

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Published Weekly as the Organ of the Socialist Party of New York, Left Wing Branches.

Vol. 1. - No. 7. 401

Saturday, September 25, 1937

5 Cents per Copy

La Guardia Endorses George U. Harvey

Erwin Wolf in Spanish Prison

Trotsky Secretary Held By G.P.U. in Barcelona

Erwin Wolf, young Czech revolutionist who acted as secretary to Leon Trotsky during the latter's exile in Norway, has been arrested and imprisoned by the Stalinist G.P.U. in Barcelona. Over his head hangs the threat of being assassinated in prison or of being shipped secretly to the Soviet Union in the hope that the Stalinist Secret Police can get him to sign one of those notorious "confessions" which they have imposed on other victims of their frame-up system.

This dreadful news comes from Erwin Wolf's wife, Hjordis, daughter of Konrad Knudsen, Labor Party member of the Norwegian Parliament. She accompanied her husband several months ago when they travelled to Barcelona. After his arrest, she left for France.

Betrayed by G.P.U. Spy

In Barcelona, the Wolfs were recommended to a certain Dr. Tioli by a Norwegian friend of Hjordis Knudsen, named Grete Finnstad. Tioli allowed Wolf to use his address for the receipt of mail from abroad. On the eve of Wolf's return to France, Tioli

(Continued on page 7)

VICTOR HARRIS OUSTED AS CONN. SECRETARY

Victor Harris, militant secretary of the Connecticut State organization of the Socialist Party, has been ousted from his post for no other reason than his loyalty to the principles of revolutionary socialism.

At last Sunday's meeting of the State Executive Committee, the right wing majority on the committee, representing the deadwood and conservative membership of the state, and mobilized under the direction of Devere Allen, member of the National Executive Committee, asked comrade Harris to resign the post which he has occupied for some time. Harris refused to resign on the ground that he, and not the N.E.C., was faithful to the tradition of the convention and of socialism. The motion was then made to remove Harris, which carried by a vote of 5 to 2. There was not even a semblance of charges of violation of discipline.

Forward to the Convention

The need of the hour for the sincere and revolutionary socialists of the country is the speedy convening of an emergency rank and file convention of the Socialist Party.

Throughout the country, the usurpers of the National Executive Committee are splitting the party by the expulsion of the left wingers on the basis of an infamous "loyalty oath".

As a condition for membership in the party, they are seeking to compel the comrades who are earnestly devoted to socialist principles, who are concerned with their socialist integrity—to compel them to condemn the revolutionists who are fighting the betrayal of socialism perpetrated by the National Executive Committee when it sanctioned the support of the capitalist demagogue, La Guardia, and declared the expulsion of all those who opposed this loathsome sell-out.

On the basis of this "loyalty oath", which they know will not be signed by a single self-respecting socialist anywhere in the country, comrades are being expelled throughout the party and the locals are being organized on the basis of support for "La Guardia Socialism."

There is no other way of effectively combatting the disruption of the movement, no other way of reconstructing the socialist party on a revolutionary basis, than by the rank and file taking matters into their own hands. Over the heads of the La Guardia socialists on the National Executive Committee, guilty of perfidy and treachery to socialist principle, the rank and file of the party must mobilize for their own national convention.

The State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Ohio has already taken the initiative. By unanimous vote it has called for an emergency convention "for the purpose of throwing out the traitors, determining the will of the membership on all important party problems and reestablishing of the party on the foundation of revolutionary socialism". The Ohio S.E.C. proposes that the convention be held in Chicago on or about the Thanksgiving week-end. It has authorized the City Central Committee of Local New York, Left wing, to act as organizing committee on convention arrangements.

The National Executive Committee of the Young People's Socialist League has already given its unanimous endorsement to the movement initiated by Ohio.

The Executive Committee of Local Cook County (Chicago) has adopted a similar resolution.

Local Lynn, Mass., has unanimously decided to join hands in the calling of the emergency convention of the rank and file.

Local Rochester, New York, has now gone on record against the La Guardia Socialists and echoes the demand for the emergency convention.

Local Allentown, Penna., has joined the movement for the convention in Chicago on the Thanksgiving week-end.

Local Austin, Minn., has given a vigorous reply to the splitters and reformists of the N.E.C. and called for a special convention.

Local Philadelphia, Parkside branch, has taken the same action and will be represented at the convention.

Other local and state organizations throughout the country, from Boston to San Francisco, are expected to take action on the question in the coming days.

Throughout the country, the local must act immediately to endorse the Ohio resolution. Every day's delay facilitates the criminal work of the right wing and their centrist tools. The revolutionary socialist party must be restored and consolidated.

All hands united! On to the Chicago convention of the rank and file, of the revolutionary socialists!

'People's Front' Candidate for New York's Red-Baiter No. 1.

Thomas Is 'Shocked'--But Will Not Run

By a majority even larger than the most daring estimates, Fiorello H. La Guardia was nominated by the enrolled Republican voters of New York City as the Republican candidate for Mayor. The Republicans know their man when they see him. These enrolled voters were those who registered Republican in October, 1936, in the midst of last year's Presidential campaign. They are the real die-hard Landonites.

La Guardia has not been slow in showing his gratitude. On the eve of the primaries, in order to make things perfectly clear to the Republican machine, he went down the line for the regular Republican candidates for city-wide office: in particular, for McGoldrick and Newbold Morris, both among New York's most prominent Landon supporters last year.

Two days after the primaries, La Guardia devoted his speech in celebration of the Constitution to an elaborate defense of the Supreme Court as the guardian of the people's liberty.

Red-Baiter Endorsed

But the pay-off came on Monday. The morning's headlines gayly announced La Guardia's endorsement of George U. Harvey, Republican candidate for the office of Borough President of the Bronx. Few political figures in the city our better known than this same Harvey. It is granted in all camps that he does not have even a rival as champion Red-baiter of New York. He never loses an occasion to attack, in public and in private, every and any labor "agitator"

(Continued on page 3)

To Speak Friday



HARRY MILTON

When Will the New World War Begin

It has been often noticed that military tacticians are almost always caught off guard in the first stages of a new war. The reason for this is easily explained: At the conclusion of one war, the tacticians set about learning the lessons which its campaigns have taught. They then base their plans for the coming war upon what they have learned from the war just finished, expecting to correct "mistakes" chiefly by extending the scope of operations. But in modern times, during the intervening period of peace, vast technological changes have profoundly altered the instruments of warfare, and social and political shifts have altered ways of handling masses of people. Consequently, the lessons of the past war are discovered not to apply to the new war, or to apply only indirectly. The military staff have to throw overboard most of their studies, and learn afresh, from reality.

Same In Politics

The same difficulty is as common in political as in military tactics. Painfully, exhaustively, we learn the political lessons from the last war. But, if we apply them directly and mechanically to the new crisis, we are left floundering and disoriented, and have to learn our lessons all over again. Valuable and instructive as are political analogies drawn from the past, they are never a sufficient substitute for

(Continued on page 2)

The Truth About Spain!

HEAR
Harry Milton
Just Released from a G.U.P. Prison in Spain
Albert Goldman

IRVING PLAZA
15th St. & Irving Place
Friday, September 24, 1937
8 p. m.
ADMISSION: 25 Cents
Auspices, Socialist Party, N. Y. Left Wing

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Published Weekly as the Organ of the Socialist Party of New York, Left Wing Branches.

Vol. 1. - No. 7. 401

Saturday, September 25, 1937

5 Cents per Copy

La Guardia Endorses George U. Harvey

Erwin Wolf in Spanish Prison

Trotsky Secretary Held By G.P.U. in Barcelona

Erwin Wolf, young Czech revolutionist who acted as secretary to Leon Trotsky during the latter's exile in Norway, has been arrested and imprisoned by the Stalinist G.P.U. in Barcelona. Over his head hangs the threat of being assassinated in prison or of being shipped secretly to the Soviet Union in the hope that the Stalinist Secret Police can get him to sign one of those notorious "confessions" which they have imposed on other victims of their frame-up system.

This dreadful news comes from Erwin Wolf's wife, Hjordis, daughter of Konrad Knudsen, Labor Party member of the Norwegian Parliament. She accompanied her husband several months ago when they travelled to Barcelona. After his arrest, she left for France.

Betrayed by G.P.U. Spy

In Barcelona, the Wolfs were recommended to a certain Dr. Tioli by a Norwegian friend of Hjordis Knudsen, named Grete Finnstad. Tioli allowed Wolf to use his address for the receipt of mail from abroad. On the eve of Wolf's return to France, Tioli

(Continued on page 7)

VICTOR HARRIS OUSTED AS CONN. SECRETARY

Victor Harris, militant secretary of the Connecticut State organization of the Socialist Party, has been ousted from his post for no other reason than his loyalty to the principles of revolutionary socialism.

At last Sunday's meeting of the State Executive Committee, the right wing majority on the committee, representing the deadwood and conservative membership of the state, and mobilized under the direction of Devere Allen, member of the National Executive Committee, asked comrade Harris to resign the post which he has occupied for some time. Harris refused to resign on the ground that he, and not the N.E.C., was faithful to the tradition of the convention and of socialism. The motion was then made to remove Harris, which carried by a vote of 5 to 2. There was not even a semblance of charges of violation of discipline.

Forward to the Convention

The need of the hour for the sincere and revolutionary socialists of the country is the speedy convening of an emergency rank and file convention of the Socialist Party.

Throughout the country, the usurpers of the National Executive Committee are splitting the party by the expulsion of the left wingers on the basis of an infamous "loyalty oath".

As a condition for membership in the party, they are seeking to compel the comrades who are earnestly devoted to socialist principles, who are concerned with their socialist integrity—to compel them to condemn the revolutionists who are fighting the betrayal of socialism perpetrated by the National Executive Committee when it sanctioned the support of the capitalist demagogue, La Guardia, and declared the expulsion of all those who opposed this loathsome sell-out.

On the basis of this "loyalty oath", which they know will not be signed by a single self-respecting socialist anywhere in the country, comrades are being expelled throughout the party and the locals are being organized on the basis of support for "La Guardia Socialism."

There is no other way of effectively combatting the disruption of the movement, no other way of reconstructing the socialist party on a revolutionary basis, than by the rank and file taking matters into their own hands. Over the heads of the La Guardia socialists on the National Executive Committee, guilty of perfidy and treachery to socialist principle, the rank and file of the party must mobilize for their own national convention.

The State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Ohio has already taken the initiative. By unanimous vote it has called for an emergency convention "for the purpose of throwing out the traitors, determining the will of the membership on all important party problems and reestablishing of the party on the foundation of revolutionary socialism". The Ohio S.E.C. proposes that the convention be held in Chicago on or about the Thanksgiving week-end. It has authorized the City Central Committee of Local New York, Left wing, to act as organizing committee on convention arrangements.

The National Executive Committee of the Young People's Socialist League has already given its unanimous endorsement to the movement initiated by Ohio.

The Executive Committee of Local Cook County (Chicago) has adopted a similar resolution.

Local Lynn, Mass., has unanimously decided to join hands in the calling of the emergency convention of the rank and file.

Local Rochester, New York, has now gone on record against the La Guardia Socialists and echoes the demand for the emergency convention.

Local Allentown, Penna., has joined the movement for the convention in Chicago on the Thanksgiving week-end.

Local Austin, Minn., has given a vigorous reply to the splitters and reformists of the N.E.C. and called for a special convention.

Local Philadelphia, Parkside branch, has taken the same action and will be represented at the convention.

Other local and state organizations throughout the country, from Boston to San Francisco, are expected to take action on the question in the coming days.

Throughout the country, the local must act immediately to endorse the Ohio resolution. Every day's delay facilitates the criminal work of the right wing and their centrist tools. The revolutionary socialist party must be restored and consolidated.

All hands united! On to the Chicago convention of the rank and file, of the revolutionary socialists!

