

November 1940

Fourth International

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

LEON TROTSKY

The Comintern and the GPU

The Article Trotsky Finished a Few Days Before His Assassination

Wall Street Wins Election *An Editorial*
Trotsky's Last Battle *Joseph Hansen*
War Strips Lovestonites *Jack Weber*
America's Productive Capacity . . . *Book Review*

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Last month's issue was a notable one for the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. That our comrades, sympathizers and new worker contacts received the magazine with great interest is evidenced by the fact that even as this column is being written, orders are still arriving for the Trotsky Memorial issue.

Here is only a small part of the enthusiastic response to the magazine:

G. M. of Detroit writes, "The comrades here feel that the October issue is the best yet and I assure you we will do everything in our power to pay our bill promptly."

I. C. of Youngstown writes, "With such an issue of the F. I. we can't help but get a good start on the fund drive. Please send us 25 more copies for our contact work."

D. C. of Memphis writes, "The October number is wonderful. We were fortunate that the Old Man was able to pass on those ideas before his death."

J. B. of Plentywood writes, "The magazine this month is excellent. Please send me 12 more for I am sure I will have no difficulty in selling them."

There can be no doubt that hundreds of workers read the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for the first time during the month of October. What is vitally important now is that these same workers read the November issue of the magazine . . . and the December . . . and the January 1941.

It is not enough that they have read of the tragic death of the Old Man and that they were moved by his personal letters. It is not even enough that they have read and understood his analysis of the current imperialist war and our role in that war. To become fully class-conscious revolutionaries they must continue to read Marxian theory.

That is the task of every branch . . . to see that all October contacts continue to receive our theoretical organ . . . FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

A brief review of branch successes is in order. While nearly all branches reported brisk sales during the past month, we want to commend especially those branches that not only disposed of their regular bundles, but ordered additional copies.

These branches were (in order of the size of bundles): Cleveland, Youngstown, Philadelphia, Plentywood and Hutchinson. We want to give special recognition to Philadelphia.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Volume I November 1940 No. 6 (Whole No. 6)

Published monthly by the SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON JOSEPH HANSEN
ALBERT GOLDMAN FELIX MORROW

Business Manager:
MICHAEL CORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment	147
The Comintern and the GPU... by Leon Trotsky	148
Trotsky's Last Battle Against the Revisionists by Joseph Hansen	164
War Strips the Lovestonites... by Jack Weber	172
America's Productive Capacity... A Book Review by C. Charles	175

MANAGER'S COLUMN
Inside Front Cover

446

(Printed in United States of America)

This branch has long been dormant, as far as the magazine is concerned. With the appointment of Comrade P. R. as the new literature agent, the branch has not only ordered additional copies, but has started to make inroads on its back debts.

All of which goes to show how vitally important to the success of the magazine are the local literature agents. Upon their interest and untiring activity we depend, to a great extent, for the continuance of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

Other branches that are beginning to liquidate their old debts, are: New Haven, St. Paul, Rochester, Youngstown and Reading. Add to this list the following branches that are almost or completely paid up: Los Angeles, Indianapolis, Lynn, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Toledo, Quakertown, Milwaukee and New York.

We'll make no mention of the rest of the branches except to say that your absence from these columns condemns you. A prompt check, however, brings automatic absolution.

In the past we have offered many suggestions for the solving of your F. I. financing and distributing problems. We believe enough has been said on this score.

However, a letter has just arrived from Comrade O. B. of Minneapolis, in which he explains his financing method.

The plan seems, to us, to be so simple and yet so practical, that we print part of his letter.

"We are putting on a drive to get individual comrades to be responsible for three copies of the magazine every month. The comrade is to agree to take three copies as soon as the bundle arrives, for which he or she pays 50 cents in advance. The comrades may then either sell or distribute the magazine free. To date, we have the agreement of 14 comrades to go down the line on such a program. The distribution problems, we believe, are now on the road to a solution. We also believe this will lay a good basis for getting subscriptions in the future."

A word of warning! This copy of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is labeled Volume 1, Number 6. This means that it was just six months ago that our great nation-wide drive for subscriptions was conducted. It means also, since most subs were for a six month period, that the great majority of subscriptions now on file will expire this month. Each branch must prepare a concerted renewal drive sometime during the month.

All expirations will be forwarded to the branches and no subscriber should fail to receive a personal visit.

All literature agents should be on the alert for their expiration lists! Let's make the renewals

as near 100 percent as possible.

We have received many inquiries regarding the deadline for reorders on the Memorial issue of the magazine. This historic issue will be in demand, not only this month and next, but for years to come. We have, therefore, printed several hundred extra copies and can fulfill your orders at any time. It would be a good plan for all branches to have a number of extra copies on hand for distribution to each new contact.

