myth; that is why it is so easily vanquished. But in vanquishing its "negative," racism at the same time destroys the foundations for its own existence. In the measure that the phantom of "Jewish capitalism" disappears, capitalist reality appears in all its ugliness. The social contradictions, banished for a moment by the fumes of "racial" drunkenness, reappear in all their sharpness. In the long run, the myth proves powerless against reality.

Despite its apparent homogeneity, the very evolution of racism allows the economic, social and political transformations that it strives to conceal, to be clearly discerned. At the beginning, in order to arm itself for the struggle for its "living space," for imperialist war, Big Business must beat down its domestic enemy, the proletariat. It is the petty bourgeoisie and declassed proletarian elements that furnish it with its shock troops, capable of smashing the economic and political organizations of the proletariat. Racism, at the beginning, appears therefore as an ideology of the petty bourgeoisie. Its program reflects the interests and illusions of this class. It promises struggle against "super-capitalism," against the trusts, stock exchange, big department stores, etc. But as soon as Big Business has succeeded in smashing the proletariat, thanks to the support of the petty bourgeoisie, the latter becomes an unbearable burden to it. The program of preparation for war implies precisely the ruthless elimination of small businesses, a prodigious development of the trusts, an intensive proletarianization. This same military preparation necessitates the support or at least a kind of neutrality from the proletariat, the most important factor in production. Thus Big Business does not hesitate for a moment to violate its most solemn promises in the most cynical way and to strangle the petty bourgeoisie

in the most brutal fashion. Racism now devotes itself to flattering the proletariat, to appearing as a radically "socialist" movement. It is here that the Judaist-capitalist identification plays its most important role. The radical expropriation of Jewish capitalists has to fulfill the role of "collateral," of "endorser" of racism's anti-capitalist will to struggle. The anonymous character of the capitalism of the monopolies, in contrast to the generally personal (and often speculative commercial) character of Jewish businesses, facilitates this operation of spiritual swindling. The common man more readily sees the "real" capitalist, the businessman, the manufacturer, the speculator, than the "respectable director of a corporation" who is made to pass as an "indispensable factor in production." It is in this way that racist ideology reaches the following identifications: Judaism-capitalism; racism-socialism; an economy controlled for war—a socialist controlled economy.

It is undeniable that large sections of workers, deprived of their organizations, blinded by the foreign political successes of Hitler, have allowed themselves to be taken in by racist mythology, just as was the case previously with the petty bourgeoisie. For the time being the bourgeoisie appears to have attained its objective. The furious anti-Jewish persecution extending throughout Europe serves to indicate the "definitive" victory of racism, the final defeat of "international Judaism."

The racial "theory" now dominant is nothing but an attempt to establish racism "on a scientific basis." It is devoid of all scientific value. It is enough to observe the pitiful acrobatics which the racist theoreticians perform to demonstrate the relationship of the "Germans and the Nipponese" or the irrevocable antagonism between "the heroic German spirit" and the "commercial Anglo-Saxon spirit" in order to be completely convinced of this. The ramblings of a Montadon on the "de-prostitution" of the Jewish "ethnic entity" by . . . the compulsion to wear stars of David certainly have no greater value. The real prostitution of certain "scholars" to racism presents an unusual spectacle of the decline of human dignity. But we see there only an end product of the complete decay of bourgeois science which had already, under democracy, lost its objectivity.

Racist stupidities must not however deter us from examining the extent to which it is necessary to speak of a Jewish race. The most superficial examination of the question leads us to the conclusion that the Jews constitute in reality a mixture of the most diverse races. It is evidently the *Diaspora* character of Judaism which is the fundamental cause of this fact. But even in Palestine, the Jews were far from constituting a "pure race." Disregarding the fact that, according to the Bible, the Israelites brought a mass of Egyptians with them when they left Egypt and that Strabon considered them as descendants of Egyptians, it is enough to recall the numerous races which had established themselves in Palestine: Hittites, Canaanites, Philistines, Egyptians ("Aryans"), Phoenicians, Greeks, Arabs. Judea was inhabited, according to Strabon, by the Phoenicians, Egyptians and Arabs. The development of Jewish proselytism during the Greek and Roman era strongly accentuated the mixed character of Judaism. As early as 139 B.C. the Jews were driven out of Rome for having made proselytes there. The community of Antioch was composed in large part of proselytes. Proselytism continued even during subsequent eras. The compulsory conversion of slaves to Judaism, the conversion of the Chasars as well as of other races and tribes in the course of the long *Diaspora*, have been so many factors which have made a characteristic conglomeration of races out of Judaism.

At the present time there is absolutely no racial homogeneity between the Yemenite Jews, for example, and the Jews of Daghestan. The first are Oriental in type while the latter belong to the Mongol race. There are black Jews in India, Ethiopian Jews (Falascha), "Troglodyte" Jews in Africa. However, this fundamental difference which exists, for example, between the Jews of Daghestan and the Yemenite Jews, does not exhaust the question. Actually nine-tenths of today's Jews are inhabitants of Eastern Europe or descendants of Jews from this section. Is there a European-Oriental Jewish race? Here is how the anti-semitic theoretician, Hans Gunther, answers this question: Oriental Judaism, which comprised close to nine-tenths of the Jews, consisting today of the Jews of Russia, Poland, Galicia, Hungary, Austria and Germany, as well as the largest part of the Jews in North America and in western Europe, constitutes a mixture of pre-Asiatic, Baltic, Central Asiatic, Nordic, and Negro races (*Rassenkunde des jüdisches Volkes*).

According to research undertaken in New York, of 4,235 Jews, there were:

	Jews %	Jewesses %
Brunette types	52.62	56.94
Blond types	10.42	10.27
Mixed types	36.96	32.79

14.25 per cent of Jews and 12.7 per cent of Jewesses had what is called the Jewish nose, which is nothing else but the nose common to the peoples of Asia Minor, especially widespread among the Armenians. This nose is also widespread among the Mediterranean peoples as well as among Bavarians. These few observations permit us to see how stupid the concept of the "Jewish race" is. The Jewish race is a myth. On the other hand, it is correct to say that the Jews constitute a different racial mixture from the racial mixtures of most of the European peoples, especially the Slavs and Germans.