'People's Front' Candidate for New York's Red-Baiter No. 1.

Thomas Is 'Shocked'--But Will Not Run

By a majority even larger than the most daring estimates, Fiorello H. La Guardia was nominated by the enrolled Republican voters of New York City as the Republican candidate for Mayor. The Republicans know their man when they see him. These enrolled voters were those who registered Republican in October, 1936, in the midst of last year's Presidential campaign. They are the real die-hard Landonites.

La Guardia has not been slow in showing his gratitude. On the eve of the primaries, in order to make things perfectly clear to the Republican machine, he went down the line for the regular Republican candidates for city-wide office: in particular, for McGoldrick and Newbold Morris, both among New York's most prominent Landon supporters last year.

Two days after the primaries, La Guardia devoted his speech in celebration of the Constitution to an elaborate defense of the Supreme Court as the guardian of the people's liberty.

Red-Baiter Endorsed

But the pay-off came on Monday. The morning's headlines gayly announced La Guardia's endorsement of George U. Harvey, Republican candidate for the office of Borough President of the Bronx. Few political figures in the city our better known than this same Harvey. It is granted in all camps that he does not have even a rival as champion Red-baiter of New York. He never loses an occasion to attack, in public and in private, every and any labor "agitator"

(Continued on page 3)

To Speak Friday



HARRY MILTON

When Will the New World War Begin

It has been often noticed that military tacticians are almost always caught off guard in the first stages of a new war. The reason for this is easily explained: At the conclusion of one war, the tacticians set about learning the lessons which its campaigns have taught. They then base their plans for the coming war upon what they have learned from the war just finished, expecting to correct "mistakes" chiefly by extending the scope of operations. But in modern times, during the intervening period of peace, vast technological changes have profoundly altered the instruments of warfare, and social and political shifts have altered ways of handling masses of people. Consequently, the lessons of the past war are discovered not to apply to the new war, or to apply only indirectly. The military staff have to throw overboard most of their studies, and learn afresh, from reality.

Same In Politics

The same difficulty is as common in political as in military tactics. Painfully, exhaustively, we learn the political lessons from the last war. But, if we apply them directly and mechanically to the new crisis, we are left floundering and disoriented, and have to learn our lessons all over again. Valuable and instructive as are political analogies drawn from the past, they are never a sufficient substitute for

(Continued on page 2)

The Truth About Spain!

HEAR
Harry Milton
Just Released from a G.U.P. Prison in Spain
Albert Goldman

IRVING PLAZA
15th St. & Irving Place
Friday, September 24, 1937
8 p. m.
ADMISSION: 25 Cents
Auspices, Socialist Party, N. Y. Left Wing

When Will the New World War Begin

Imperialists Now Launch Conflicts Without Formal Declarations of War

(Continued from page 1)

the direct analysis of living and concrete reality. Every new historical crisis, deep as may be its roots in the past, is yet novel and unprecedented in certain of its fundamental aspects. We are as likely to be fooled as instructed by memories; and conventional formulas can never do the work of intelligence.

Central Task

Every serious person knows that the new world imperialist war is coming, and is in fact not far off. Every Marxist or near-Marxist realizes that in the new war the fate of mankind will be at issue; that out of this war will come either the workers' revolution or a social barbarism more terrible and devastating than ever before known in history. Every revolutionist understands that in the last analysis his central task is to prepare for the challenge of the coming war with the unbreakable determination that it shall be at once the death of the monstrosity of capitalism and the birth of the new world order.

All the more fatal, then, will be any miscalculation concerning the nature and manner of the new war. A simple major error may well prove a disaster. Nor, to avoid miscalculation, is it enough to rely passively on what we have learned from the past.

The New Aspect

Right on the surface there is a peculiarity of the present world situation which is all-important. This peculiarity is suggested by asking the simple question, How will the new war begin?

At no time in the past would this question even have been raised. War was always a social activity with certain conventional standards and rules. Wars began with a formal announcement to that effect, called in modern times a "Declaration of War", by the warring parties. This, in turn, was a modified development from the more elaborate ceremonies that preceded armed conflict in feudal society. The Declaration of War, in modern times, has itself almost invariably come as the conclusion of several other standardized actions: an "Ultimatum" of some kind, "breaking off of diplomatic relations", "general mobilization", and then the Declaration of War.

The past three or four years in international relations have witnessed a more complete breakdown in usual "diplomacy", in the conventional ways of doing things, than has ever before occurred. Since the withdrawal of Japan from the League of Nations, the act has come first, and the formality is either added on later or dispensed with altogether. Armies march, ships are sunk, cities bombed, treaties violated, all without benefit of the traditional "rules".

Does this mean that the new imperialist war will never be formally initiated, never "declared"?

No Formalities

There was, as we know, no declaration of war when Japan invaded Manchuria, none when Italy invaded Ethiopia, and there has been none in connection with the Spanish events. None of these situations is however, exactly comparable to an

By James Burnham

inter-imperialist war, at least as such a war has been up to now understood. The invasions of Manchuria and Ethiopia were carried out by imperialist powers against backward nations. In the past, such acts have been frequent enough in the history of all the great power; and very often the great power did not see fit to dignify the colonial aggression with a formal Declaration. Therefore, we are not able to conclude definitely from the evidence of the Manchurian and Ethiopian affairs that the inter-imperialist war itself will be undeclared.

But there is, when we examine the question more closely, a significant difference between the Manchurian and Ethiopian invasions, on the one hand, and earlier colonial enterprises on the other. During the 18th and 19th centuries there was still left in the world vast "virgin" territories, enormous areas as yet not brought under the sway of capitalist exploitation, and often not even definitely under the influence of any single great nation. But by the eve of 1914, almost the entire world had been divided up among the great powers, either as colonies, dominions, subject nations, or as some other type of "sphere of influence". This meant that capitalism had reached its progressive limit, and was entering its decline as a world system. The War of 1914-18 was not a war of capitalist expansion, but a war for the re-division, of the world among the great powers, and out of the war there did in fact come a re-division, enshrined and "legalized" in the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations.

End of Versailles

The Versailles system summed up the relationship of forces which held at the end of the war, after the military defeat of the Central Powers. It could hold only until intolerable inner conflicts compelled some one of the powers or group of powers to attempt to change it. Japan in Manchuria gave the first powerful blow to the Versailles system; but the system itself was able still to stand up under that blow.

It was Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, more or less simultaneous with Hitler's de facto repudiation of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, which showed that the Versailles system had broken down, and that a new period was beginning. Political questions were now no longer going to be settled by diplomacy, but "by other means", by armed conflict. In a world all farmed out among the various great powers, all linked together by the chains of world capitalism, Italy's campaign could not be regarded as a mere "private" subjugation of the single backward country of Ethiopia. It was an armed attack on the whole political structure of the world as it has existed since 1918.

Prelude To The War

When Italy struck in Ethiopia, Marxists said that this was "the prelude to the new world war. By that, they meant what has been stated above, that the stage of national and international conflicts had reached a level beyond solution within the framework of the League of Nations and the post-war Peace Treaties, that

henceforth the conflicts could never be forced back within that framework, that it was now a race toward war on a world scale.

The phrase, "prelude to the new world war", however, may have had a more literal meaning that was suspected even by those who used it. It is the remarkable and indisputable fact that since the beginning of the Ethiopian invasion there have been in the world taken as a whole bodies of armed men in conflict in numbers steadily increasing month by month, almost without exception. In form these armed men have been engaged chiefly in two "colonial wars" (Ethiopia and China) and in a civil war (Spain). But in the Ethiopian war, the fleets of Great Britain and Italy were brought into the Mediterranean; in the Spanish War, there have been tens of thousands of men and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of munitions poured in by the great powers, and there have been armed encounters between the ships, airplanes and submarines of the powers; and in China there is present a considerable concentration of the armed forces of the powers, some of whose tactics have amounted to at least partial intervention.

What Next?

It is still, of course, possible that a temporary "solution" can be found for both the Spanish and the Chinese struggles—though it is not possible that any solution could endure for long. But the sequence of events during the past three years now raises also, as another and distinct possibility, the alternative that the process which began with the invasion of Ethiopia may continue, and that the armed struggles now going on may pass by a series of almost insensible gradations into conflict on a world scale, into the new imperialist world war. This process might, furthermore, be completed with no formalities whatever, above all with no formal Declarations of War. Military tacticians have already speculated with this notion from the point of view of its military desirability; it now becomes related, in a

manner not foreseen by the militarists, to concrete events.

What This Means

The profound importance of this possibility for Marxists should be apparent. If we do not take it into account, we may wake up some morning to find, not that war has suddenly started, but that it stared some long while ago. The revolutionists would be caught completely off guard, organizationally and politically. Tactics applicable to a colonial civil war might be applied long after what began as dominantly a colonial or civil struggle had been subordinated to the inter-imperialist conflicts.

On the other hand, if this possibility turns out to be the case, or is even partly true, we may anticipate a different tempo in certain developments associated with the period following the Declaration of War: as for example, the passing of reformists and labor bureaucrats over to full-blown social-patriotism, measures by Governments for "consolidation of the nation", etc. In fact, the voting of the war budgets by the French Communist and Socialist Parties in January, and the pro-Armament vote of the British Trades Union Congress this month, which we have tended to point to as an example of a difference in the character of the labor movement now as compared with 1914 (when such votes occurred only after the Declaration of War), might seem to strengthen the possibility which I have been discussing, and to suggest that the difference lies rather in the changed form of the development of the new war.

"War is a continuation of politics by other means". A war period of peace. Heretofore we have always had an easy convention to distinguish the two—the convention of the War Declaration. If this convention is, or may be, removed, we shall have to look more closely than ever at events themselves. In an article next week, I propose to make such an examination of the Spanish events, and to suggest certain political conclusions that follow.

Build the Appeal

WHERE HAVE YOU BEEN GETTING A CRITICAL MARXIAN ANALYSIS OF THE EVENTS IN THE U. S., RUSSIA, SPAIN AND THE ENTIRE WORLD? THE SOCIALIST APPEAL, OF COURSE!

This is the seventh issue of the new Socialist Appeal. It's success thus far has been the result of your financial and moral support plus the vigorous and enthusiastic work of the Appeal staff. While the Revolutionary Socialists are being expelled wholesale by the reformist right wingers, who are left with an almost defunct organization, our most potent weapon against their bureaucratic slander is our own SOCIALIST APPEAL. The APPEAL will now be used not only as an internal party organ dealing with the internal party struggle, but it will increasingly become a propaganda organ which can and will reach and influence the masses. To make a mass organ of the APPEAL is now one of our most important tasks. How

shall we do it?

Circulation is the life blood of any periodical—be it a capitalist publication or the organ of a revolutionary party. WE MUST BUILD THE APPEAL CIRCULATION! You can help in this! If you are already a subscriber, it is your duty to help us get more subscribers. The blank below is for your subscription or a friend's or comrade's. And if you want additional subscription blanks, a request on a penny post card will bring them to you by return mail:

BESIDES SUBSCRIPTIONS WE NEED FUNDS! In this reorganization period every effort is being made to stabilize expenditures and income—and until this reorganization is complete you must help your own paper financially. Contribute liberally. Help the APPEAL survive and grow. Every copy of this issue of the Appeal should have this blank torn out and mailed back to us at once with your subscription or contribution OR BOTH!

Socialist Appeal
100 Fifth Ave.
Room 1609
New York City

I enclose \$..... for which please send me the Socialist Appeal. One year—(\$2.00); Six Months—(\$1.00).

I enclose \$..... as my contribution toward building the Socialist Appeal.