Statement of the ownership, management, circulation, etc., required by the Acts of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933 of Fourth International published monthly at New York, N. Y. for Oct 1, 1940, State of New York, County of New York.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Felix Morrow, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is an editor and owner of the Fourth International and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Fourth International Publish. Assn., 116 University Place.
Editors, J. P. Cannon, F. Morrow, A. Goldman, J. Hansen, 116 University Place.

Managing Editor, None.
Business Manager, Michael Cort, 116 University Place.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)
Fourth Internat'l Publish. Assn., 116 University Place.
James P. Cannon, 116 University Place.

Felix Morrow, 116 University Place.
Albert Goldman, 116 University Place.
Joseph Hansen, 116 University Place.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (if there are none, so state.)
None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Felix Morrow
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15 day of Oct. 1940

Irving J. Bard, Commissioner of Deeds, N. Y. Co. Clerk's No. 193, Reg. No. 63BO Kings Co. Clerks No. 96, Reg. No. 140 Commission Expires December 20, 1940

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

VOLUME I

NOVEMBER 1940

NUMBER 6

Editorial Comment

The Democratic Party has been kept in power by a much smaller majority of the popular vote than in 1932 or 1936. Roosevelt received 55 percent of the ballots in 1940 compared to 62 percent four years ago. This trend away from the Democrats resulted from a shift in the allegiance of the middle-classes—the upper sections, including part of the farm vote, returning to Republicanism, the lower sections remaining with Roosevelt.

Willkie was the coupon-clipper's choice, the wealthy woman's darling. His single bloc of electoral votes came from the mid-Western agricultural belt. Roosevelt, on the other hand, owes his victory to the industrial workers. Setting aside the Southern states guaranteed by the Democratic dictatorship over that area, Roosevelt's strength derived from his support in the industrial states and centers. This was strikingly demonstrated in the key state of New York where his margin of victory was less than the total vote cast for him by the American Labor Party.

Why Roosevelt's Influence?

After his failure to solve a single important social problem, after all his blows at labor, what has enabled Roosevelt to maintain this amount of influence over the working masses? There is first the spreading economic boom generated by the war-trade and the militarization program, which has given employment and fresh hope to millions of workers. The unusually large vote cast for Roosevelt in Connecticut and other armament centers reflected this.

Then the mounting tide of patriotism has already caught some workers in its sweep. Roosevelt's spokesmen concentrated their campaign around the nationalist issue. Roosevelt was really running, they claimed, not against Willkie, but against the dictators. The Republicans were depicted as agents and appeasers of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin.

Third, Roosevelt, the author of the New Deal reforms, appeared as the chief guardian of the relief check, Social Security and the labor laws against reactionary attack. Most of the workers have yet to realize that Roosevelt's War Deal means the death of his New Deal. Fourth, the bulk of the workers saw no effective alternative to the Democratic candidate. They detested and distrusted the Republican machine of the Girdlers, Pews, and Fords; they had no point of identity with the corporation president who was its candidate; nor could they detect any difference, save for the worse, in the domestic or foreign platforms of the two capitalist parties.

Despicable Role of Labor Fakers

The decisive factor was the despicable role played by the official labor leadership. The Republicans tried to make the third-term a main issue against Roosevelt by invariably referring to him as "the third-term candidate." This strategy evoked no response from the masses. This demonstrated that

the workers don't give a damn for "the sacred traditions" of American politics. At least their most advanced sections would have been equally willing to scrap the "two-party tradition," if they had been given the lead. But labor's representatives barred the road toward independent political action.

Ninety percent of labor officialdom, with Tobin, Hillman, Murray and Green at their head, rode herd for Roosevelt. John L. Lewis was the notable exception. In 1936 Lewis used Labor's Non-Partisan League as the rope to lead the industrial workers into the Democratic corral, holding out the prospect of a Labor Party in 1940, if Roosevelt failed to fulfill his promises.

Opportunity to Launch Labor Party

Roosevelt's manifest failures presented Lewis with a perfect opportunity to launch the long-awaited national Labor Party movement, or at least to lay the basis for it. When Lewis was scheduled to announce his position over the radio two weeks before election day, the ears of the whole people were listening. Tens of millions of workers eagerly awaited his words.

Lewis lambasted Roosevelt. Good! exclaimed the progressive workers, true! Then Lewis broke the news that he was returning to his first love, the Republican money-masters. What a deep, cruel disappointment to the workers! Even those who were not yet inclined to quit the Democratic Party would have rejoiced if Lewis had taken a bold and independent stand against both capitalist parties and candidates, instead of crawling back to the Republican camp.

Lewis Could Not Deliver Goods

It must be said that Lewis remained true to himself in thus betraying the political interests of the American workers. He has always been an opportunist bureaucrat. The dirty deal he made with Willkie and Girdler in 1940 was no different from his agreement with Roosevelt in 1936, or the strike-breaking contracts he has concluded with the coal-operators in the past.

This time, however, Lewis could not deliver the goods. The workers refused to be sold, like himself, to the Republicans. They repudiated Lewis. Even his miners refused to follow him, as the anti-Republican vote in the coal-districts proved. The industrial workers can no longer be driven back to Black Republicanism. Their leaders dared not urge them forward to independent political class action. And so most of them clung to the Democratic Party, choosing what seemed to them the lesser of two evils.