However it is not so much the anthropological characteristics of the Jews which distinguish them from other peoples as their physiological, pathological and above all psychological characteristics.

It is primarily the economic and social function of Judaism throughout history which explains this phenomenon. For centuries the Jews were the inhabitants of cities, devoted to trade. The Jewish type is far more the result of this secular function than a racial characteristic. The Jews have absorbed a mass of heterogeneous racial elements but all these elements have been subjected to the influence of the special conditions in which the Jews lived, which, in the long run, ended up with the creation of the so-called "Jewish type." This is the result of a long selection, not racial but economic and social. The physical weakness, the frequency of certain illnesses like diabetes, nervous disorders, a specific bodily posture etc., are not racial characteristics but are the result of a specific social position. Nothing is more ridiculous than to explain, for example, the Jews' penchant for trade, or their tendency to abstraction, on the basis of their race. Wherever the Jews are assimilated economically, wherever they cease to form a class, they rapidly lose all these characteristics. And so it happens that where the racist theoreticians thought they were face to face with a "genuine race," they were in reality, only viewing a human community, whose specific characteristics are above all the result of the social conditions in which it lived for many centuries. A change in these social conditions must naturally bring with it the disappearance of the "racial characteristics" of Judaism.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

A Documentary History of the Fourth International

By LEON TROTSKY

(Continued from the October issue.)

Up to this point Urbahns repeats in the main only the arguments of Louzon. But then he goes on to "deepen" Louzon. If the editorial article of *Die Fahne des Kommunismus* is stripped of its reservations, equivocations and all other loopholes, its gist comes down to the following formula: Since the national revolution triumphed in China, while the counter-revolution has triumphed (or virtually triumphed, or is ineluctably bound to triumph) in Russia, therefore it follows that. . . . What follows? The article does not give a clear answer. Its eclectic philosophy performs precisely the service of dodging a clear-cut answer.

I consider it necessary for the exposition that follows to set down the following preliminary propositions:

1. Comrade Urbahns has a false conception of the character of the Russian Revolution and the stage through which it is now passing. He interprets wrongly the meaning of Thermidor. (I refer here, as well as further on, to Comrade Urbahns for the sake of brevity. What I have in mind is the majority of the Leninbund's leadership and the editors of its publications. Incidentally, it is not uncommon in the columns of *Volkswille* to run across the expression: "The leadership of the Leninbund and Comrade Urbahns.")

2. Comrade Urbahns has a wrong conception of the class mechanics of the Chinese Revolution and its present condition.

3. From his false social appraisals he draws erroneous and highly dangerous political conclusions.

4. The fact that he (like Louzon and the other ultra-Lefts) does not pursue his conclusions to the end only shows a lack of consistency, but in nowise diminishes the danger of his false position.

At this point I am compelled to quote a long passage from *Die Fahne des Kommunismus* which tries in its leading editorial to explain those conditions which created a "national liberation movement" in China:

. . . (China's) national liberation movement, revolutionary in its character, had its barb directly aimed at the imperialists and the Chinese proletariat found its class interests (!!) expressed in it. This revolution came to a halt (!) at the bourgeois stage; it brought Chiang Kai-shek's military rule to the top, drowned in blood the Chinese proletarian revolution and the revolutionary peasant uprisings which infringed upon private property; and brought the Chinese bourgeoisie closer to the goals of the bourgeois revolution. One of these goals is national unification. . . . Imperialist concessions are a painful splinter in the flesh of this national unification of China. . . . The Chinese seek to get rid of it—through negotiations with the imperialist powers; in relation to Soviet Russia, which they regard as a much weaker opponent, they seek to accomplish it—through military assault. Therewith (!) decisive (*massgebend*) for the Chinese military government is the fact that the Russian concession is, from the class standpoint, a more (?) dangerous factor than the concessions of the capitalist "hostile brothers." This conflict ought to have been foreseen by everybody inasmuch as Chinese and Russian interests

could not possibly cohabit peacefully in the China of the bourgeois revolution. Only a victorious Chinese revolution could have realized such a collaboration in life. *Even if it had ended only in a workers' and peasants' China. . .*" (Loc. cit. Issue No. 31, p. 245.)

I do not recall ever encountering such a confusion of ideas in twenty odd lines of type. At all events, it did not happen to me often. A whole page would be required to untangle each line. I will try to do it as briefly as possible, disregarding the secondary contradictions.

In its first part the passage deals with imperialist concessions, including the Chinese Eastern Railway, which, it is asserted, constitute a splinter in the flesh of China's national independence. The Soviet Republic is here bracketed with the capitalist states. In its second part, the passage makes the assertion that "therewith" it is also decisive (!) that the Russian concession is more (?) dangerous from the class standpoint. And finally there follows a synthesis of these two mutually exclusive explanations, namely: the interests of China and Russia are irreconcilable *in general*. How so? Why so? From the first part of the quotation it follows that Russian *imperialism* is incompatible with China's *national* unity. From the second part it follows that the interests of *workers'* Russia are irreconcilable with those of *bourgeois* China. Which of these two diametrically opposed explanations does Urbahns choose? He does not choose between them but instead combines the two. How does he accomplish this? With the aid of a little adverb, "therewith" (*dabei*). Five German letters and the problem is—solved.

That the interests of the Soviet Republic and bourgeois China were irreconcilable, says Urbahns, ought to have been foreseen by everybody. Very well. This means that it is not at all a question of the railway or of the 1924 Treaty, doesn't it? The irreconcilability in the relations between present-day China and the Soviet Republic only mirrors the irreconcilability of China's own internal contradictions. Had Urbahns said that the Chinese bourgeoisie, which rests on bayonets, hates the Soviet Republic, *whose mere existence is a source of revolutionary unrest in China*, he would have spoken correctly. In addition, one would still have to say that its fear of its own oppressed masses is designated by the Chinese bourgeoisie as fear of Soviet imperialism.