Name
Address
City

Erber and Gould on Tours

GOULD

1. New York, N. Y. Sept. 17
2. Newark, N. J. Sept. 21
3. Philadelphia, Pa. Sept. 22-23
4. Reading, Pa. Sept. 24
5. Youngstown, O. Sept. 25
6. Cleveland, Ohio Sept. 26-30
7. Akron, Ohio Oct. 1-3
8. Chicago, Ill. Oct. 4-12
9. Minneapolis, St. Paul, Austin, Minn. Fargo, N. D., Nebraska Oct. 13-20
10. Denver, Col. Oct. 24-25
11. Salt Lake City, Utah Oct. 27-28
12. San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Calif. Oct. 30-Nov. 5
13. Stockton, Fresno, Calif. Nov. 6-8
14. Los Angeles, San Diego, Pasadena, Calif. Nov. 9-14
15. Phoenix, Ariz. Nov. 16
16. St. Louis, Mo. Nov. 20-21

ERBER

1. Gardner, Fitchburgh, Worcester, Mass. Sept. 20-26
2. Boston, Lynn, Mass. Sept. 27-30
3. Albany, N. Y. Oct. 1
4. Syracuse, N. Y. Oct. 2
5. Ithaca, N. Y. Oct. 3
6. Rochester, N. Y. Oct. 4
7. Detroit, Mich. Oct. 7
8. Toledo, Ohio Oct. 8
9. Chicago, Ill. Oct. 9-16
10. Indianapolis, Ind. Oct. 17
11. Louisville, Ky. Oct. 18
12. Columbus, Ohio Oct. 19
13. Washington, D.C. Oct. 20
14. Baltimore, Md. Oct. 21
15. Philadelphia, Pa. Oct. 22
16. New York, N. Y. Oct. 23

Who Does the Constitution Belong To?

Should the Working Class Celebrate Its Birthday or Prepare Its Funeral?

The Constitution of the United States is one hundred and fifty years old. Last week all the worshippers at the shrine of bourgeois democracy held birthday parties in its honor. The Republican presidential aspirant, Vandenberg, swore to defend this citadel of capitalist conservatism from all assault. The Democratic President rejoiced in "the wisdom of the Constitution" and pledged himself to defend it against its "misinterpreters." The most stalwart, the most belligerent champions of the Constitution were the Stalinists, who called upon "all liberty-loving Americans" to fight for this palladium of their rights against "the princes of privilege."

The monied and mercantile men, who together with the Southern planting aristocrats, framed the Constitution; the slaveholding oligarchy who employed it to extend and maintain their "peculiar institution;" and the industrial and financial bourgeoisie who have ruled the country since the Civil War, each of these governing minorities has found the Constitution adequate to ensure their sovereignty over the majority of the American people and a few subject peoples to boot.

Undemocratic

For the Constitution is essentially an undemocratic document. It was the product of a period of reaction in the development of the first American revolution, the climax of a protracted struggle for power between the petty-bourgeois farmers and artisans, who composed the mass of the nation, and the Southern planters and Northern capitalists, who succeeded in suppressing them.

It is a truism for Marxists that such constitutions are always (as Marx put it) a compromise among "contending factions of the ruling class.... which allow them to continue the struggle between themselves and at the same time to keep the exhausted masses of the people out of it.... it sanctioned the monetary victory of the old society over the revolution."

The Constitutional Convention was a self-constituted group of large property holders, who had no mandate from the people.

They met to consolidate their victory over the masses; to safeguard themselves against further assaults from within and from without; and above all to promote and protect their own immediate and narrow social interests. This conspiratorial clique conducted its affair in the dark. No hostile intruders, no direct representatives of the farmers and artisans were admitted to the sessions held behind closed doors; no notes of the proceedings were allowed to be published. The final draft was forced down the throats of the states by gerrymandering, electoral frauds, and conventions with the most hasty and restricted representation. The whole procedure was in effect nothing but a coup d'etat. So much for the circumstances of the origins of the Constitution.

Could one expect that this bastard child of reaction, conceived by usurpation, brought forth in illegality, and adopted by main force, could be a democratic document?

Some Features

A volume would be necessary to enumerate and describe all of its anti-democratic features. Let us limit ourselves to a few of the most important.

Vandenberg sees in the division of the government into three separate and autonomous branches,

the legislative, executive, and judicial, the greatest contribution of the Constitution to statecraft and to stable government. The Republican Senator has a keen class sense. The tripartite system of "checks and balances" was expressly designed to strangle legislation unfavorable to the governing group. What could not be maimed or miscarried in Congress might be vetoed by the President; what the Chief Executive (of the ruling class!) could not put out of the way, the Supreme Court could kill. No cleverer, no more efficient machinery for obstructing the expression of the popular will in a republic has ever been devised.

Why Two Houses

An important cog in this system is the bicameral Congress with its upper and lower houses, so admirable a check that the French Republican bourgeoisie copied it. By requiring the concurrence of both houses for the passage of legislation and at the same time allotting two Senators to each state regardless of population, the control of the law-making machinery was concentrated in the hands of the masters of the upper house. Thereby the slave oligarchy prolonged their rule long after they had lost popular support. Moreover, biennial election of one third of the Senators not only facilitates clique control of the Senate through "rotten borough states" but also allows time for popular protest or indignation to expend itself or be extinguished before the Senate can be changed.

Indirect Elections

Elections were as indirect as possible. The President was to be chosen by an electoral college. In case of tie or a disputed election the election was thrown into the House of Representatives where each state was given one vote. Judges were to be appointed by the President and ratified by the Senate.

It must be remembered that the Constitution was a compact between the slaveholders and capitalists. It therefore legalized slavery and although slaves were given no right whatsoever they formed part of the basis of representation and taxation. It required a revolution to root out slavery from the Constitution.

Amendments Balked

The method of amendment was made as cumbersome as possible. Amendments could be made only by the consent of three fourths of the states. That means today that five percent of the population in thirteen states can frustrate the demands of ninety five percent of the population.

Witness the fate of the Child-Labor Amendment.

Finally, a most interesting article which we quote in toto: Article IV, Section 4. "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence."

Washington and Hamilton used this clause to send Federal troops against the so-called "Whiskey Rebellion" in 1794, the first attempt of the bourgeois state to suppress its own citizens. It was used against the railroad strikers of the 1870's. It was used by Democratic President Cleveland to send Federal troops against

the striking railroad workers in 1893.

The Stalinist defenders of this "democratic document" forget that this article affords full legal warrant for a military dictatorship of the capitalist over the working class!

Such is the real character of the Constitution as it was, as it has been, as it is today. Republican in form, anti-democratic in essence.

Bill of Rights?

But, the Stalinists expostulate, the Bill of Rights! True, it was offered as a bribe to dissident elements to facilitate adoption and initial operation of the Constitution. But the primary purpose of the Bill of Rights (i.e. the first ten amendments) was to safeguard state rights. They are limitations on the Federal government, but not on the states. Until the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment became the bulwark of reaction, Article IV—the most radical-sounding of the Bill of Rights—was the instrumentality for protecting property, especially slave property.

What did Article One, Section One of the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing freedom of speech and of the press mean to Eugene V. Debs in Atlanta prison? What did the right of the people to peacefully assemble, mean to the Southern Negroes, the abolitionists, the workers in company towns, striking workers, meetings broken up by the police? Almost every state has laws today restricting or denying Article Two: the right to keep or bear arms shall not be infringed. What did Article Four, asserting the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, property, and effects mean to the thousands involved in the Palmer raids? The whole Bill of Rights has been worth less than five cents on the dollar in wartime, as the Civil War and World War experiences demonstrate. And the formal political right of the people to "be secure in their persons, property and effects," remains a mockery during peacetime in a social system which condemns the masses to perpetual exploitation, periodic destitution, and deprives them of the opportunity of obtaining the material means of that security.

Class Instrument

The point is that the Constitution must necessarily be interpreted and administered by the ruling class and in its interests. The Dred Scott decision which legalized the extension of slavery throughout the country was the most glaring instance before the Civil War. The Fourteenth Amendment did not give either social equality or political rights to the Southern negro. And for every decision the Supreme Court has rendered in defense of civil liberties under the Fourteenth Amendment, it has rendered ten to safeguard the rights of corporate property.

According to the Daily Worker, the Constitution of the United States and the Stalinist Constitution are "the two great juridical monuments that mark the progress of the human race at different epochal historical periods." But the Stalinists refrain from revealing all the traits of similarity between the two documents. Both were the offspring of usurping and reactionary cliques, granted to the exhausted revolutionary masses by their benevolent masters rather than formulated and adopted by the

revolutionary representatives of the people.

It would be foolish to take a purely negative attitude toward the Constitution, either from the historical or the practical political standpoint.

It accomplished the task that the popular masses proved unable to perform by themselves, the unification of the thirteen states into a single government. It legitimized a bourgeois-democratic republic and made impossible a monarchial restoration. For all its reactionary features the Constitution and the state system it set up was the most advanced of its day, and served as a model for the progressive and democratic forces of the early nineteenth century.

Today, however, it is thoroughly obsolete. The Stalinists are guilty of criminal folly in idealizing, glorifying, and defending this document in competition with the outright spokesmen of the capitalist regime. The American Constitution is not "the property of the people;" it is the property of the reactionary bourgeoisie. It is no "bulwark of democratic rights," it is the ultimate legal entrenchment of the ruling class.

How to Fight

While it is necessary to fight for the maintenance of all those political rights that have been wrested from the ruling classes in a century and a half of struggle, and to support any genuinely democratic reform of the constitution, the workers must always remember that these can be obtained under contemporary conditions only as the result of the most intransigent struggle and direct mass action, and that all together they will not solve

the social and political problems that confront the working class under capitalism.

When the capitalist and slaveholders, the original authors of the Constitution, could no longer live together in the same house, and contended for its exclusive possession with arms in hand, the Constitution was nullified. The Confederacy wrote a new one; the Union suspended its own, and then amended it to insure the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

When the combat between the reactionary bourgeoisie and the revolutionary American workers matures, the capitalist reaction will scrap the Constitution and the proletarian revolution will write a new one.

Our Constitution

The new Constitution of the worker's state will not sanctify private property, appropriation, and accumulation; it will eliminate them entirely and forever. It will not be based upon a parliamentary form of government designed to frustrate the will of the majority but upon a flexible system of workers and farmers councils, democratically elected and controlled, sensitive to the needs, demands, and interests of the masses. It will not create a national state but will envisage itself as one among a federation of world socialist republics.

Not to defend the outworn Constitution that will be the first victim of the coming revolution, but to mobilize the forces in a struggle for a new socialist constitution and society. Such is the task and the outlook that revolutionary Socialists set for themselves on this birthday of the bourgeois Constitution.

LaGuardia for Harvey

(Continued from page 1)

out of the city. He has time and again openly praised Mussolini and Hitler, and declared that strong arm methods are the only ones to use in dealing with "communists". Probably no man in the country can point to a more consistent anti-working class record.

The endorsement of Harvey brought immediate howls from the La Guardia "Communists", the La Guardia "Socialists", and the La Guardia Laborites. Israel Amter, C. P. State organizer, and Alex Rose, A. L. P. secretary, were "keenly disappointed". Norman Thomas, in anguish, told the press that the news "will come as a great shock".

These gentlemen, apparently, are shocked and keenly disappointed when one capitalist demagogue endorses another.

Thomas to Withdraw

No doubt, however, Thomas will have time to get over his "shock" by Saturday. As is known, the La Guardia "socialists" have already decided to withdraw Norman Thomas as the party candidate for Mayor in order that they may be able to complete their sell-out to the A. L. P. bureaucracy and the La Guardia machine.

The withdrawal—the Appeal is in a position to state—will go through on schedule and will be effected in a particularly shameful manner. Thomas is to be nominated by his clique as candidate for the delegate-at-large to the State Constitutional Convention, a move which, according

to the New York State Election Laws, automatically eliminates his name from the ballot as candidate for any City Office. The "La Guardia Socialists" do not even have the courage of the Stalinists in presenting in a forthright and unambiguous manner, the Republican-Fusion-Progressive-A. L. P. candidate as their very own. They have decided instead to give him their full support in the most apologetic and hypocritical manner conceivable.