A call for an independent Labor policy and party would have transformed the whole electoral situation. It would have aroused great enthusiasm and sympathy throughout the working population. It could have opened out new perspectives for organized labor and all the unprivileged, preparing the

way for a labor power that would be more than political merchandise offered for sale to the highest bidder among the capitalist competitors.

Capitalists Monopolize Elections

The two capitalist parties worked overtime in this election to monopolize the entire political activity of the country, as the giant corporations already monopolize our economic life. This is evidenced in the increased restrictions piled upon minority political groups to prevent them from appearing on the ballot.

Our party was unable to run more than two candidates, Grace Carlson for Senator in Minnesota, George Breitman for Senator in New Jersey. Carlson, who appeared on the ballot as the "Trotskyist Anti-War Candidate" received 5,743 votes with 100 precincts yet to report. In the Twin Cities, her vote of 2,782 topped that of all the other minority parties. Returns for George Breitman were not yet available at the time we went to press.

Communists Handcuffed to Lewis

Handcuffed to Lewis, the Communists, particularly its CIO leaders, were dragged along with him toward the Republican camp. The Stalinists gave the same kind of left-handed support to Willkie this year as they gave to Roosevelt four years ago. The extremely small vote for the Socialist Party indicates that the semi-patriotic and pseudo-Socialist pacifism peddled by Norman Thomas can inspire no one, including his

retinue of middle-class admirers. Thomas did not forget to wish Roosevelt "all the success in the world" after his victory.

Roosevelt returns to office with full freedom to execute his imperialist war program. Hitherto he has been compelled to restrain himself in many directions. From now on there are no important internal factors preventing the Big Chief from taking to the warpath. The moves of the administration (immediately after election day) to increase the national debt limit by twenty billions and to allot half of the arms production to Great Britain, demonstrated the determination to extend its intervention in the conflict.

Workers Must Take Counter-Measures

The coming period will witness the swift unfolding of the administration's War Deal. Roosevelt, the preserver of peace, must come forth as the leader of war; Roosevelt, the democrat, must act as the dictator of a war machine; Roosevelt, the friend of labor, must keep labor in its place; Roosevelt, the "Good Neighbor" President, must use the Yankee fist against the Latin American nations.

Instead of peace, unbounded prosperity, and liberty, the Democratic victory holds in store war, misery, reaction.

To warn the workers of these prospects, to explain their inevitability, and to help them take the necessary counter-measures against the War-Dealers—such is our task now that the elections are over.

The Comintern and the GPU

The Attempted Assassination of May 24 And the Communist Party of Mexico

By LEON TROTSKY

(EDITORIAL NOTE: This article was finished by Leon Trotsky a few days before his assassination. He intended it for the Mexican court in relation to the machine gun assault by Stalin's GPU upon his bedroom on May 24, but so wrote it that it could be used for general publication, and it has appeared as part of a pamphlet in Mexico. Its analysis of the relationship between the Comintern and the GPU and the proofs it brings forward of Stalin's guilt in the terroristic attempt of May 24 were underlined in blood by Trotsky's assassination at the hands of the GPU on August 20.)

Political Premises

This document pursues aims which are juridical and not political. But the criminal acts of the members of the so-called "Communist" party of Mexico derive from political motives. The attempt of May 24 was an attempt of political character. That is why the mechanics of this crime, and all the more so the motives inspiring its participants cannot be understood without laying bare, if only in summary form, the political subsoil of the attempt.

There is no doubt now in public opinion that this attempt was organized by the GPU, the principal organ of Stalin's rule. The Kremlin oligarchy is *totalitarian* in character, i.e., subjugates to itself all functions of the country's social, political and ideological life and crushes the slightest manifestations of criticism and independent opinion. The totalitarian character of the Kremlin politics does not flow from Stalin's personal character but from the position occupied by the new

ruling stratum before the face of the people. The October revolution pursued two intimately related tasks: first, the socialization of the means of production, and the raising, through planned economy, of the country's economic level; second, the building on this foundation of a society without class distinctions, and consequently without a professional bureaucracy—a socialist society administered by its members as a whole. The first task in its basic outlines has been realized; despite the influence of bureaucratism, the superiority of planned economy has revealed itself with indisputable force. It is otherwise with the social regime. In place of approaching socialism it moves ever further away. Owing to historical causes, which cannot properly be dealt with here, there has developed on the foundation of the October revolution a new privileged caste which concentrates in its hands all power and which devours an ever greater portion of the national income. This caste finds itself in a profoundly contradictory position. In words it comes forward in the name of communism; in deeds it fights for its own unlimited power and colossal material privileges. Surrounded by the mistrust and hatred of the deceived masses, the new aristocracy cannot afford the tiniest breach in its system. In the interests of self-preservation it is compelled to strangle the least flicker of criticism and opposition. Hence the suffocating tyranny, the universal groveling before the "leader" and the not less universal hypocrisy; from the same source flows the gigantic role of the GPU as the instrument of totalitarian rule.