Urbahns asserts that the bourgeois revolution has triumphed in China. This is the opinion of the international Social Democracy. What triumphed in China was not the *bourgeois* revolution but the *bourgeois counter-revolution*. This is not at all the same thing. Of the massacre of workers and peasants Urbahns speaks as of some internal detail of the bourgeois revolution. He even goes so far as to maintain that the Chinese workers found their class interests expressed (*vertreten*) in the national revolution, that is to say, in the Kuomintang, into which the Comintern drove them with a club. Such a standpoint is Stalinist, i.e., Social Democratic. The bourgeois revolution,

insofar as it proved at all realizable in China as an independent stage, took place in 1911. But it took place only in order to demonstrate that a bourgeois revolution, completed to any degree whatever, is impossible in China. That is to say, that China's national unification, her emancipation from imperialism and her democratic transformation (the agrarian problem!) are unthinkable under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The second Chinese revolution (1925-27) showed by its entire course what the Marxists clearly saw beforehand, namely: the genuine solution of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution in China is possible only through the dictatorship of the proletariat, resting on the alliance of workers and peasants as against the alliance of the native bourgeoisie with imperialism. But this revolution cannot come to a halt at the bourgeois stage. It becomes converted into the permanent revolution, that is, it becomes a link of the international socialist revolution and shares the destinies of the latter. It is for this reason that the bourgeois counter-revolution, which triumphed with the help of Stalin-Bukharin, mercilessly crushed the movement of the popular masses and installed not a democratic regime but military-fascist rule.

The Permanent Revolution in China

In the first part of the foregoing quotation, Comrade Urbahn's newspaper talks about the triumph of the bourgeois revolution in China. In the second part it proclaims that collaboration of China with Soviet Russia could be possible only in the event of "a victorious Chinese revolution." What does this mean? After all, according to Urbahn, didn't the bourgeois revolution triumph in China? Isn't this exactly why it is trying to pluck the imperialist splinter out of its flesh? In that case, what *other* revolution is Urbahn talking about? Is it the proletarian revolution? Not at all. "Even if it had ended only in a workers' and peasants' China." What does this "even" mean? It can mean nothing else but that the proletarian revolution is not involved here. Neither is the bourgeois revolution, not so? Then which one? Does it mean that Urbahn—like Bukharin and Radek—foresees the possibility of neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian dictatorship but of a special workers' and peasants' dictatorship in China? One ought to speak out on this more clearly, more boldly and more firmly, without seeking to hide behind the little word "even." The Stalinist-Bukharinist orientation toward the Kuomintang originated precisely from this philosophy of a non-bourgeois and non-proletarian dictatorship. It is precisely on this point that Radek and Smilga first stumbled. Stalin, Bukharin and Zinoviev, and following in their footsteps Radek with Smilga, believe that as against world imperialism on the one side and the workers' state on the other, a *petty-bourgeois revolutionary dictatorship* is possible in China. And after the experience with Russian Kerenskyism and with the Chinese Kuomintang, both of the Right and the Left, Urbahn timidly sings in tune with Radek on this question, upon which the fate of the whole Orient depends. Not for nothing does Urbahn reprint the extremely superficial and trite article of Radek on the question of the permanent revolution, while keeping silent on his own attitude to the question.

Let me add parenthetically that Radek's article contains an absolutely fantastic bit of gossip to the effect that during my confinement in Alma-Ata I held back the exposure of Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev, because I hoped for a bloc with the Rights. What is the source of this? Yaroslavsky's snuff box? Or Menzhinsky's notebook? Radek is hardly the inventor of it. But Comrade Urbahn has so much space that he prints not only the novels of Sinclair but even the rantings of Yaroslavsky-Radek. Had Comrade Urbahn's loyalty turned to me for

verification, I could have explained to him that the news of Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev reached me almost simultaneously with the report of Urbahn's equivocal declarations concerning a bloc with Brandler. My reaction to this was set down in an article on the absolute inadmissibility of unprincipled blocs between the Left and Right Oppositions. This article was published only a few months ago by Brandler and *only then* was it reprinted by *Volkswille*.

But to resume, today it is not at all a question of repeating fraudulently selected fragments of 1905 quotations on the permanent revolution. This work of falsification has had sufficient efforts devoted to it by the Zinovievs, the Maslows and the like. It is a question of the entire strategic line for the countries of the East and for a whole epoch. One must state clearly whether a special *democratic dictatorship* of workers and peasants is conceivable and just wherein it would differ from the dictatorship of the Kuomintang on the one hand and from the dictatorship of the proletariat on the other. This brings us to the following question: Can the peasantry have an independent policy in the revolution—a policy independent in relation to the bourgeoisie and in relation to the proletariat? Marxism, enriched by the experience of the Russian and Chinese revolutions, replies: *No, no, no*. Following the lead of its top circles and of the petty bourgeois intellectuals, the peasantry either marches with the bourgeoisie—in that case what we get is S.R.'ism, Kerenskyism, or Kuomintangism. Or following the lead of its lower sections, the semi-proletarian and proletarian elements of the village, the peasantry marches with the industrial proletariat. In that case we have the path of Bolshevism, the path of October (i.e., the permanent) revolution.

It was on this question—and on no other—that Stalin and Bukharin broke the neck of the Chinese Communist Party and of the Chinese revolution. Zinoviev, Radek, Smilga, Preobrazhensky strayed between Stalinism and Marxism and this straying led them to ignominious capitulation. For the countries of the East this question draws the line of demarcation between Menshevism and Bolshevism. The fact that present-day Martynovs use as a fig-leaf the shreds of Bolshevik quotations from the year 1905, the very same quotations which Stalin, Kamenev, Rykov and others used to cover themselves against Lenin in 1917—this masquerade can take in only fools or ignoramuses.* In China the Comintern realized in life the leadership of Martynov-Bukharin-Stalin, to the accompaniment of savage braying against the permanent revolution. Today this is the fundamental question for the countries of the East and it is therefore one of the basic questions for the West. Has Comrade Urbahn an opinion on this subject? No, he has not. He ducks for cover behind a particular little word, or what is worse, he hides behind an article of Radek, which he prints "just in case."