Despite Thomas' withdrawal from the ticket, the revolutionary socialists are determined to carry on the best tradition of the class-conscious labor movement, and to make sure that in this election, the New York workers will have the opportunity of expressing their class position by a vote for a working class candidate for Mayor.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol 1. No. 7 Saturday
September 25th, 1937

Published every week by the
Socialist Appeal Pub. Assn.

Published at Room 1609
100 Fifth Avenue, New York

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year;
\$1.00 for 6 months. Bundle
orders 3 cents per copy. Single
copies 5 cents.

All checks and money orders
should be made out to
the Socialist Appeal.

Application for entry as
second class matter is pending.

Stalinism and Bolshevism - An Article Concerning the Movement for

Reactionary epochs like ours not only disintegrate and weaken the working class and its vanguard but also lower the general ideological level of the movement and throw political thinking back to stages long since passed through. In these conditions the task of the vanguard is above all not to let itself be carried along by the backward flow; it must swim against the current. If an unfavorable relation of forces prevents it from holding the positions that it has won, it must at least retain its ideological positions, because in them is expressed the dearly-paid experience of the past. Fools will consider this policy "sectarian". Actually it is the only means of preparing for a new tremendous surge forward with the coming historical tide.

THE REACTION AGAINST MARXISM AND BOLSHEVISM

Great political defeats inevitably provoke a reconsideration of values, generally occurring in two directions. On the one hand the true vanguard, enriched by the experience of defeat, defends with tooth and nail the succession of revolutionary thought and on this basis attempts to educate new cadres for the mass struggle to come. On the other hand the routinists, centrists and dilettantes, frightened by defeat, do their best to destroy the authority of revolutionary tradition and go backward in their search for a "New Word."

One could indicate a great many examples of ideological reaction, most often taking the form of prostration. All the literature of the Second and Third Internationals, as well as of their satellites of the London Bureau, consists essentially of such examples. Not a suggestion of Marxist analysis. Not a single serious attempt to explain the causes of defeat. About the future, not one fresh word. Nothing but clichés, conformity, lies, and above all solicitude for their own bureaucratic self-preservation. It is enough to smell ten lines from some Hilferding or Otto Bauer to know this rottenness. The theoreticians of the Comintern are not even worth mentioning. The famous Dimitroff is as ignorant and commonplace as a shop-keeper over a mug of beer. The minds of these people are too lazy to renounce Marxism; they prostitute it. But it is not they that interest us now. Let us turn to the "innovators".

The former Austrian communist, Willi Schlamm, has devoted a small book to the Moscow trials, under the expressive title, "The Dictatorship of the Lie". Schlamm is a gifted journalist, chiefly interested in current affairs. His criticism of the Moscow frame-up, and his exposure of the psychological mechanism of the "voluntary confessions", are excellent. However he does not confine himself to this: he wants to create a new theory of socialism which would insure us against defeats and frame-ups in the future. But since Schlamm is by no means a theoretician and is apparently not well acquainted with the history of the development of socialism, he returns entirely to pre-Marxian socialism, and notably to its German, that is to its most backward, sentimental and mawkish variety. Schlamm renounces dialectics and the class struggle, not to mention the dictatorship of the proletariat. The problem of transforming society is reduced for him to the realization of certain "eternal" moral truths with which he would imbue mankind, still under capitalism. Willi Schlamm's attempt to save socialism by the insertion of the moral gland is greeted with both joy and pride in Kerensky's review "Novaya Rossia" (an old provincial Russian review now published in Paris): as the editors justifiably conclude, Schlamm has arrived at the principles of true Russian socialism, which a long time ago opposed the holy precepts of faith, hope and charity to the austerity and harshness of the class struggle. The "novel" doctrine of the Russian "Social Revolutionaries" represents, in its "theoretical" premises, only a return to the socialism of pre-March (1848!) Germany. However, it would be unfair to demand a more intimate knowledge of the history of ideas from Kerensky than from Schlamm. Far more important is the fact that Kerensky, who is in solidarity with Schlamm was, while head of the government, the instigator of persecutions against the Bolsheviks as agents of the German general staff: organized, that is,

the same frame-ups against which Schlamm now mobilizes his moth-eaten metaphysical absolutes.

The psychological mechanism of the ideological reaction of Schlamm and his like, is not at all complicated. For a while these people took part in a political movement that swore by the class struggle and appealed, in word if not in thought, to dialectical materialism. In both Austria and Germany the affair ended in a catastrophe. Schlamm draws a wholesale conclusion: this is the result of dialectics and the class struggle! And since the choice of revelations is limited by historical experience and... by personal knowledge, our reformer in his search for the Word falls on a bundle of old rags which he valiantly opposes not only to Bolshevism but to Marxism as well.

At first glance Schlamm's brand of ideological reaction seems too primitive (from Marx... to Kerensky!) to pause over. But actually it is very instructive: precisely in its primitiveness it represents the common denominator of all other forms of reaction, particularly of those expressed in a wholesale denunciation of Bolshevism.

"BACK TO MARXISM"?

Marxism found its highest historical expression in Bolshevism. Under the banner of Bolshevism the first victory of the proletariat was achieved and the first workers' state established. Nothing can erase these facts from history. But since the October Revolution has led in the present stage to the triumph of the bureaucracy, with its system of repression, plunder, and falsification—to the "dictatorship of the lie", to use Schlamm's happy expression—many formalistic and superficial minds leap to a summary conclusion: one cannot struggle against Stalinism, without renouncing Bolshevism. Schlamm, as we already know, goes farther: Bolshevism, which degenerated into Stalinism, itself grew out of Marxism; consequently one cannot fight Stalinism while remaining on the foundation of Marxism. There are others, less consistent but more numerous, who say on the contrary: "We must return from Bolshevism to Marxism." How? To what Marxism? Before Marxism became "bankrupt" in the form of Bolshevism it had already broken down in the form of Social Democracy. Does the slogan "Back to Marxism" then mean a leap over the periods of the Second and Third Internationals... to the First International? But it too broke down in its time. Thus in the last analysis it is a question of returning... to the complete works of Marx and Engels. One can accomplish this heroic leap without leaving one's study and even without taking off one's slippers. But how are we to go from our classics (Marx died in 1883, Engels in 1895) to the tasks of our own time, omitting several decades of theoretical and political struggles, among them Bolshevism and the October Revolution? None of those who propose to renounce Bolshevism as an historically "bankrupt" tendency has indicated any other course. So the question is reduced to the simple advice to study "Capital". We can hardly object. But the Bolsheviks too studied "Capital" and not with their eyes closed. This did not however prevent the degeneration of the Soviet state and the staging of the Moscow trials. So what is to be done?

IS BOLSHEVISM RESPONSIBLE FOR STALINISM?

Is it true that Stalinism represents the legitimate product of Bolshevism, as all reactionaries maintain, as Stalin himself avows, as the Mensheviks, the anarchists, and certain left doctrinaires considering themselves Marxist, believe? "We have always predicted this," they say. "Having started with the prohibition of the other socialist parties, the repression of the anarchists, and the setting up of the Bolshevik dictatorship in the soviets, the October Revolution could only end in the dictatorship of the bureaucracy. Stalin is the continuation and also the bankruptcy of Leninism."

The flaw in this reasoning begins in the tacit identification of Bolshevism, October Revolution and Soviet Union. The historical process of the struggle of hostile forces is replaced by the evolution of Bolshevism in a

vacuum. Bolshevism, however, closely fused with the work with it. And aside from the in the Soviet Union a hundred nationalities, and a heritage of ignorance. The state built up not only the thought and will of cultural level of the country, the population, the pressure of less barbaric world imperialism of degeneration of the Soviet of pure Bolshevism is to ignore name of only one of its elements. One has only to call this element name to do away with every thing.

Bolshevism, at any rate, new with the October Revolution or issued from it. Bolshevism or the factors of history, the "e important but not the decisive historical subjectivism. We see the existing basis of product struggle, not only on a national scale.

When the Bolsheviks made a tendency to private ownership membership in the party, purges, prohibited other parties; granted enterprises as concessive agreements with imperialist drawing partial conclusions from been theoretically clear to the that the conquest of power, to be in itself, by no means transfer sovereign ruler of the historic over the state the party is all the development of society will it before; but in return it sub greater influence from all other can, by the direct attack of how of power. Given a more dragg it can degenerate internally with power. It is precisely this dialectic that is not understood by who try to find in the decay of an annihilating argument again.

In essence these gentlemen party that contains in itself its own degeneration is bad. By vism is naturally condemned: the criterion itself is wrong. So a concrete analysis: how and what ate? No one but the Bolshevik the present time, given such an had no need to break with Bols they found in its arsenal all the tion of its fate. They drew t Stalinism "grew out" of Bolshe ever, but dialectically; not as tion but as a Thermidorian neg the same.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROGNOSIS

The Bolsheviks, however, did Moscow trials to explain the re tion of the governing party of they foresaw and spoke of the this development. Let us ren the Bolsheviks, not only on the lution but years before. The st in the national and internatio

COMING AS AN

The essay *Stalinism as* reprinted here by arrangement Publishers. It will appear page pamphlet for mass are available at 10 cents at reduced rates. Write to Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

Bolshevism - An Article Concerning the Roots and Traditions of the Movement for the Fourth International

steps against which Schlamm now mobilizes metaphysical absolutes.

logical mechanism of the ideological reform and his like, is not at all complicated. These people took part in a political movement by the class struggle and appealed, in thought, to dialectical materialism. In Germany the affair ended in a catastrophe. Schlamm draws a wholesale conclusion: this is dialectics and the class struggle! And since the revelation is limited by historical experience, by personal knowledge, our reformer or the Word falls on a bundle of old rags and only opposes not only to Bolshevism but well.

Since Schlamm's brand of ideological reaction is primitive (from Marx... to Kerensky!) But actually it is very instructive: primitiveness it represents the common denominator of other forms of reaction, particularly as evidenced in a wholesale denunciation of Bolshevism.

"BACK TO MARXISM"?

and its highest historical expression in the banner of Bolshevism the first proletarian was achieved and the first established. Nothing can erase these facts. But since the October Revolution has led to a stage of the triumph of the bureaucracy, of repression, plunder, and falsification of the truth, to use Schlamm's happy phrase "formalistic and superficial minds leap to the conclusion: one cannot struggle against the system without renouncing Bolshevism. Schlamm, however, goes farther: Bolshevism, which is the only form of Stalinism, itself grew out of Marxism; one cannot fight Stalinism while remaining within the framework of Marxism. There are others, less numerous, who say on the contrary: "Back to Marxism from Bolshevism to Marxism." How? Before Marxism became "bankrupt" Bolshevism it had already broken down the social democracy. Does the slogan "Back to Marxism" mean a leap over the periods of the First and Second Internationals... to the First International? It broke down in its time. Thus in the end it is a question of returning... to the communism of Marx and Engels. One can accomplish this without leaving one's study and even without taking off one's slippers. But how are we to do this? (Marx died in 1883, Engels in 1895) In our own time, omitting several decades of political struggles, among them Bolshevism and the October Revolution? None of those who once praised Bolshevism as an historically "bankrupt" has indicated any other course. So the only recourse is to the simple advice to study "Capital". But the Bolsheviks too studied "Capital" not with their eyes closed. This did not prevent the degeneration of the Soviet state and the Moscow trials. So what is to be done?

BOLSHEVISM RESPONSIBLE FOR STALINISM?

What Stalinism represents the legitimate development of Bolshevism, as all reactionaries maintain, as they do, as the Mensheviks, the anarchists, and other doctrinaires considering themselves "Marxists." "We have always predicted this," they started with the prohibition of the other side, the repression of the anarchists, and the consolidation of the Bolshevik dictatorship in the soviets. The revolution could only end in the dictatorship of the proletariat. Stalin is the continuation and development of Leninism."