Stalin's absolutism does not rest on the traditional authority of "divine grace," nor on "sacred" and "inviolable"

private property, but on the idea of communist equality. This deprives the oligarchy of a possibility of justifying its dictatorship with any kind of rational and persuasive arguments. Similarly it cannot refer in self-justification to the "transitional" character of its regime because it is not a question of why *equality hasn't been completely realized* but why *inequality is growing continually*. The ruling caste is compelled systematically to lie, to paint itself up, don a mask, and ascribe to critics and opponents motives diametrically opposite to those impelling them. Anyone who comes out in defense of the toilers against the oligarchy is immediately branded by the Kremlin as a supporter of capitalist restoration. This standardized lie is not accidental: it flows from the objective position of the caste which incarnates reaction while swearing by the revolution. In all previous revolutions the new privileged class tried to shield itself against criticism from the left by means of fake revolutionary phraseology. The Thermidorians and Bonapartists of the Great French Revolution hounded and condemned all genuine revolutionists—the Jacobins—as "Royalists" and agents of Pitt's reactionary British government. Stalin hasn't invented anything new. He has only carried the system of political frame-up to its extreme expression. Lies, slander, persecution, false accusations, juridical comedies flow inexorably from the position of the usurping bureaucracy in Soviet society. Unless this is understood it is impossible to understand either the internal politics of the USSR or the role of the GPU on the international arena.

Lenin proposed in his "Testament" (January 1923) to remove Stalin from the post of General Secretary of the Party, giving as his reasons Stalin's rudeness, disloyalty and tendency to abuse power. Two years earlier Lenin warned: "This cook will prepare only peppery dishes." No one in the party liked or respected Stalin. But when the bureaucracy began to sense acutely the danger threatening it from the people, it required precisely a rude and disloyal leader, ready to abuse power in its interests. That is why the cook of peppery dishes became the leader of the totalitarian bureaucracy.

The Moscow oligarchy's hatred of me is engendered by its deep-rooted conviction that I "betrayed" it. This accusation has a historical meaning of its own. The Soviet bureaucracy did not elevate Stalin to leadership at once and without vacillation. Until 1924 Stalin was unknown even among the broader party circles, let alone the population, and as I have already said he did not enjoy popularity in the ranks of the bureaucracy itself. The new ruling stratum had hopes that I would undertake to defend its privileges. No few efforts were expended in this direction. Only after the bureaucracy became convinced that I did not intend to defend its interests against the toilers but on the contrary the interests of the toilers against the new aristocracy was the complete turn toward Stalin made, and I was proclaimed "traitor." This epithet on the lips of the privileged caste constitutes evidence of my loyalty to the cause of the working class. It is not accidental that 90 per cent of those revolutionists who built the Bolshevik party, made the October revolution, created the Soviet state and the Red Army, and led the Civil War were destroyed as "traitors" in the course of the past twelve years. On the other hand the Stalinist apparatus has taken into its ranks during this period people the overwhelming majority of whom stood on the other side of the barricades in the years of the revolution.

The Communist International suffered a similar degeneration during that period. In the initial stages of the Soviet regime, when the revolution marched from one danger to

another, when all energies were absorbed by the Civil War with its retinue of famine and epidemics, the boldest and most unselfish revolutionists in different countries joined the October revolution and the Communist International. Of this original revolutionary layer that proved in action its loyalty to the October revolution during those difficult years there does not now remain, literally, a single man. Through interminable expulsions, economic pressure, direct bribery, purges and executions the totalitarian Kremlin clique has transformed the Comintern completely into its obedient tool. The present leading tier of the Comintern, as well as of its constituent sections, comprises people who did not join the October revolution but the triumphant oligarchy, the fountain-head of high political titles and material boons.

The predominating type among the present "Communist" bureaucrats is the political careerist, and in consequence the polar opposite of the revolutionist. Their ideal is to attain in their own country the same position that the Kremlin oligarchy gained in the USSR. They are not the revolutionary leaders of the proletariat but aspirants to totalitarian rule. They dream of gaining success with the aid of this same Soviet bureaucracy and its GPU. They view with admiration and envy the invasion of Poland, Finland, the Baltic states, Bessarabia by the Red Army, because these invasions immediately bring about the transfer of power into the hands of the local Stalinist candidates for totalitarian rule.

Lacking independent stature, independent ideas, independent influence, the leaders of the sections of the Comintern are only too well aware that their positions and reputations stand and fall with the position and reputation of the Kremlin. In the material sense, as will be later shown, they live on the hand-outs of the GPU. Their struggle for existence resolves itself therefore into a rabid defense of the Kremlin against any and all opposition. They cannot fail to sense the correctness and therefore the danger of the criticism which comes from the so-called Trotskyists. But this only redoubles their hatred of me and my co-thinkers. Like their Kremlin masters, the leaders of the Communist parties are unable to criticise the real ideas of the Fourth International and are forced to resort to falsifications and frame-ups which are exported from Moscow in unlimited quantities. There is thus nothing "national" in the conduct of the Mexican Stalinists: They merely translate into Spanish the policies of Stalin and the orders of the GPU.