Thermidor

If Comrade Urbahn is in a bad way with the Chinese Revolution, then the situation is still worse, if that is possible, when he comes to the Russian Revolution. I am referring here primarily to the question of *Thermidor*, and by this very reason, to the question of the class nature of the Soviet state. The formula of Thermidor is of course a conditional formula, like every historical analogy. When I employed this formula for the

*For twenty years (1903-1923) Martynov was the chief theoretician of Menshevism. He became a member of the Bolshevik Party when Lenin was already on his sick-bed and the campaign against Trotskyism was on its way. The October Revolution prior to the NEP was accused by Martynov in 1923 of Trotskyism. Today this creature is the chief theoretician of the Comintern. He remains true to himself. But he uses quotations from Lenin to cover up his old fundamental line. Several factories are in operation for the selection and falsification of these quotations.

first time against Zinoviev-Stalin, I immediately underscored its wholly conditional character. But it is entirely legitimate, notwithstanding the difference between the two epochs and the two class structures. Thermidor signalizes the first victorious stage of the counter-revolution, that is, the direct transfer of power from the hands of one class into the hands of another, where-with this transfer, although necessarily accompanied by civil war, is nevertheless masked politically by the fact that the struggle occurs between the factions of a party that was yesterday united. Thermidor in France was preceded by a *period of reaction* which unfolded while the power remained in the hands of the plebeians, the city's lower classes. Thermidor crowned this preparatory period of reaction by an out-and-out political catastrophe, as a result of which the plebeians lost power. Thermidor thus does not signify a period of reaction in general, i.e., a period of ebb, of downsliding, of weakening of revolutionary positions. Thermidor has a much more precise meaning. It indicates the direct transfer of power into the hands of a different class, after which the revolutionary class cannot regain power except through an armed uprising. The latter requires, in turn, a new revolutionary situation, the inception of which depends upon a whole complex of domestic and international causes.

As far back as 1923, the Marxist opposition established the inception of a new chapter in the revolution, the chapter of ideological and political downsliding, which could, in the future, signify Thermidor. It was then that we employed this term for the first time. . . . Had the German revolution conquered toward the end of 1923—as was entirely possible—the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia would have been cleansed and consolidated without any internal convulsions. But the German revolution ended in one of the most terrible capitulations in working class history. The defeat of the German revolution gave a powerful impetus to all the processes of reaction inside the Soviet Republic. Hence the struggle against the “permanent revolution” and “Trotskyism” in the Party led to the creation of the theory of socialism in one country, and so on. The ultra-Lefts in Germany failed to grasp the breaking-point that had occurred. With their right hand they supported the reaction in the Russian Communist Party, with their left hand they conducted a formally aggressive policy in Germany, ignoring the defeat of the German revolution and the incipient ebb. Like the Centrists in the RCP, the German ultra-Lefts (Maslow, Fischer, Urbahns) also covered up their false policy by a struggle against “Trotskyism” which they portrayed as “liquidationism”—because they themselves saw the revolutionary situation not behind but ahead of them. The label of Trotskyism was in this case attached to the ability to appraise a situation and to differentiate correctly between the periods. It would be very profitable, let me add in passing, if Urbahns would at long last draw the theoretical balance sheet of this entire struggle which befuddled the minds of the German workers and paved the way for the victory of fatuous functionaries, adventurists and careerists.

The false “ultra-Left” course of 1924-25 tended still further to weaken the positions of the European proletariat and thereby accelerated the reactionary recession in the Soviet Republic. The expulsion of the Opposition from the Party, the arrests and the deportations constituted extremely important consecutive moments of the entire process. They signified that the Party was growing weaker and weaker and consequently that the power of resistance of the Soviet proletariat was also declining. But all this still far from signified that the counter-revolutionary overturn had already taken place, that is, that the power had passed from the hands of the working class to another class.

The fact that the Soviet proletariat found it beyond its strength to prevent the organizational crushing of the Opposition, represented naturally a highly alarming symptom. But on the other hand, Stalin found himself driven, simultaneously with the crushing of the Left Opposition, to plagiarize partially from its program in all fields, to direct his fire to the Right, and to convert an internal party maneuver into a very sharp and prolonged zigzag to the left. This shows that despite everything the proletariat still possesses powers to exert pressure and that the state apparatus still remains dependent on it. Upon this cardinal fact the Russian Opposition must continue to base its own policy, which is the *policy of reform and not of revolution*.

Even before the Opposition was crushed organizationally, we said and wrote more than once that after the Lefts have been lopped off, the Rights would prevent the Center with their bill. Those elements that supported Stalin in the struggle against us will start pressing with redoubled force as soon as the Left barrier was removed. That was our prediction. We expressed it frequently as follows: “The Thermidorian tail will come down on the Centrist head.” This has already taken place, and this will be repeated again and again. I have in mind not Bukharin or Tomsky but the powerful Thermidorian forces whose pale reflection the Rights are in the Party.