But this reasoning begins in the tacit identification of Bolshevism, October Revolution and Soviet Union with the historical process of the struggle of hostile forces. It is the evolution of Bolshevism in a

vacuum. Bolshevism, however, is only a political tendency, closely fused with the working class but not identical with it. And aside from the working class there exist in the Soviet Union a hundred million peasants, various nationalities, and a heritage of oppression, misery and ignorance. The state built up by the Bolsheviks reflects not only the thought and will of Bolshevism but also the cultural level of the country, the social composition of the population, the pressure of a barbaric past and no less barbaric world imperialism. To represent the process of degeneration of the Soviet state as the evolution of pure Bolshevism is to ignore social reality in the name of only one of its elements, isolated by pure logic. One has only to call this elementary mistake by its real name to do away with every trace of it.

Bolshevism, at any rate, never identified itself either with the October Revolution or with the Soviet state that issued from it. Bolshevism considered itself as one of the factors of history, the "conscious" factor—a very important but not the decisive one. We never sinned in historical subjectivism. We saw the decisive factor—in the existing basis of productive forces—in the class struggle, not only on a national but on an international scale.

When the Bolsheviks made concessions to the peasant tendency to private ownership, set up strict rules for membership in the party, purged the party of alien elements, prohibited other parties, introduced the N.E.P., granted enterprises as concessions, or concluded diplomatic agreements with imperialist governments, they were drawing partial conclusions from the basic fact that had been theoretically clear to them from the beginning: that the conquest of power, however important it may be in itself, by no means transforms the party into a sovereign ruler of the historical process. Having taken over the state the party is able, certainly, to influence the development of society with a power inaccessible to it before; but in return it submits itself to a ten times greater influence from all other elements of society. It can, by the direct attack of hostile forces, be thrown out of power. Given a more dragging tempo of development it can degenerate internally while maintaining itself in power. It is precisely this dialectic of the historical process that is not understood by those sectarian logicians who try to find in the decay of the Stalinist bureaucracy an annihilating argument against Bolshevism.

In essence these gentlemen say: the revolutionary party that contains in itself no guarantee against its own degeneration is bad. By such a criterion Bolshevism is naturally condemned: it has no talisman. But the criterion itself is wrong. Scientific thinking demands a concrete analysis: how and why did the party degenerate? No one but the Bolsheviks themselves have up to the present time, given such an analysis. To do this they had no need to break with Bolshevism. On the contrary, they found in its arsenal all they needed for the clarification of its fate. They drew this conclusion: certainly Stalinism "grew out" of Bolshevism, not logically, however, but dialectically; not as a revolutionary affirmation but as a Thermidorian negation. It is by no means the same.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROGNOSIS OF BOLSHEVISM

The Bolsheviks, however, did not have to wait for the Moscow trials to explain the reasons for the disintegration of the governing party of the U.S.S.R. Long ago they foresaw and spoke of the theoretical possibility of this development. Let us remember the prognosis of the Bolsheviks, not only on the eve of the October Revolution but years before. The specific alignment of forces in the national and international field can enable the

proletariat to seize power first in a backward country such as Russia. But the same alignment of forces beforehand that without a more or less rapid victory the proletariat in the advanced countries the government in Russia will not survive. Left to itself the Soviet regime must either fall or degenerate. It will fall exactly: it will first degenerate and then fall. I have written about this more than once, beginning in 1905. In my "History of the Russian Revolution" (Appendix to the last volume: "Socialism in One Country") are collected all the statements on this question made by the Bolshevik leaders from 1917 until 1923. They all lead to one conclusion: without a revolution in the West, Bolshevism will be liquidated either by internal counter-revolution or by external intervention—a combination of both. Lenin stressed again and again that the bureaucratization of the Soviet regime was a technical or organizational question, but the political degeneration was the beginning of the degeneration of the workers' state.

At the Eleventh Party Congress in March, 1923 Lenin spoke of the support offered to Soviet Russia at the time of the N. E. P. by certain bourgeois politicians, particularly the liberal professor Ustrialov. "I am for the support of the Soviet power in Russia," said Ustrialov though he was a Kadet, a bourgeois, a supporter of intervention—"because on its present course it is bound to fall back into an ordinary bourgeois power." Lenin called Ustrialov the cynical voice of the enemy to "sugary communist babble." Soberly and harshly he warns the party of the danger: "What Ustrialov says is possible, one must not ignore it openly. History knows transformations of all kinds. It is absolutely trivial in politics to put one's faith in a man's conviction, devotion, and other excellent moral qualities. A small number of people have excellent moral qualities. The historical outcome is decided by gigantic forces. The people who, if they are not pleased with this small number of people, will treat them none too politely." In a word, the party is not the only factor of development and on a larger historical scale is not the decisive one.

"One nation conquers another," continued Lenin at the same congress, the last in which he participated. This is quite simple and understandable to everyone. But what of the culture of these nations? That is not so simple. If the conquering nation has a higher culture than the conquered, it imposes its culture on the latter, but if the contrary is true then the defeated nation imposes its culture on the conqueror. Did not something like this occur in the case of the capital of the R.S.F.S.R. and was it not in the case of the 4,700 communists (almost a whole division of them the best) were submitted to an alien culture? This was said in the beginning of 1923, and not for the first time. History is not made by a few people, even the "best"; and not only that: these "best" can degenerate and lose the spirit of an alien, that is a bourgeois culture. Only can the Soviet state abandon the way of socialism but the Bolshevik party can, under unfavorable conditions, lose its Bolshevism.

From the clear understanding of this danger the Left Opposition, definitely formed in 1923, fought day by day the symptoms of degeneration, in order to oppose to the growing Thermidor the conscious action of the proletarian vanguard. However, this subjective factor proved to be insufficient. The "gigantic forces" which, according to Lenin, decide the outcome of the struggle, became tired of internal privations and waiting too long for the world revolution. The masses declined. The bureaucracy won the day. It cowed the revolutionary vanguard, turned upon Marxism, prostituted the Bolshevik party, and Bolshevism conquered. In the form of the Left Opposition Bolshevism broke with the Soviet bureaucracy and its Thermidorian negation. This was the actual course of development.

To be sure, in a formal sense Stalinism did not break with Bolshevism. Even today the Moscow bureaucracy continues to call itself the Bolshevik party. It is using the old label of Bolshevism the better to fool the masses. So much the more pitiful are those theoreticians who take the shell for the kernel and the appearance for the reality. In the identification of Bolshevism and Stalinism they render the best possible service to the Thermidorians and precisely thereby play a clearly defined Thermidorian role.

COMING AS A PAMPHLET

The essay *Stalinism and Bolshevism* is being reprinted here by arrangement with the Pioneer Publishers. It will appear in a few days as a 32 page pamphlet for mass distribution. Single copies are available at 10 cents. Orders of five or more at reduced rates. Write to the publishers at 100 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

ing the Roots and Traditions of - By Leon Trotsky

or the Fourth International

is only a political tendencing class but not identical working class there exist million peasants, various of oppression, misery and by the Bolsheviks reflects of Bolshevism but also the the social composition of of a barbaric past and no m. To represent the pro-viet state as the evolution ore social reality in the ats, isolated by pure logic. entary mistake by its real trace of it.

ver identified itself either with the Soviet state that considered itself as one of onscious" factor—a very one. We never sinned in w the decisive factor—on tive forces—in the class al but on an international

concessions to the peasant p, set up strict rules for red the party of alien ele- s, introduced the N.E.P., ons, or concluded diploma- t governments, they were om the basic fact that had em from the beginning: owever important it may nsforms the party into a al process. Having taken le, certainly, to influence in a power inaccessible to mits itself to a ten times er elements of society. It stile forces, be thrown out ing tempo of development hile maintaining itself in ectic of the historical pro- those sectarian logicians the Stalinist bureaucracy inst Bolshevism.

say: the revolutionary no guarantee against its such a criterion Bolsh- it has no talisman. But eientific thinking demands why did the party degener- ks themselves have up to 1 analysis. To do this they lshivism. On the contrary, ey needed for the clarifica- this conclusion: certainly eivism, not logically, how- a revolutionary affirma- gation. It is by no means

SIS OF BOLSHEVISM

id not have to wait for the reasons for the disintegra- of the U.S.S.R. Long ago e theoretical possibility of member the prognosis of e eve of the October Revo- specific alignment of forces onal field can enable the

PAMPHLET

ad Bolshevism is being sent with the Pioneer a few days as a 32 ution. Single copies ers of five or more the publishers at 100 Y.

proletariat to seize power first in a backward country such as Russia. But the same alignment of forces proves beforehand that *without a more or less rapid victory of the proletariat in the advanced countries* the workers' government in Russia will not survive. Left to itself the Soviet regime must either fall or degenerate. More exactly: it will first degenerate and then fall. I myself have written about this more than once, beginning in 1905. In my "History of the Russian Revolution" (cf. "Appendix" to the last volume: "Socialism in One Country") are collected all the statements on this question made by the Bolshevik leaders from 1917 until 1923. They all lead to one conclusion: without a revolution in the West, Bolshevism will be liquidated either by internal counter-revolution or by external intervention, or by a combination of both. Lenin stressed again and again that the bureaucratization of the Soviet regime was not a technical or organizational question, but the potential beginning of the degeneration of the workers' state.

At the Eleventh Party Congress in March, 1923, Lenin spoke of the support offered to Soviet Russia at the time of the N. E. P. by certain bourgeois politicians, particularly the liberal professor Ustrialow. "I am for the support of the Soviet power in Russia," said Ustrialov, although he was a Kadet, a bourgeois, a supporter of intervention—"because on its present course it is sliding back into an ordinary bourgeois power." Lenin prefers the cynical voice of the enemy to "sugary communistic babble." Soberly and harshly he warns the party of the danger: "What Ustrialov says is possible, one must say it openly. History knows transformations of all kinds; it is absolutely trivial in politics to put one's faith in conviction, devotion, and other excellent moral qualities. A small number of people have excellent moral qualities. The historical outcome is decided by gigantic masses who, if they are not pleased with this small number of people, will treat them none too politely." In a word, the party is not the only factor of development and on a larger historical scale is not the decisive one.

"One nation conquers another," continued Lenin at the same congress, the last in which he participated... "This is quite simple and understandable to everyone. But what of the culture of these nations? That is not so simple. If the conquering nation has a higher culture than the defeated, it imposes its culture on the latter, but if the contrary is true then the defeated nation imposes its culture on the conqueror. Did not something like this occur in the capital of the R.S.F.S.R. and was it not in this way that 4,700 communists (almost a whole division and all of them the best) were submitted to an alien culture?" This was said in the beginning of 1923, and not for the first time. History is not made by a few people, even "the best"; and not only that: these "best" can degenerate in the spirit of an alien, that is a bourgeois culture. Not only can the Soviet state abandon the way of socialism, but the Bolshevik party can, under unfavorable historic conditions, lose its Bolshevism.

From the clear understanding of this danger issued the Left Opposition, definitely formed in 1923. Recording day by day the symptoms of degeneration, it tried to oppose to the growing Thermidor the conscious will of the proletarian vanguard. However, this subjective factor proved to be insufficient. The "gigantic masses" which, according to Lenin, decide the outcome of the struggle, became tired of internal privations and of waiting too long for the world revolution. The mood of the masses declined. The bureaucracy won the upper hand. It cowed the revolutionary vanguard, trampled upon Marxism, prostituted the Bolshevik party. Stalinism conquered. In the form of the Left Opposition, Bolshevism broke with the Soviet bureaucracy and its Comintern. This was the actual course of development.