The GPU as Organizer of the Attempt

To the uninitiated it might seem incomprehensible why Stalin's clique first exiled me abroad and then tries to kill me. Wouldn't it have been simpler to have shot me in Moscow, like so many others?

Here is the explanation. In 1928 when I was expelled from the party and exiled to Central Asia it was still impossible to talk not only of execution but even of arrest. The generation with which I had gone through the October revolution and the Civil War was still alive. The Political Bureau felt itself besieged from all sides. From Central Asia I had the opportunity of maintaining unbroken connections with the opposition which was growing. In these conditions Stalin, after vacillating for a year, decided to apply exile abroad as the lesser evil. His arguments were: Isolated from the USSR, deprived of an apparatus and material resources Trotsky will be impotent to undertake anything. Stalin calculated moreover that after he had succeeded in discrediting me utterly in the eyes of the country, he could without difficulty obtain my return to Moscow from the friendly Turkish government for the final reckoning. Events have proved, however, that it

is possible to participate in political life without an apparatus and without material resources. With the aid of young friends I created the foundations of the Fourth International which is developing slowly but surely. The Moscow trials of 1936-1937 were staged in order to obtain my deportation from Norway, that is, my being actually handed over to the GPU. But this failed; I had the possibility of going to Mexico. As I have been informed, Stalin has several times admitted that my exile abroad was his "greatest mistake." To correct the mistake, nothing remained save a terrorist act.

In recent years the GPU has destroyed several hundred of my friends in the USSR, including members of my family. In Spain the GPU killed my former secretary Erwin Wolfe and a number of my political co-thinkers; in Paris they killed my son Leon Sedov who was hunted by Stalin's professional murderers for two years. In Lausanne, Switzerland, the GPU killed Ignace Reiss who came over from the ranks of the GPU to the side of the Fourth International. In Paris Stalin's agents killed another of my former secretaries, Rudolph Klement whose body was found in the Seine. This list could be continued indefinitely.

In Mexico the first attempt at assassination was made in January 1938 by an unknown man who appeared in my house with a forged message from a Mexican political figure. It was precisely after this incident, which alarmed my friends, that more serious defense measures were adopted: the establishment of a 24-hour guard, installment of an alarm system, etc.

Since the active and truly murderous participation of the GPU in the Spanish events I have received not a few letters from my friends, chiefly in New York and Paris, concerning GPU agents who were being sent into Mexico from France and the United States. The names and photographs of some of these gentlemen were transmitted by me at the time to the Mexican police. The outbreak of the world war still further aggravated the situation in view of my irreconcilable struggle against the domestic and foreign politics of the Kremlin. My statements and articles in the world press—on the dismemberment of Poland, the attack on Finland, on the weakness of the Red Army beheaded by Stalin and so on—were reproduced in all countries of the world in millions of copies. Within the USSR discontent is growing. The Third International was far weaker at the beginning of the last war than the Fourth International is today.

On August 25, 1939 just before the break of diplomatic relations between France and Germany, the French ambassador Coulondre reported to G. Bonnet, Minister of Foreign Affairs, his dramatic interview with Adolf Hitler at 5:30 P.M.:

"If I really think"—I observed—"that we will be victorious, I also have the fear that at the end of the war there will be only one real victor: Mr. Trotsky." Interrupting me, the Chancellor shouted: "Then why have you given Poland free rein?" (Diplomatic Documents, 1938-1939, p. 260, Document No. 242.)

Two authoritative representatives of two imperialist powers, democratic and fascist, in the critical moment just prior to the war, seek to frighten each other with the name of a revolutionist whom the agents of the GPU have been trying in vain to blacken for a number of years as an "agent of imperialism." I could adduce other evidence of the same sort. But this is hardly necessary. Hitler and Coulondre are at all events expert politicians much more serious than David Siqueiros and Lombardo Toledano.

As a former revolutionist Stalin understands that the course of the war must provide a mighty impulse to the de-

velopment of the Fourth International, in the USSR as well. That is why Stalin issued an order to his agents: Get rid of Trotsky as quickly as possible.

All political considerations thus bespeak incontestably the fact that the organization of the May 24 attempt could originate only with the GPU. However, there is no lack of supplementary empiric proofs.

(1) Some weeks before the attempt the Mexican press was filled with rumors of the concentration of GPU agents in Mexico. These reports contained much that was false. But the gist of the rumors was true.