Despite the organizational crushing of the Opposition and the weakening of the proletariat, the pressure of its class interests combined with the pressure of the Opposition's ideas proved sufficiently powerful to compel the Centrist apparatus to undertake a prolonged left zigzag. And it was precisely this left zigzag that created the political premise for the latest series of capitulations. The composition of the capitulators is naturally quite diversified, but the leading role is being played in the main by those who formerly imagined the process of downsliding as purely one-sided and who were inclined at each new stage to proclaim that Thermidor had already been accomplished. On the eve of our expulsion from the party, the Zinovievist, Safarov, cried out in Berlin and later in Moscow, “It is five minutes to twelve!” that is, it is five minutes before Thermidor. Five minutes passed, and—Safarov capitulated. Even before Safarov, Radek desired, in connection with the expulsion of myself and Zinoviev from the Central Committee, to proclaim the inception of Thermidor. I tried to show him that it was only a *party rehearsal for Thermidor*, perhaps not even a dress rehearsal, but at all events not Thermidor itself, i.e., not the counter-revolutionary overturn which is accomplished by classes. Since 1926 Smilga held the opinion that the then policy of Stalin-Bukharin (“peasants enrich yourselves,” the Anglo-Russian Committee, the Kuomintang) could shift in one direction and one only—to the *right*. Smilga held that the October Revolution had exhausted its internal resources, and that aid could come only from the outside, but he had no hopes of this in the years immediately ahead. He wrote theses on this subject. The possibility of a break between the Centrists and the Rights and of a Centrist swing to the left, under the pressure of internal forces, was entirely absent from his perspective. On the question of Thermidor and of two parties, Radek and Smilga held the extreme “left” position within the Opposition. That is why the events caught them by surprise, and that is why they capitulated so easily.

This brief historical review should make it clear to the reader that the question of whether “Trotsky goes far enough,” or “not far enough” on the problem of Thermidor (as Urbahns formulates it), contains nothing new. We studied this whole cycle of questions long ago and reviewed them over and over again at each new stage.

On May 26, 1928 I wrote from Alma-Ata to the exiled comrade Mikhail Okudzhava, one of the old Georgian Bolsheviks as follows:

To the extent that Stalin's new course sets itself tasks, it unquestionably represents an attempt to approach *our* position. What decides in politics, however, is not only the *what*, but the *how* and the *who*. The main battles which will decide the fate of the revolution, still lie ahead. . . . We always held, and we said so more than once, that the process of the political downsliding of the ruling faction cannot be pictured as a steadily dropping curve. Downsliding, too, does not take place, after all, in a vacuum but in a class society, with its profound internal frictions. The basic party mass is not at all monolithic, it simply represents, for the most part, political raw material. In its processes of differentiation are unavoidable—under the impact of class impulses both from the right and the left. The grave events which recently occurred in the Party and the consequences of which you and I are suffering, are only an overture to the future march of

events. As an overture in an opera anticipates the musical themes of the opera as a whole and gives them in a condensed form, just so our *political "overture"* only anticipates those melodies which will find their full expression in the future, to the accompaniment of the tubas, double-basses, drums and other instruments of serious *class music*. The development of events confirms beyond the shadow of a doubt that we were and remain correct not only as against the weathercocks and turncoats, i.e., the Zinovievs, the Kamenevs, Pyatakovs and the rest, but also as against our dear friends on the "left," *the ultra-left muddlers insofar as they are bent to accept the overture for the opera*, that is to say, to assume that all the basic processes in the Party and in the State have already been accomplished; and that Thermidor, of which they heard for the first time from us, is an already accomplished fact."

This is not a hint, Comrade Urbahns, it is the truth.

(To Be Continued)

The Jackson Period in American History

By HARRY FRANKEL

The Jackson period, extending roughly from the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 through his two terms and one of Martin Van Buren, his chief lieutenant, gave a different cast to American political life. In addition to reshaping the political methods and institutions of its own day, it has assumed especial significance in the liberal bourgeois tradition. In the annals of capitalist historians, the Jackson period has gone down as a revolutionary-democratic era of popular rule. The Bryan "revolt," and the Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations referred especially to the Jacksonian past. Even certain renegades from Marxism (Corey) refer explicitly to Jacksonianism for proof of the fundamentally democratic character of American capitalism. Marxists interpret this period in American history in an entirely different manner.

The year 1800 in American national politics marked the triumph of the planting aristocracy under the leadership of Jefferson over its Northern merchant rival. Southern plantation economy was at that time based upon the slave cultivation of tobacco, rice and indigo, as the chief staples. The next half century saw a displacement of these crops by a new staple. It is well known that the invention of the cotton gin in 1793 provided the initial impetus to the increase of the cotton crop. The cultivation of upland, or short-fibered cotton had been limited by the difficulty of separating the fiber and seed. By overcoming this, the cotton gin freed cotton from its narrow confines in the seaboard area and started it on its career across the Appalachian range to the furthest reaches of suitable soil in faraway Texas. At the height of cotton cultivation, two-thirds of Southern slaves were engaged exclusively in its production. Between 1791 and 1860 the cotton crop multiplied a thousandfold. This enthronement of King Cotton made possible the most stupendous social reversion of modern times. For Southern cotton was raised on the basis of pre-capitalist, even pre-feudal relations: the system of chattel slavery.

For sixty years the Southern planters held national power. It is an abnormality for the slavocracy to dominate in an era of rising capitalism. But norms can serve only as guides for the understanding of history; they cannot be substituted for the more complex living social process. U.S. history has shown that the rule of the slavocracy was no symbol of the absolute retrogres-

sion of human society as some in that day thought it to be. Rather it was a temporary retrograde motion produced by a transient conjuncture of circumstances which could not endure. History has likewise shown that Jacksonianism, which arose in the period of planter rule, did not overthrow that rule, but represented rather a transitory phenomenon. Jacksonianism continued slaveholder rule with modified techniques.

Andrew Jackson was a man of iron will who left a personal mark upon the history of the United States. He typified in almost every way the new rising western cotton planters. A Tennessee slaveholder of considerable wealth (his "Hermitage" was one of the finest mansions of the West), he was, in his early career during the first decades of the Nineteenth century, the most important single human instrument of the planters in their westward expansion. His victories in the Indian Wars, and especially in the War of 1812 (where, at New Orleans, he "beat the men that beat Napoleon"), opened the Southwest to the plantation system.

His early political career disproves the contention of Jackson's adulatory historians that he was a "democratic figure." Even one of his most enthusiastic historian-adulators is forced to record that in local Tennessee politics Jackson was of the "landholding aristocracy," and together with his class, "normally acted . . . both against the financial aristocracy and the canebrake democracy." (Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., *The Age of Jackson*.)