To be sure, in a formal sense Stalinism did issue from Bolshevism. Even today the Moscow bureaucracy continues to call itself the Bolshevik party. It is simply using the old label of Bolshevism the better to fool the masses. So much the more pitiful are those theoreticians who take the shell for the kernel and the appearance for the reality. In the identification of Bolshevism and Stalinism they render the best possible service to the Thermidorians and precisely thereby play a clearly reactionary role.

In view of the elimination of all other parties from the political field the antagonistic interests and tendencies of the various strata of the population must, to a greater or less degree, find their expression in the governing party. To the extent that the political center of gravity has shifted from the proletarian vanguard to the bureaucracy, the party has changed in its social structure as well as in its ideology. Owing to the impetuous course of development, it has suffered in the last fifteen years a far more radical degeneration than did the social democracy in half a century. The present purge draws between Bolshevism and Stalinism not simply a bloody line but a whole river of blood. The annihilation of all the old generation of Bolsheviks, an important part of the middle generation which participated in the civil war, and that part of the youth which took seriously the Bolshevik traditions, shows not only a political but a thoroughly physical incompatibility between Bolshevism and Stalinism. How can this be ignored?

STALINISM AND "STATE SOCIALISM"

The anarchists, for their part, try to see in Stalinism the organic product not only of Bolshevism and Marxism but of "State socialism" in general. They are willing to replace Bakunin's patriarchal "federation of free communes" by the more modern federation of free Soviets. But, as formerly, they are against centralized state power. In fact: one branch of "state" Marxism, social democracy, after coming to power became an open agent of capitalism. The other gave birth to a new privileged caste. It is obvious that the source of the evil lies in the state. From a wide historical viewpoint, there is a grain of truth in this reasoning. The state as an apparatus of constraint is undoubtedly a source of political and moral infection. This also applies, as experience has shown, to the workers' state. Consequently it can be said that Stalinism is a product of a condition of society in which society was still unable to tear itself out of the strait-jacket of the state. But this situation, containing nothing for the evaluation of Bolshevism or Marxism, characterizes only the general cultural level of mankind, and above all—the relation of forces between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Having agreed with the anarchists that the state, even the workers' state, is the offspring of class barbarism and that real human history will begin with the abolition of the state, we have still before us in full force the question: what ways and methods will lead, *ultimately*, to the abolition of the state? Recent experience proves that they are certainly not the methods of anarchism.

The leaders of the C. N. T., the only important anarchist organization in the world, became, in the critical hour, bourgeois ministers. They explained their open betrayal of the theory of anarchism by the pressure of "exceptional circumstances." But did not the leaders of German social democracy invoke, in their time, the same excuse? Naturally, civil war is not a peaceful and ordinary but an "exceptional circumstance." Every serious revolutionary organization, however, prepares precisely for "exceptional circumstances." The experience of Spain has shown once again that the state can be "denied" in booklets published in "normal circumstances" by permission of the bourgeois state, but that the conditions of revolution leave no room for "denial" of the state; they demand, on the contrary, the conquest of the state. We have not the slightest intention of blaming the anarchists for not having liquidated the state by a mere stroke of the pen. A revolutionary party, even after having seized power (of which the anarchist leaders were incapable in spite of the heroism of the anarchist workers) is still by no means the sovereign ruler of society. But we do severely blame the anarchist theory, which seemed to be wholly suitable for times of peace, but which had to be dropped rapidly as soon as the "exceptional circumstances" of the... revolution had begun. In the old days there were certain generals—and probably are now—who considered that the most harmful thing for an army was war. In the same class are those revolutionaries who claim that their doctrine is destroyed by revolution. (Concluded in next issue).

The Wave of Trials In The U.S.S.R.

Mass Executions, Disrupting Economy, Reveal Reactionary Role of Stalin

The corrosion of the very foundations of the Soviet Union by the Stalinist police regime is increasingly exposed to view by the wave of trials. These trials occur with such almost monotonous regularity that one picks up the paper wondering only who Stalin's next victims will be. But even for the least class-conscious worker there emerges from the news the conviction that the Soviet Union is passing through a severe and deep-going crisis. The very mass nature of the trials, their wholesale character, the systematic pattern which they all follow, lay bare not only the reality of the crisis, but its nature as well.

The bureaucratic methods of planning and the usurpation of special privileges by the Stalinist ruling caste have brought Russian economy to the brink of disaster. How explain the fact, after reporting such resounding successes in the fulfillment of the five year plans, that production in such varied and important industries as coal, oil, pig iron production, cement, lumber, textiles, should not only be lagging behind the norms set for them, but in many instances should be considerably below the figures reported for the year 1936? A similar situation exists in the agricultural field, fruit, vegetables, sugar, cotton, flax, butter and margarine showing alarming drops.

Stalin's Alibi

Stalin has an infallible explanation which has "worked" by and large up till now. It is the work of Trotskyist wreckers and scoundrels from the right and from the left (some are already included from the center, Stalinists from beginning to end!). Such scapegoats serve a double purpose for Stalin: they divert attention from the real culprits in the Kremlin and, so Stalin hopes, allay the discontent among the masses by punishing the ones supposedly responsible for goods shortages and for the unbearable living conditions of the workers and peasants.

It is impossible to give more than a brief summary of some of the cases reported in the press recently. Most of the trials, even that small number that reaches the press of the outside world, are held (if they are held at all!) behind closed doors. Rarely is the public admitted to the courtroom and that only when some spectacular, and therefore all the more unconvincing, confession has been extorted from some unfortunate prisoner. Then a "show" can be made of the trial.

Some Recent Trials

Thus the press of August 27 reports that "A Show Trial Is Being Made of Seven Important Agricultural Executives in a Leningrad Province near the Finnish Border". In this case Chief Agronomist Samokhvalov confessed to disruption of collective farming by false planning to reduce yields, all for the purpose of seeing capitalism restored. One Tarasink, Chairman of the District Executive Committee of the GP, confessed that he led a group of Rightists since 1935 in a campaign to disrupt collective agriculture. In resolutions demanding the death penalty for these executives, significantly enough, the demand is also made for the death of Bukharin, their "real" leader!

On Aug. 20 eight people were shot for "Trotskyist counter-revolutionary activities in two factories". On Aug. 12 we learn that the lumber industry is chock full

of "enemies of the people" some of whom have been executed for sabotage. The Civil Aviation Administration is also honey-combed with "enemies of the people" and numerous engineers and executives have been dismissed and arrested, including the recently appointed head Petrozhitsky. At Azov in the Black Sea Region 13 veterinarians and minor agricultural functionaries were placed on trial for spreading disease among cattle in order to disrupt the economy. These disrupters were, naturally, in contact with Trotskyists.

Far Eastern Trials

In the Far East the Military Tribunals have been extremely active. No doubt many spies are at work in Siberia, particularly along the border and along the railroads. But we will perhaps never know how many of those who were shot, allegedly as spies were in actuality merely scapegoats or really revolutionists in unyielding opposition to the present bloody regime. For all these trials are shot through and through with the clumsy attempts at amalgams of real scoundrels with framed-up oppositionist victims. The press of July 5 reports laconically that 22 more were executed as spies in the Far East. On July 8 we learn that 64 more were shot, etc. Some of these "spies" were accused of sabotage on the Trans-Siberian Railroad, some of sabotage of gold production. The Orsk Gold Trust in the Urals is raked over the coals for being run by Trotskyists who reported a higher production of gold than was actually achieved!

The National Problem

The Stalinist bureaucracy acts as the greatest disrupter not only of the economic system but of the political and social system in the USSR. The completely democratic methods of the October Revolution in the handling of the national question served to tie the national republics firmly together in a close economic union. Stalinism acts as a centrifugal force, driving them apart.

Evidence of this is clear in the trials and executions in the outlying republics. It is nothing new for Stalin, the Georgian, to act, in the fashion of a Great Russian oppressor of nationalities. When Stalin and Erdjonikidze first removed Mdivani from his leading post in Georgia in 1922-3 Lenin, even though on a sick-bed, entered into a fierce controversy against Stalin precisely on this score. Now on July 13 of this year Stalin takes his final revenge. After a closed trial Mdivani and 7 others are executed as terrorists and conspiratorial plotters.

Similarly whole executive committees, heads of the republic, are removed in such places as Uzbekistan and Kazakstan for resisting the adventurist agricultural plans of the bureaucrats who would have caused wholesale starvation of the local peasants in order to make a "showing" in their particular sector of planned economy. Most recently Tursun Khodpieff, Commissar of Domestic Trade, has been removed in Uzbekistan. The utter disregard of national rights and of the peculiarities of local economy have brought about a tense situation in the smaller republics which Stalin seeks to "liquidate" by the methods of bureaucratic terrorism.

Since the liquidation of Mdivani, a further drive has been made against the Georgians. Eleven minor executives are

By Jack Weber

doomed as a Rightist organization which sabotaged and disrupted socialized agriculture and ordered an armed rebellion and assassinations in Georgia. No doubt the resulting trials will include "confessions" to besmirch the name of Mdivani. Already one Zitlidze, former leader of the Signakh regional committee of the CP, has confessed terrorist orders from the premier Mgaloglishvili, removed from office in June, and from the vice-premier Agnyashvili.

Some Revealing Trials

Stalin must stop the mouths of all those who are capable of revealing the truth about the frame-ups, whether that involves the death of a Yagoda, one of those mainly responsible and "in the know", or of some obscure relative of a Gamarnick or Tukhachevsky who knows the truth and can prove the falsehood. But as the circle widens the number of such people becomes legion and Stalin's task becomes utterly impossible. The truth will out!

Some of the trials take on a macabre comic air. There is the case of the Izvestia editorial writer Suvinsky. Evidently he either took the matter of sabotage seriously or pretended so. When certain bureaucrats in the Saratov region hastened to charge the farm workers with deliberate sabotage (thereby getting the jump on some of these workers who might have been inclined to reverse the charge) Suvinsky defended the maligned workers against the heads of the collectives, saying that they were raising the cry of sabotage to cover their own inefficiency. This was too much for the bureaucracy. It touched home too closely and involved by generalization an exposé of the entire bureaucracy. Hence Suvinsky was hastily removed and arrested.

The motive behind the attack made on the Young Guard Publishing House, producing works for youth, is transparent also. It is stated that the Director Leschiner, is a friend of Feinberg, recently removed from the Central Executive Committee of the YCL. That is surely reason enough for removing him. But we learn of a far more important motive: the director of the division of history had spent a whole year writing a biography on Tukhachevsky. Could this have been anything but laudatory? What a danger for the youth to know the truth about the brilliant Tukhachevsky!

Economy & Bureaucracy

In the early stages of planned economy, the bureaucracy, despite all its inefficiency and adventurism, could play a certain "progressive" role by acting to achieve the plans set. The only method they knew, however, was to whip the workers and peasants into over-exhausting and underpaid labor. The speed-up system in its worst forms was adopted quite naturally by the "fists" put in charge of industry. The extreme top layers put added pressure on the layers just below in order to have them apply the proper pressure to the lowest strata. When the pressure became too great and lack of fulfillment might easily lead to the prison cell, if not worse, the lesser bureaucrats and those further up defended themselves by falsifying the accounts to make things appear more rosy. In the present period the mass of falsification

of accounts is reacting sharply against the whole system of planning. The plans were laid on the basis of the swollen figures and were therefore bound to be at variance with the possibilities.

Instead of the amount of coal or cotton figured to enter into the various fields of production, less was available. The top layer of the bureaucracy, which was primarily responsible for creating this situation by its methods, then turned on the lower layers in a fury for having in part misled it. But in doing this, arresting thousands of experts and specialists for "sabotage", the bureaucracy merely disrupted economy all the more by removing (in the process of choosing scapegoats) the ones best acquainted with the industry. Thus we see this peculiar contradiction: the wholesale arrest of scapegoats, and at the same time the attempt to reassure these same elements when they are paralyzed by fear and really sabotage by refusing to take any initiative. Thus on July 27 the Donetsk Basin coal industry had been so disrupted by the imprisonment of so many of the technicians, that 445 of these specialists had to be released from prison for "false arrest" to try and straighten matters out. Stalin learned that the method of choosing scapegoats has its limits!