(2) Noteworthy is the exceptionally high technological level of the attempt. The assassination failed owing to accident which is an inevitable element in every war. But the preparation and the execution are remarkable in their scope, thorough planning and painstaking care. The terrorists were perfectly acquainted with the layout of the premises and the internal life. They obtained police uniforms, weapons, an electric saw, rope ladders, etc. They succeeded completely in tying up the police guard outside; they paralyzed the guard inside with a correct strategy of machine-gun fire; they penetrated into the victim's room, directed a cross-fire with impunity for a period of three to five minutes, hurled incendiary bombs and left the arena of attack without leaving a trace behind. Such an undertaking is beyond the resources of a private group. Observable here is tradition, training, great resources, a careful selection of executors. This is the work of the GPU.

3. In strict correspondence with the entire system of the GPU is the care taken to sidetrack the investigation on a false trail, and which was included in the very plan of the attempt. When tying up the police, the assailants yelled: "Viva Almazan!" These artificial and false shouts at night, before five policemen, of whom three were asleep, envisaged two ends: to distract, if only for a few days or hours, the attention of the future investigation from the GPU and its agency in Mexico; and to compromise the followers of one of the presidential candidates. To murder one opponent and cast the suspicion on another is the classic method of the GPU or more correctly, of its inspirer, Stalin.

(4) The assailants carried with them several incendiary bombs, two of which they threw into the room of my grandson. The participants in the attempt thus pursued not only murder but also arson. Their only purpose in this was to destroy my archives. In this only Stalin is interested, inasmuch as the archives are of exceptional value to me in the struggle against the Moscow oligarchy. By means of my archives I exposed, in particular, the Moscow juridical frame-ups. On November 7, 1936 the GPU at a great risk to itself, stole a section of my archives in Paris. It did not forget about them during the night of May 24. The incendiary bombs thus represent something in the nature of Stalin's visiting card.

(5) Exceptionally characteristic of the crimes of the GPU is the division of labor between the secret assassins and the legal "friends": From the time they began preparations for the attempt, side by side with the underground conspiratorial work, they conducted a slanderous campaign aimed to discredit the designated victim. The same division of labor has been continued since the commission of the crime: The terrorists go into hiding; on the open arena remain their attorneys who seek to divert the attention of the police onto a false trail.

(6) It is impossible too not to call attention to the reaction of the world press: The newspapers of all tendencies openly or tacitly proceed from the fact that the attempt is the handiwork of the GPU; only the papers subsidized by the

Kremlin and those fulfilling its orders, defend an opposite version. This is by itself an invaluable indication.

(7) The most important and convincing proof, however, that the attempt was organized by the GPU is the fact that all the accomplices in the attempt are either members of the Communist party or its closest "friends," and furthermore the most prominent among them held commanding posts in those sections of the Spanish army which were under the direct command of the GPU ("The Fifth Regiment" and "The International Brigades").

Why I Was Certain There Would Be an Attempt

Just why did I expect an attempt with such certainty since the beginning of this year? Replying in court on July 2 to this question of Mr. Pavon Flores, the defense attorney, I referred in particular to the Convention of the Communist Party of Mexico which took place in March of this year and which proclaimed its orientation toward the extermination of "Trotskyism." In order that my answer be further clarified, I must supply additional explanatory facts.

Inasmuch as the practical preparation for the attempt began in January of this year and inasmuch as a certain interval was required for preliminary discussions and elaboration of the plan, it may be stated with certainty that the "order" for the attempt arrived in Mexico not later than November or December 1939.

As can be seen from *La Voç de Mexico* the crisis in the party leadership dates back precisely to this period. The impulse for the crisis came from without the party, and the crisis itself developed from the top down. It is not known who elaborated the special document, the so-called "Materials for Discussion," which was published in *La Voç de Mexico* on January 28 and which constituted an anonymous indictment of the old leadership (Laborde, Campa, *et al.*), who were allegedly guilty of a "conciliatory" attitude toward Trotskyism. Broad public opinion was completely in the dark at the time as to just what was behind all this. But to the initiated and interested observers it was indubitable that some new serious blow was in preparation, if not against "Trotskyism," then against Trotsky.

Today it is absolutely self-evident that the overturn in the Communist party was intimately connected with the order for the attempt issued in Moscow. What happened most probably is that the GPU encountered some opposition among the leaders of the Communist party who had become accustomed to a peaceful existence and might have feared very unpleasant political and police consequences from the attempt. Perhaps this is the source of the charge of "Trotskyism" against them. Whoever objects to an attempt against Trotsky is, obviously, a—"Trotskyist."

The anonymous "Purging Commission" removed Laborde, the leader of the Communist party, and together with him, the Central Committee elected at the previous convention. Who invested the purging committee with such immense powers? Whence came the committee itself? It could not have originated through spontaneous generation. It was appointed by persons who received their plenipotentiary powers from the outside. These persons obviously had every reason for concealing their names.