Andrew Jackson became a link of special configuration in the chain of planter Presidents that began with Thomas Jefferson and ended forever with Jefferson Davis. The attitude of this group of Presidents towards slavery was progressively modified as cotton fixed the "peculiar institution" on the South. Thomas Jefferson was a passive opponent of slavery. Jackson takes his rightful place in the progression as an active defender of slavery, as the planters travelled the sixty-year road to Jefferson Davis. Where Jefferson was a planter of Old Virginia, and Davis a planter of Mississippi towards the further western reaches of the slave power, Jackson takes his accurate geographical place in the shifting center of plantation gravity as a Tennessee planter.

Marxists always approach the question of the class nature of a state by first determining the character of the economy upon

which the political structure rests. In this scientific approach they differ from all varieties of vulgar thinkers for whom states are indeterminate formations, dominated now by "demagogues," then by "the people," and again by "dictators." Nor can any pretended "exceptionalism" exempt the United States from this method. Despite special American conditions, the history of this country will yield its secrets only to the Marxist key.

American economy up to 1865 exhibited a dual structure. Hewing in one portion of the country to the classic capitalist line, it took on the atavistic shape of plantation economy based upon slavery in the other section. The cohabitation of these two systems was made partially and temporarily possible by the segregation of the systems each to its own geographical region. Political decentralization in the form of state governments provided both the bourgeoisie and the slaveholders a measure of local autonomy. Yet national policies of growing importance were decided by the class controlling the Federal government. By examining the decisions on these issues we discover which class was in control of the Federal government. Up until the Civil War, the important decisions were almost always in favor of the slaveholders. It is instructive in view of the Jackson myths to examine the stand of the Jacksonian party on each of these issues.

The National Bank: At the time of Jackson's election, the Second Bank of the United States was in existence, chartered by the Jeffersonian Democrats to finance the War of 1812. The very chartering of such a bank demonstrates that the planter administrations had been pursuing a course of compromise with the capitalist class; for the first Bank had been destroyed by the Jefferson-led planters' assault. The renewed apprehensions of the slaveholding class, and especially of its newer and more aggressive western sections led to a new attack upon the Bank. Many local state-banking interests participated in this onslaught. Jackson destroyed this centralized engine of bourgeois power.

Western Lands: The planters' attitude to western lands was determined by its ever-growing greed for more cotton soil. The farmers also wanted the territories opened to their penetration. But in the planter attitude and the farmer attitude there was a difference—the difference being slavery. This difference was to tear them apart in the free-soil controversy of later years. During the Jackson period, they united against the bourgeoisie which was seeking to restrict land sales in order to restrict the planting power and to keep labor in the East. Jackson's policy here again is most clearly revealed as the planter policy. He did everything within his power to enlarge the land area of the Union, aiming even at the annexation of Texas. Land was the capital of the planter. Jackson sought by every means to augment it, while destroying the capitalist Bank.

Robbery of Indian Lands

Indian Lands: Four Indian tribes in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee and Mississippi held ancestral lands aggregating over 33 million acres—almost the combined areas of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. No longer savages, they had developed modern agricultural forms and orderly governments. The story of these lands is described by the historian, William E. Dodd, in *The Cotton Kingdom*:

The planters of Georgia first, and later those of other states, who coveted these lands with a covetousness unimagined by the kingly exploiter of Naboth's vineyard in ancient times, vowed that the Indian should not be allowed to develop settled, civilized communities. Since the planters were represented in Congress and the natives had recourse only to executive protection, the contest was most un-

equal, and when President Jackson gave the Indians over to the tender mercies of their enemies, there was no help for them. The planters had their way, and the Indian lands were rapidly converted into cotton plantations.

It is only necessary to add that when the bourgeoisie, through the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, tried to block the planters from the Indian lands, Jackson paid no heed, saying, "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it."

Abolitionist Literature: The growing Northern movement for abolition of chattel slavery attempted to penetrate the South with its literature. The planters demanded that the mails be closed to the abolitionists. Here was a problem for Amos Kendall, Postmaster General, chief adviser to Jackson and intellectual leader of the Democratic Party. Kendall solved it with a happy "compromise": Abolitionist literature could be mailed in the North, but need not be delivered in the South! Such "compromises" are always acceptable to the ruling class.

Internal Improvements: This was a contemporary term for canals, roadways and so forth to be constructed at Federal expense. The bourgeoisie saw in them a profitable transportation network necessary for trade and having the additional value of linking the bourgeoisie and western farmers in an economic bloc. With this in view that inimitable juggler, Henry Clay, made "internal improvements" part of his "American System" along with the manufacturers' tariff. But the planters saw no reason why they should bear part of the burden for a program that was primarily of benefit to their rival. Jackson thereupon set his face against this scheme and used his veto power to check it. This is a most important fact in the analysis of the class base of Jacksonianism. For Jackson here showed that he was prepared to risk his western farmer base in order to carry out the slaveholder's program.

Tariff: This was one of the most significant controversies of the Jackson period. The tariff, having a direct bearing on the economic welfare of the capitalist and planter classes, was the most hotly contested of all the issues. The tariff disputes originated at an earlier date, when the positions of the classes on the tariff were curiously inverted. The planters, hoping to lay the basis of a home market for their crop, inaugurated a protective policy with the tariff of 1816. They had been opposed by the chief sector of the bourgeoisie, the major interest of which was shipping, which required low tariff rates. The development of manufactures, fostered in part by the very tariff which it had opposed, caused the bourgeoisie to reverse its stand. It pressed through Congress the bills of 1824 and 1828, the latter with schedules so highly protective that it became known to the planter and farmer interests as the "tariff of abominations." Coming to understand their true interests, the planters turned against a tariff which served as a tax upon them without providing any economic benefit. The remainder of the story is related in the previously quoted work of the most realistic historian of the South, William E. Dodd:

When, in 1828, the South and the West united to place Jackson in the President's chair, it was definitely understood that the "tariff of abominations" was to be abolished, or greatly reduced. The exigencies of national politics caused Jackson to falter and delay. South Carolina allowed the new President four years to make up his mind. When he was still uncertain in 1832, the state proceeded to nullify the offensive national statute. The President then threatened war; South Carolina thereupon paused; but the outcome was the definite abandonment of the higher tariff policy in favor of the lower rates of the compromise tariff of 1833. Every South Carolinian thought that the planters had once again had their way; and South Carolinians were scattered all over the cotton states.