Nevertheless the bureaucracy can only continue to act in the fashion of a whip. It can in no sense evoke the initiative that has become essential for the carrying on of planned production by the masses. Such initiative can only be exerted against the bureaucracy and in antagonism to it. Precisely because of that the Stalinist bureaucracy has become a tremendous brake on the forces of production. It is also, of course, a tremendous overhead. Not only by its recognized privileges but by the bribery and corruption, and above all by the diverting of all sorts of raw material and finished products for its own purposes. The Stalinist bureaucracy are the true "diversionists"!

Hidden Strikes

The masses are beginning to realize that the bureaucracy stands in the way. Under the present apparatus of suppression the workers have not yet managed to organize themselves independently and to strike against the bureaucracy. But the mass walk-outs in many plants, the tremendous turnovers of labor, take on the character not merely of individual resentment against low wages and frightful conditions, but of a hidden form of strike aimed at the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy finds itself in the sharpest antagonism to the masses of workers and collectivized peasants. It is fearful above everything else that centers may develop around which the masses will rally for political action. Hence Stalin, in the name of the bureaucracy, must act to keep the workers disunited, must establish a completely totalitarian regime.

To create a psychological terror which will prevent one worker from talking frankly to his neighbor, and which will frighten the worker away from any "group", Stalin starts a spy scare campaign. "Russians Are Told Informing Is a Duty". The police regime must establish itself right among the masses! Every worker must learn to distrust his neighbor. Make it difficult for

janitors are ordered to remove all names of their tenants so that any visitor must inquire from the janitor where so-and-so lives. And janitors the world over are used by the police. If anybody has too many visitors he must be a central figure in a spy plot. Report him!

Youth Endangers Stalin

But it is the youth especially that must be watched. The youth that grew up under the Soviet regime and knows no other. Even the Stalinized YCL is a constant source of danger, if only because it permits the youth to come together—and youth can be so engagingly frank! Since the youth cannot be kept entirely apart, the next best thing is to establish the closest surveillance over them. The YCL becomes a tool of the police. Kosariëff performed this function of police agent not so well, hence he is reprimanded and given a warning for next time. Evidently he allowed too much freedom among the youth to suit the apparatus. But freedom and initiative are precisely what the youth demand. Hence the bureaucracy finds itself at every turn in the sharpest antagonism to the younger generation.

The wave of trials in the USSR are clear indications, therefore, of the deep-going crisis through which the Soviet Union is passing. The crisis is one which shows the growing antagonism between the bureaucracy and the masses. It reveals that the bureaucracy can play no progressive role in Soviet economy, but can only serve as a brake on the productive forces. The bureaucracy stands in the way of the initiative of the working masses, it stands in the way of planned economy, it stands in the way of the youth. In order to maintain its power the bureaucracy resorts to an oppressive and bloody police regime worse even than that of Hitler.

Stalin Teaches Hitler

For it teaches Hitler the art of extorting confessions by torturing for the purpose of bolstering up a regime. How such confessions are wrung from the victims is heart-rendingly told in the book "I Confess" containing the account of the experiences of the German communist Weiss in the Soviet Union. The entire apparatus of the Stalinist regime, above all the GPU, is devoted to the task of keeping the workers disunited. To terrorize the masses into complete silence Stalin resorts to systematic frame-ups on a scale never before seen in history. These frame-ups, the stock-in-trade of Thermidorean reaction, are used against real and fancied opposition, and also against perfectly innocent victims who are dragged in haphazardly to suit the schemes of the GPU. The earlier frame-ups of the engineers, the Mensheviks, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky and all the Old Bolsheviks, engender the need for more and more. The present wave of trials thus gathers momentum, but at the same time represents the death agony of the Stalinist regime. For it indicates that the bloody and oppressive regime comes into more and more violent conflict with the masses and their needs. It is this sharpening conflict that will inevitably bring about the sweeping aside of the Stalinist bureaucracy as outworn, corrupt reactionary to the core.

The Case of Leon Trotsky

A Review of the Dewey Sub-Commission's Hearing in Mexico City

Last April, in a crowded little room in a suburb of Mexico City, Leon Trotsky made a promise to the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry which may have seemed unusual, over-ambitious, and, indeed, incapable of fulfillment.

Professor Charles A. Beard (though he indicated that Vyshinsky's puppet-shows were on the same level as the trials of the Inquisition), had stated that it was impossible for Trotsky to "prove a negative by positive evidence," and declared that the burden of proof still rested upon Stalin and not Trotsky.

Trotsky, however, promised "direct and, moreover, quite positive proof of the 'negative fact'; he pledged not only to raise a reasonable doubt but to establish his innocence beyond the shadow of a doubt, and, by the same token, to prove Stalin guilty of the basest and most bloody frame-up in history. The task which he assumed was not simply a defensive one, a refutation of the charges against him, but vigorously offensive: he undertook to brand his accusers for all time as falsifiers and murderers, the assassins of revolutionaries and the grave-diggers of the Russian Revolution.

Verbatim Report

The verbatim report of the Mexican hearings has now been published (*The Case of Leon Trotsky*, Harpers) and it is possible for all to weigh Trotsky's promises against the actual proofs presented.

The investigation has not yet drawn to a close; the Commission of Inquiry is still in session, collating the work of the Mexican, Parisian and New York sub-commissions, examining the wealth of new evidence which has come to light, and on this basis will pronounce its verdict.

Nevertheless, these 600 pages of the record, incomplete though they may be, contain such a bulk of persuasive juridical evidence, furnish such weighty political and psychological analysis, offer such complete historical documentation, that hesitations and suspended judgements are now bereft of the slightest foundation. Trotsky has here already proved his case to the hilt, and turned the charges into a terrible indictment of his accusers.

Documentation

Exclusive of Trotsky's oral testimony, the documentary evidence submitted to the Commission was of two chief types: (a) a category of purely legal documents, refuting the few charges of a specific and factual character, those which alleged certain conspirative meetings and correspondence; (b) a political category of historical materials bearing on Trotsky's record in the revolutionary movement, his relations with the various defendants and with Lenin, his attitude over years and decades on the subjects of terrorism, fascism, sabotage and industry, war, etc. (The latter materials, to be sure, are also of basic legal importance, since Vyshinsky made definite allegations regarding Trotsky's writings and activities.)

Never, from a purely legal point of view, has a refutation been so completely and relentlessly established in a case of like nature and magnitude. It would almost seem as if Vyshinsky, in the few charges which he dared to fill with some small amount of precision, deliberately resorted only to the most absurd and easily

refutable fabrications. Actually, of course, Moscow's brazen disregard for consistency and elementary fact is due both to the impossibility of falsifying Trotsky's activities and conditions of life, regulated and recorded as they are down to the most minute detail, and to a careless cynicism born of bureaucratic impunity.

Physically Impossible

The documentation, as indicated by the extracts in the report, is complete in every important case: literally hundreds of documents and affidavits demonstrate the physical impossibility of Trotsky's alleged meeting with Romm in Paris, or with Holtzman, Olberg, David and Berman-Yurin in Copenhagen, of Sedov's alleged presence in Copenhagen, of Pyatakov's alleged flight to Oslo and meeting with Trotsky. Straight down the line, every factual charge of any importance is crushed to bits.

What, then, is left of the whole flimsy framework of falsehoods? If confessions, of and by themselves, do not constitute conclusive proof (and none other than Vyshinsky has so affirmed, in a standard Soviet handbook on criminal procedure), then Stalin's whole case must stand or fall with the evidence which Vyshinsky submitted.

Of what did this "substantiating evidence" consist? A calling-card with two letters scribbled on it (significance unexplained), a passport proving that Olberg entered Russia as a Honduran citizen, an alleged letter from a "Japanese diplomat" (not introduced into the court record), a German telephone directory... and nothing more! Beyond this—only references to "conspiratorial letters" from Trotsky, and falsified and distorted "quotations" from Trotsky's writings, which any literate person can look up and refute.

The Role of Confessions

It is clear why Vyshinsky had to extract from Pyatakov, Romm and others trumped-up stories about meetings with Trotsky and Sedov at which they received their "directives": otherwise the attempt to implicate Trotsky, backed up by not one iota of material proof, would have been too patently absurd to stand the light of day. Vyshinsky, despite the preliminary investigations reports allegedly filling dozens upon dozens of volumes, could present not one trace of material documentary evidence. From a juridical standpoint, therefore, his case hangs by the slenderest of threads to those few depositions which attempt, however halfheartedly, to name names, give places and dates. The hundreds of documents submitted by Trotsky refute every attempt to establish a concrete link between him and the "conspirators." Thus, even when viewed purely legalistically, the frame-up is crystal-clear.

With Trotsky and Sedov's innocence, the bloody proceedings are hopelessly compromised. Trotsky was pictured as the master-mind, the prime-mover of the "plot" in whose hands the others were but passive puppets; Trotsky's name appears on almost every page of the Court record, usually several times. If Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Radek and the others were forced to utter such monstrous lies about their "master", can anyone then place the slightest credence in any part

of their "confessions"? Emphatically no! And precisely by that token Trotsky's legal argument and case take on added import.

"The absence of proofs," Trotsky repeated tirelessly before the Commission, "is the most terrible proof against Stalin." Trotsky's voluminous proofs not only demonstrate the innocence of the chief defendants, but fling the crimes back in Stalin's face. Not only are Trotsky's hands clean, but Stalin's are stained with the blood of hundreds of innocent victims. That is the full significance of Trotsky's legal case.

Provides Political Understanding

Although public opinion has been increasingly skeptical since the extension of the blood-purge to the Red Generals the question of Stalin's motivation, the why of the trials and persecutions, has been the stumbling-block for considerable sections of bewildered liberal thought. The political documentation in the record, besides exposing the absurdity of the charges of terrorism, sabotage, alliance with Hitler and the Mikado, etc., furnishes indispensable keys to the understanding of the trials, reveals their roots in the political exigencies of the Stalinist bureaucracy and relates them to events within the Soviet Union and throughout the world.

In lengthy testimony, the salient facts of Trotsky's biography are set forth, showing how devotion and loyalty to the working-class movement run like a red thread through his career.

The categorical facts of Trotsky's life throw the lie in the face of his accusers, the most vociferous of whom served in the October Revolution... on the other side of the barricades.

The Capitulators

Vyshinsky faced another knotty psychological problem: to explain away the repeated capitulations of all the known defendants, their grovelling and abject bootlicking, their fiery denunciations of the arch-demon Trotsky and the bitter attacks which the Oppositionists have launched for long years against the renegades from their ranks. For him there is a simple explanation: "camouflage."

Trotsky's analysis of the history of the capitulations, his ample quotations from the contemptuous articles of the Opposition press since 1927 on the "traitors" and "scoundrels" and "deserters" as well as from the miserable writing of the capitulators themselves, make it crystal-clear that, as he says, "It is a historical and political law that the relationship between the Oppositionists and the capitulators was all these years more bitter than the relationship between the Oppositionists and the Stalinists."

On Sabotage

Concerning the charge of sabotage, Trotsky introduces extracts from his writings which analyzed the bureaucratic setting of industrial tempos and warned of the ruinous outcome of dizzy speeds, making it compellingly clear that the "saboteurs" are scapegoats selected to conceal the industrial crisis which now exists in the economy of the Soviet Union. Lengthy documents acquired from the Danish engineer, Winfeld-Hansen, who occupied a high technical post in Russia, bear out Trotsky's predictions

strikingly and attest to the industrial impasse to which the bureaucracy's frantic drive for records has led.