Only on February 18, after the change was already accomplished and the only thing remaining was to sanction it, was the composition of the new Commission, consisting solely of Mexicans, made public, and again without any indication as to who appointed them. By the time the party convention was called on March 21, all the questions had already been

decided, and the only thing left for the delegates was an oath of loyalty to the new leadership which had been created without them and for purposes unknown to the majority.

As appears from the report of the convention in *La Voç de Mexico* (March 18, 1940), the discussion on the question of "the struggle against Trotskyism and other enemies of the people" took place not at an open session of the Convention, as was the case with other questions on the agenda, but at a *secret session of a special commission*. This fact alone is evidence that the new leaders found it necessary to hide their plans even from a convention of their own party. I do not know who composed the secret commission. But it is possible to surmise who directed it from behind the scenes.

The convention elected, or rather passively approved, an "honorary presidium" composed of Dimitrov, Manuilsky, Kuusinen, Thaelmann, Carlos Contreras and others. The composition of this honorary presidium was published in a pamphlet, *Fuera el Imperialismo!* by Dionisio Encina (Popular Edition, 1940, p. 5). Dimitrov, Manuilsky, Kuusinen are in Moscow, Thaelmann is in a jail in Berlin, while Carlos Contreras is in Mexico. His inclusion in the honorary presidium could not have been accidental. Contreras does not in any case belong among the number of the so-called international "chiefs" whose inclusion in an honorary presidium is of a ritualistic character. Contreras first gained sinister notoriety during the Spanish Civil War, where as the commissar and commander of the Fifth Regiment he was one of the most cruel agents of the GPU. Lister, Contreras, and "El Campesino" waged a "civil war" of their own inside the republican camp, physically destroying the opponents of Stalin in the ranks of the anarchists, socialists, Poumists, and Trotskyists. This fact can be corroborated by press dispatches and by testimony of many Spanish refugees. It would not therefore be too audacious to assume that the former commissar of the Fifth Regiment and member of the convention's "honorary" presidium was one of the important levers in changing the leadership of the Communist party at the beginning of this year. This supposition is all the more justified since Contreras has already conducted one "anti-Trotskyist" purge in the Mexican Communist Party, namely in 1929. True enough, Contreras denies his participation in the assault. But in that case, why was he elected to the honorary presidium of the convention which is linked with the conspiracy?

When I followed in the press the happenings in the Communist party during the early months of this year, I was far from seeing the situation with the same clarity as I do now. But even at that time it was evident to me that behind the official party screen, with its shadow pantomime was hidden the movement of real figures. In this performance the real figures are agents of the GPU. That is why I expected an attempt.

The "Moral" Preparation for the Attempt

The original sketch of the plan to develop a "mass" movement for the expulsion of Trotsky from Mexico suffered complete failure. The GPU had to resort to a terrorist act. But it was indispensable to prepare public opinion for this deed. Since the GPU was not prepared to acknowledge its sponsorship of the murder, it was indispensable to link the terrorist act with the internal political struggle in Mexico. *La Voç de Mexico*, *El Popular*, and *Futuro* had even earlier attempted to link me up with General Cedillo, with General Amaro, with Vasconcelos, with one Dr. Atl, not to mention the oil magnates and the Dies Committee. They now received orders to multiply their efforts in this direction. The presidential campaign with its prospect of sharp conflicts appeared

to provide the most favourable situation for such efforts. The intellectual accomplices of the attempt enrolled me in the camp of General Almazan, which did not restrain them from ascribing later on the organization of the attempt to followers of Almazan. These people are guided in their activity by the precept which was applied by Stalin before it was formulated by Hitler: "the grosser the lie the more readily people believe it."

The "moral" preparation of the attempt began simultaneously with the technical preparation. The intensification of the drive against "Trotskyism" became evident in December of last year. In the December 24 issue of *La Voiz de Mexico* in an article, "The Role of Trotskyism," we read:

"THE ROLE OF TROTSKYISM"

By Gonzalo Beltran

"... As for the new pontiff, Leon XXX—in view of the thirty pieces of silver of the dirtied Judas—he has carried out his role in the part elaborated for him by the Dies Committee... Leon XXX intervenes in the affairs of Latin America on the side of the imperialist powers and completes his work declaring that 'the oil expropriation was the work of the Communists'..."

The words "the oil expropriation was the work of the Communists" are set off with quotation marks, as though they represented a citation from some article of mine, which would represent me as opposed to the expropriation of the oil companies. Needless to say this is a lie. To the best of my ability I defended in the world press the right of the Mexican people to be masters of their own natural resources. But the falsifiers of the GPU are not deterred by such bagatelles.

In his report to the March convention, Andres Garcia Salgado, member of the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party, broke all records in lying set by international Stalinism. Despite one's natural repugnance, let me cite a few instances:

"... The Cardenas government permitted the entrance of Trotsky against the opinion expressed by the workers' organizations; this fact which permitted Trotsky to install in our country the directing center of his international organization of espionage in the service of all the counter-revolutionary forces, was possible solely thanks to the interest that the imperialist countries themselves had in making our country a center for their activities of espionage and provocation."