This was the famous "nullification" controversy, which is often cited to "prove" Jackson's independence of the planters. This struggle, it is true, was responsible for much friction, and was partially responsible for the alienation of the Calhoun-led planters from the Jacksonians. But traced to its end it proves the slaveholder hegemony in the Democratic Party in Jackson's day. For the Southern oligarchy was finally awarded the reduced tariff rates which it sought.

It has not been difficult to demonstrate the class base of Jacksonianism. It was the political arm of the slaveholders. This was its decisive character. Remaining to be accounted for are the specific configurations of the Jacksonian regime that distinguish it from earlier and later forms of planter rule. For the Democratic Party of Jackson's day reflected an enormous popular ferment that existed at this time in American national politics. This period became a turning point in the development of the techniques of class rule in the United States.

A Period of Social Change

It must be remembered that the period 1800-1860 was a time of enormous social change, both in the North and South. Classes were becoming transformed, new sections arising within existing classes, the relationship of forces between classes was shifting, and an entirely new class, the modern proletariat, was being born. The Jacksonian regime represented a modification of the undisguised planter rule brought about by the interaction of four main classes: planters, capitalists, petty-bourgeoisie and the rising proletariat.

Let us first turn to the planters. The impact of cotton on the South caused profound changes. The great engine of change was the demand for land. The wasteful mode of cotton cultivation caused the rapid exhaustion of the soil. Charles A. Beard wrote that what the planters were chiefly marketing was the "pristine fertility" of the land. The plantation system plowed inexorably westward, turning up the land like an enormous and insatiable bulldozer. The five years following the War of 1812 saw a great westward movement known as "The Great Migration." Several hundreds of thousands of people were shifted to the trans-Alleghany region, leading to the formation of two territories, the admission of three states, the merciless clearing of the Indians to beyond the Mississippi, and indirectly, the "purchase" of Florida. This movement, and the later "Jacksonian Migration," brought into the cotton kingdom the states of Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida and Arkansas. If we compare the cotton production of this new western region with that of the older cotton states of the eastern seaboard, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia and North Carolina, we get a graphic picture of the western shift of economic power:

Cotton Crop (in Million Lbs.)

	1791	1801	1811	1821	1826	1834
Southwest		1	5	60	150.5	297.5
Southeast	2	39	75	117	180	160

With the opening of the new Southwest, the old South on the Atlantic seaboard declined in wealth and importance. The rapid exhaustion of the soil led to the impoverishment of the planters. Historians have described with touching pathos how poverty and indebtedness descended upon Jefferson, Madison, Randolph, Calhoun, all planter-statesmen of the eastern region. Indeed, Old Virginia and her neighbors soon found that the slave was their most profitable product, and looked to the breeding and traffic of slaves for the rehabilitation of their region.

Between the older seaboard plantation aristocracy and the

rising western planter class existed a strong antagonism. It expressed itself outwardly in an eastern aristocratic snobbery on the one hand, and a western levelling tendency on the other. In the beginning the dispute was between the western and eastern portions of the seaboard states. The solid aristocratic class of the older region feared to take the newer section into full partnership because of the lack of an organized ruling class in the western regions. The larger proportion of pioneer farmers and smaller planters in the west inspired in the old aristocracy fears for the safety of the slave system. Only as slavery took root in the western counties did the eastern slaveholders relax their grip on the state governments. Frederick J. Turner describes this in his *Rise of the New West*:

It was only as slavery spread into the uplands with the cultivation of cotton, that the lowlands began to concede and to permit an increased power in the legislatures to the sections most nearly assimilated to the seaboard type. South Carolina achieved this end in 1808 by the plan of giving to the seaboard the control of one house, while the interior held the other; but it is to be noted that this concession was not made until slavery had pushed so far up the river courses that the reapportionment preserved the control in the hands of slaveholding counties. A similar course was followed by Virginia.

The new western region was rapidly assimilated to slavery. By 1850 over half of the slaveowners were living in the trans-Alleghany region. Nor did this apply only to small slaveholders; for by this date more than half of the 1700 great planters (those holding from 100 to 1000 slaves) were in the new region. But the old antagonism between the two regions did not die out. On the contrary, new disputes, feeding upon the old mistrust, soon arose.

We must recall that the policy of the Jeffersonian party had been to take the reins of the national government and draw into cooperation with the planters, sections of the Northern capitalist class. So successful had been this policy that the bourgeois Federalist Party was virtually dissolved in the Jeffersonian party during the administrations of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and the second Adams. The eastern planters grew accustomed in this so-called "era of good feeling" to secure their rule by means of this alliance at the cost of some concessions to the New England merchant capitalists. However, the fundamental antagonism between the two systems could not forever be repressed. In the North an aggressive manufacturing bourgeoisie was supplanting the merchant class. Paralleling this was the rise of an aggressive cotton slavocracy in the Southwest. Here were the chief contenders in the coming irrepressible conflict.

Scorning the alliance with the old Federalists, unafraid of a pact with the anti-capitalist agrarian and urban petty-bourgeois radicals, the slaveholders of the Southwest burst angrily on the scene. They demanded the retraction of all important concessions to the capitalist class, a more energetic policy to secure western lands and the breakup of the old closed caste of office holders. Led by the planters of the Tennessee Valley, the first western cotton planting region, they demanded the elevation of their idol, Andrew Jackson, to the Presidency.

While these class shifts were taking place in the South, a far more fundamental process of change was taking place in the North. The development of manufactures was rapidly placing the industrial capitalist in the forefront in New England and the Middle Atlantic states. The old commercial and shipping interests were receding to second place. Hamilton's prophetic vision of a manufacturing empire was beginning to assume shape.