On Terrorism

In relation to terrorism, the record contains long excerpts from Trotsky's writings since the turn of the century, revealing a consistent advocacy of mass propaganda as against the futile and self-defeating violence of desperate individuals. The social roots of the new terrorist tendencies amongst the younger Soviet generation are analyzed and located in the new social stratification and concentration of privilege.

Regarding the charge of alliance with Hitler and the Mikado, there are introduced Trotsky's published writings, in which a consistent anti-Fascist line is maintained, a class-struggle strategy of combating fascism systematically developed, and the hopeless position of Germany and Japan in the coming war laid forth. Finally, the true political nature of the trials is exposed by a fully documented analysis of the way in which Stalin's charges against the Opposition shifted with the winds of Russia's political alliances and the changing needs of the bureaucracy.

A Great Speech

By itself, Trotsky's 136-page concluding speech is a brilliant historical document. Here all the threads are brought together; the factual material summed up in a running argument; the political core and background of the trials ruthlessly brought to light,

the record, aims and techniques of Stalin's Thermidorian inquisition conclusively exposed and explained. The materials in this speech, plus his fascinating explanations of revolutionary problems, perspectives, strategy and tactics, make of the entire volume an indispensable primer for every revolutionist. The lesson which Trotsky drives home page after page, and which is itself the most crushing condemnation of the accusations and the whole bloody Stalinist regime, is the necessity of firm, patient, and principled education of the masses, as opposed to all sorts of desperate adventures, impatient maneuvers and alliances with the enemy class.

In the era of the People's Front betrayal, Trotsky's teaching, brought out by his testimony and by his still more eloquent life, of undeviating loyalty to and reliance upon the class strength of the proletariat assumes added significance and timeliness; and this record, which systematically expounds the real nature of the revolutionary spirit and program, will go far toward rejuvenating that spirit and inspiring it with new hope.

The American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky is to be congratulated for providing a special paper-bound edition of this big book at a sales price of two dollars. That means that we can put it into the hand of every comrade—to whom it can serve as a handbook of the revolutionary movement in all its phases—and systematically distribute it to every radical worker and intellectual in the country.

ERWIN WOLF IN SPANISH DUNGEON

(Continued from page 1)

telephoned, insisting on seeing Wolf once more and giving him what he called urgent mail that had arrived. Meeting in a cafe, Tioli declared that he had forgotten the mail but would go to his room and bring it back. He did not return, and in his stead appeared the police, now controlled by the G.P.U., who arrested Wolf on the spot. His present whereabouts are unknown.

Konrad Knudsen reports from Oslo the information that a Norwegian worker who travelled through the Soviet Union last summer as a tourist, was cross-examined by the G.P.U. concerning Erwin Wolf and his wife. A friend of Knudsen from whom the Appeal has just heard, writes that he fears that the G.P.U. plans to ship Wolf secretly out of the country and to the Soviet Union, where he is doomed to fall victim either to a hideous frame-up or a murder in the dark of the night—the fate that has befallen so many already.

With the memory of Andres Nin's fate still so fresh in the minds of all, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that Erwin Wolf's life depends upon the most immediate and vigorous protest to the Spanish Government, and a demand for his immediate release. We appeal to all groups and individuals to send cablegrams immediately to the Valencia regime.

Erwin Wolf's life must be saved.

DULLEA TO RUN IN SPITE OF CLARITYITES

CLEVELAND, Ohio—The Socialist mayoralty campaign, with Robert Dullea as candidate, is being waged in vigorous fashion despite all sabotaging efforts of the right wing.

The last act of the La Guardia Socialists was to announce to the press that they had withdrawn their support from Dullea. Previously the Clarity-right wing combine had moved for no independent political action and had had been decisively defeated by the membership.

When Frank Stern, Campaign Manager, and Esther Levine, Administrative Secretary, returned to Cleveland from the Y.P.S.L. convention, they found that a new lock had been placed on the door of the party office by Bob Parker, Clarity leader, in a desperate attempt to knife the campaign for Dullea. Comrade Stern, supported by a majority of the county committee, immediately rented new quarters from which to continue the campaign. The new headquarters are at 737 Prospect Avenue, Cleveland.

At a general membership meeting, a score of members of the Yugoslav Federation, many of whom had never attended a Socialist Party meeting, were brought down by the Clarityites to vote the left wing down. A roll call vote disclosed that at least two people present were not members of the party!

Save U.S. Business in China, Is C.P. Appeal

'New Masses' Ask Roosevelt to Intervene for American Capital

By Li Fu-jen

To meet the situation created by Japan's assault, a revolutionary workers' party would place demonstrations of proletarian solidarity with the Chinese workers and peasants, and efforts to organize workers' sanctions against the robber imperialists, at the center of its activity.

The Stalinists, however, pay only lip service to revolutionary principles. Actually they have emerged as the social-patriotic defenders of American imperialist interests in China and they appeal to the Washington government in thinly-veiled terms to defend those interests against Japan in concert with other "peace-loving" imperialist powers.

In some cases, as we shall show, the appeal for war is not even formally based on defense of the Chinese masses against the Japanese imperialists, but upon the preservation of Wall Street profits and investments. Indeed, the Roosevelt government has not voiced anything like the concern over American "interests" in the Far East that the Stalinists express. As always, the flunkey is more vociferous than the master.

"Collective Security"

The Daily Worker, as the official mouthpiece of the Stalinists, still finds it necessary to use rather guarded language in expounding its betrayal of the principles of revolutionary internationalism. Its editorial comments on the Sino-Japanese war consist in the main of vague mumbblings about the necessity for applying a system of "collective security" in the Pacific.

It has been left to such unofficial organs as the New Masses and China Today to unfold the full social-patriotic line in all its vulgar splendor. This is part of the Stalinist system of double bookkeeping. Should need arise, these journals can always be pudiated.

Jingoes At Work

In a featured article by Theodore Draper on September 14, the New Masses devotes two full pages to the most blatant propaganda for imperialist war that has ever disgraced a journal pretending to serve the interests of the exploited and oppressed. The writer, a well-known party member, copies the style and ideas of such bourgeois commentators on Far Eastern affairs as Nathaniel Peffer, notorious as an advocate of war by American imperialism against Japan.

"We," says Draper (the "we" meaning Draper, the New Masses and the imperialist government at Washington), have continually postponed coming to grips with the real issues." He is complaining that the robber barons of Wall Street have allowed the Japanese imperialists to get away with too much in China and that it is time to call a halt.

Recruiting Officer Draper

The pronouns "we" and "our" are used by this Stalinist flag-waver just as they might be used by any bourgeois writer. Not so much as a hint is given that the Roosevelt government is a government of the bourgeoisie and that the workers must therefore necessarily be hostile to all its aims. Class lines are completely obliterated.

"The Roosevelt administration, like its predecessors," Draper continues, "is still hamstrung by

the gap between promise and achievement (it has warned Japan, you see, but has never really acted—L.F.J.). The Japanese themselves are keenly aware of our unsatisfactory role in the Far East and they are counting upon it to continue..... The Roosevelt administration, however, is probably faced with a choice far graver than that confronted by previous administrations. The question arises: how much longer is it possible to postpone concrete action to restore peace and China's sovereignty in the Far East?"

Poisoned Pill

The references to "peace" and "China's sovereignty" are the sugar-coating for the poisoned pill of social-patriotism. The traitors of the Second International employed in 1914 such phrases as "freedom and democracy" and "defense of the fatherland." The Stalinists know full well, however, that American imperialism cannot be driven to fight a war to preserve "peace" and "China's sovereignty." They must prod Washington with more telling arguments. Listen to Draper!

"It is good business for the United States to keep China's vast but undeveloped resources out of Japanese control, despite the short-sighted attitude, from the viewpoint of their own self-interest, of some big business men in this country.

"Secondly, China remains the greatest potential market and source of capital investment in the world.... Our present stake in China is but a tiny fraction of our potential stake in a unified and revived China. Political friendship would be a first-rate business asset."

Flunkeys in Line

China as a business asset to American imperialism! The Chinese workers as fit subjects for exploitation by the money-bags of Wall Street! Surely enough, American imperialism is girding for the march to its goal of world domination. The Stalinist flunkeys of imperialism have fallen into line even before the first bugle has sounded the call to arms.

The magazine China Today, which describes itself as an organ of the "Friends of the Chinese People," dispenses similar social-patriotic poison. In the September issue, R. A. Howell calls for an all-in (?) imperialist war against Japan. Like Draper (perhaps they are one and the the same person), he wants American imperialism to go to war with Japan to protect its business interests in China and, also like Draper, he wants the true aims camouflaged so that the support of the masses for the imperialist war may be assured. Listen again:

Plan to Deceive

"Resistance to aggressors will not be effective if it is limited to defense of lives and property, for the broadest support of the peoples cannot be mobilized behind such a policy." From the imperialists themselves the Stalinists have learned how necessary it is to drug the masses with false ideals and specious promises in order to get them to fight the dirty battles of their exploiters.

Meanwhile the bourgeois-Kuomintang government of China, facing certain defeat in the military struggle because it fears to arouse the masses and draw them actively into the war against

Yes, Yes, But What About His Friends?

ROBERT FORSYTHE

ARCHIBALD MacLEISH

NEW MASSES

AUGUST 24 1937

FIFTEEN CENTS

Hugo Black

A Man with the Right Kind of Enemies

By Wallace Moore



Reprinted without permission from the cover-page of the "New Masses" of August 24, 1937.

Japan, also makes groveling appeals for imperialist intervention. Wang Chung-hui, Nanking's foreign minister, in an interview published in the New York Times September 18, emphasized China's regret over the American isolationist attitude toward the Chino-Japanese warfare."

Real Intervention

Only four days earlier U. S. Marines went into action against striking Chinese flour-mill workers at Shanghai, as a result of which 25 were sent to hospital suffering from the effects of tear gas and scalp wounds. This incident perturbed the Chinese bourgeois minister no more than it did the Daily Worker, which published the report without a single word in condemnation of the use of forces of American imperialism for strike-breaking in China.

Wang "echoed recent Chinese arguments for intervention saying it seemed to him that materialistic, not to mention moral, considerations demanded such a step. He professed his inability to decide whether powers such as Great Britain and the United States were reconciled to abandoning their trade, investments and influence in China, which he said would certainly result from a Japanese victory." This from the representative of a government which, if we were to believe the

Stalinists (as we do not) is putting up a "fight to a finish" against Japanese imperialism!

All In Together

A united front—the bourgeois-Kuomintang government, the "peace-loving" imperialists, and the Stalinists! It remains only for the workers to recognize the fact of this united front and its inevitable consequences—betrayal of the workers and oppressed everywhere.

New York Workers: Attention!

Registration of voters for the New York elections will be held the week of October 4th. If you do not register you cannot vote in the elections. Be sure to register so that you will be able to vote for the independent working class candidates!

Register for the School!

The Fall Semester of the Marxist School, organized by the N. Y. Local of the Socialist Party (Left Wing) will open the week of October 18th. There will be five four-week lecture courses and a weekly Sunday open forum. The courses are:

1. Elementary Marxism
John G. Wright.
Monday, 7:00 P. M.—8:30 P. M.
2. China and the Far East.—
Rob't Graves.
Monday, 8:45 P. M.—10:15 P. M.
3. Political Currents in American Labor Movement.
Maurice Spector.
Tuesday, 7:00 P. M.—8:30 P. M.

4. Socialism and War —
Max Shachtman
Tuesday, 8:45 P. M. 10:15 P. M.

5. The American Trade Union Movement.
James P. Cannon.
Friday, 7:00 P. M.—8:30 P. M.

Registration fee will be seventy-five cents in each lecture-course or twenty-five cents admission for each session. The school will be held at the Party headquarters 116 University Place, where registration is now open. Watch the APPEAL for further details.