This growing power of industrial capitalism was a threat to the planting class. The increasing vigor of the capitalists and their ever-increasing demands made it more difficult for the

slaveholders to rule "in the old way." Every day brought further proof to the Southern aristocracy, and especially to its militant western section, that the reliance of traditional Jeffersonian politicians upon compromising with the Northern capitalists must come to an end. Jefferson himself lived to see his system shaken. The slavery dispute in 1820 over the admission of Missouri startled him, as he said "like a fire bell in the night."

Northern industrial development had yet another aspect. It is an historical axiom that the industrial capitalist brings with him his own grave digger. An American proletariat was growing with every advance of the factory system. With the growth of the working class came its organization into trade unions and its entry onto the political field. Workingmens' parties and newspapers rapidly spread through New England, New York and Pennsylvania. The first trade union and political battles of the American workers occurred at this time.

One further class development in the first decades of the Nineteenth century must claim our attention. The small farmer of the North was an economic prisoner as long as he remained bound between the Appalachian range and the Atlantic seaboard. His release in this period is a factor of prime importance in the relation of class forces. On the broad, fertile lands of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and the other new farming regions, the farmers grew into a national power.

Convergence of Three Classes

It is evident at once that the interests of three developing classes converged antagonistically from three sides upon the fourth. The planters, the small farmers and the proletariat, each for its own reasons, fought the rising bourgeois colossus. To the planters, industrial capitalism was a challenge for control of national economic policies. It endangered their whole system. For the farmers, capitalism was the eastern octopus which sucked from them the proceeds of their crops. They were constantly in debt to the Eastern capitalists, who furthermore sought to block them off from the ready acquisition of western lands. The proletariat confronted the bourgeoisie as the direct victim of its merciless exploitation.

The convergence of the three classes was a temporary alignment which was smashed by the struggles preceding the Civil War. The workers and farmers were soon to take their rightful place in the fight against the outmoded planter slavocracy, the chief foe of all social progress. Yet the movement of the Jacksonian period played an important role in American history. For it brought to the scene of national struggles the workers and farmers in their capacity of a mass electorate. Indeed the broadening of the suffrage was one of the most important political developments of the Jackson period. Sharp struggles by the growing worker and farmer masses, culminating in one state (Rhode Island) in armed rebellion, won the vote for the free male population.

These social and political changes wrought a fundamental change in the conditions of political life. The character of the ruling class political parties was modified to cope with the new conditions. The parties lost their previous candor and disguised themselves in order to gain the same class ends by different methods, in the face of the broadened and suspicious electorate.

While the aristocratic monopoly of politics was being smashed the aristocratic hold of state power was preserved. "Jacksonian Democracy" represented the beginnings of modern concealed class rule. The planters first learned the chief lesson of modern parliamentary "democracy" which the bourgeoisie

was to learn and express so well years later: "Men can forego the husk of a title who possess the fat ears of power."

The Jacksonian technique, while basically an enforced accommodation, naturally brought to the fore politicians of the modern, demagogic type. The rising western cotton section of the planting class, the spearhead of Jacksonianism, had been educated by the politics of their locality for their national role. In the western region, small farmers were more numerous, leveling tendencies stronger, and political life more turbulent than on the eastern seaboard. The initial coterie surrounding Jackson, William B. Lewis, John H. Eaton, Felix Grundy, William T. Barry and James K. Polk, are good examples of politicians who learned the fine art of speaking in the name of the many while ruling in the interest of the few.

The original home of this political art was in the Northern wing of the planters' Democratic Party—an auxiliary in enemy territory. It fought the bourgeoisie through sections of the urban petty-bourgeois and proletarian masses, who were mobilized by means of democratic and even anti-capitalist slogans. The planting class, resting on unorganized, unrepresented, almost unmentioned slave labor, could afford to countenance reforms which struck against the Northern bourgeoisie. The ten-hour day for workers, extension of the vote to the proletariat, attacks upon the factory system and other such agitations, typical of the Jackson period, represented no direct economic threat to the planters. During the Jackson period the planters put on their best democratic garb . . . in the North. But during that very same time, barbarous slave legislation multiplied on the statute books in the South. The concessions in the North were part of the slaveholder system of maintaining national power. John Randolph, the erratic phrasemaker of the planter bloc in Congress, gave clear expression to this strategy. "Northern gentlemen," he taunted, "think to govern us by our black slaves, but let me tell them, we intend to govern them by their white slaves!"

In order to govern the bourgeoisie "by their white slaves," the planters from Jefferson's day on, built a northern party machine of a type familiar to this day in the Democratic Party. Politicians of the modern type began to make their appearance. Aaron Burr had been Jefferson's chief lieutenant on the Northern field. Martin Van Buren, operating through the Albany Regency and Tammany Hall, was Jackson's man Friday. Each was awarded the Vice-Presidency. Van Buren exemplified the increasing importance of the Northern auxiliary when he succeeded Jackson to the Presidency.

The Jackson and Van Buren groupings, joined by a clamorous farmer element led by such men as Senator Thomas Hart Benton and Colonel Richard M. Johnson, formed a national grouping in the Democratic Party which conducted politics by carefully watching the movement of the popular masses. Their activity, well-adjusted to the new currents which the old time politicians could scarcely comprehend, much less navigate, raised behind them a sweeping national mass movement. Here the great achievement of Jacksonianism emerges. It inaugurated in national politics that pattern which has endured to the present: *the rule of an exploiting class concealed behind the appeal to the common man.*

The foregoing analysis, while simplified and schematic, indicates the essential elements of the Jackson period. Bourgeois historians like to see in Jacksonianism a basic transfer of power to the "people." This is false, for while the period was one of unquestionable popular ferment, the hold of the slaveowners upon the state power was not broken.*

*In our next article we will deal with the two chief liberal-bourgeois theories of Jacksonianism, and counterpose to them the Marxist conception.