Ignorant as these people are, they cannot but know that not a single imperialist country will admit me within its borders; that the leaders of imperialism in all countries look upon me as Enemy No. 1; that my co-thinkers are persecuted in all imperialist countries; that Mexico has extended hospitality to me precisely because it is not an imperialist country and because her government has a serious attitude toward the right of asylum. But the falsifiers engaged in the preparation of the attempt have no time to pause over such trifles. Mr. Salgado continues:

"Thus the Trotskyist spies always collaborated with Franco's army, coordinating their uprisings and agitation in the loyalist rearguard with the operations of the enemy.

"Trotsky, the man applauded by the bosses of Monterrey, he who facilitated all the arguments of the oil companies against the workers' organizations and against the government, orients his work in accord with the plans of the reactionaries and the necessities of imperialism.

"Comrades: Let this serve us as an example in

order to reinforce our struggle against Trotskyism and because the Chief of this band of spies should be thrown out of our country." (THROW THE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE OUT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY RANKS.)

Such is the report of a "leader" at the convention of a "Communist" party! Into what a cesspool has the Kremlin oligarchy converted what was once the Communist International! By dint of natural and artificial selection the place of revolutionists has been gradually taken by careerists, scoundrels and professional slanderers. To this group also belongs Mr. Salgado. In *La Voiz de Mexico*, May 1, 1940, in which complete liberty of action is demanded for D. Siqueiros whom the police were after, an official manifesto of the party is published, directed to the people, which reads:

"Throw the imperialist agents out of Mexico! Alien spies and provocateurs must be thrown out of the country and in the first place its most ominous and dangerous chief: Leon Trotsky..."

Defending D. Siqueiros against the Mexican government and at the same time demanding of this same government repressions against Trotsky; all this three weeks prior to the attempt—what is this if not its preparation?

On May 19, 1940, five days before the attempt, we find in *La Voiz de Mexico* an article, in which calculated frenzy reaches a paroxysm:

"THE TRAITOR TROTSKY"

"Trotsky, the 'old traitor' as comrade Lombardo Toledano once qualified him on a certain occasion, demonstrates to us, every time he is able, that the older he grows, the more curlike and cynical he becomes.

"Spy in the pay of the reactionary forces, agent of the Dies Committee in Mexico..."

"... the responsibility of Trotsky in the conspiracy which the traitors to Mexico, agents of the imperialist companies and of the Dies Committee..."

"Trotsky must answer before the authorities of the country for his anti-proletarian and anti-Mexican doings and cease his idiocies.

"Lately the traitor, dreaming perhaps of reviving the days in which he could organize his own trial, judge himself through his friends in Diego Rivera's house, now launches a challenge that a tribunal examine the charges that are launched against him of being an agent of the Dies Committee, which he confessed through his own public declarations.

"It is clear that Trotsky seeks a tribune in order to pursue his nefarious activity against the workers of Mexico. But the people will not give him this tribune.

"With respect to Trotsky the workers of Mexico have already pronounced their opinion in the sense that he must be expelled from the country."

It would not have been at all astonishing if the article had borne the collective signature: David Siqueiros, Nestor Sanchez Hernandez, Luis Arenal, David Serrano, Mario Pavon Flores.

In another article in the same issue it is stated that Trotsky is preparing to:

"... Support the provocateurs and assassins, anxious to intervene in the internal affairs of Mexico..."

Farther on:

"In regard to Trotsky, we are reminded that this scoundrelly traitor has just launched a challenge that EL POPULAR and the magazine FUTURO present within 72 hours their accusations—which are those of

the whole revolutionary movement, in Mexico and the world—against the senile little head of the 'Fourth International.' What a slippery fish is the little old traitor! He knows very well that in 72 hours the list could scarcely be begun of his felonies, of his crimes, of his complicities with the enemies of all the peoples, beginning with those of the USSR, China, and Spain."

The last issue of *La Voç de Mexico* prior to the attempt is devoted as we have seen principally to hounding Trotsky and represents a monstrous accumulation of accusations and slanders. This is the way people write who are preparing to change the pen for a machine-gun. The editorial board of *La Voç de Mexico* knew of the impending attempt and was preparing the public opinion of its own party and the sympathizing circles.

It is impossible to admit even for a moment that the editors of *La Voç de Mexico*, of age and not mad, believed what they wrote about me. They lie coldly, on orders from above. And they reveal their malice doubly by adding to the slanders they receive ready-made from Moscow their own inventions about my "participation" in Cedillo's uprising, my "alliance" with Dies against Mexico, or my participation in the election campaign. The liars refuse to supply proof on the pretext that they do not wish to provide me with a . . . "tribune" or give me . . . "publicity." And when I call them the hirelings of Stalin they threaten to put me in jail for "defamation"!

This is the school of Stalinism. Ideological cynicism and moral shamelessness are its fundamental features. These people have no respect whatever for facts and documents; they never formulate their accusations clearly and definitively; their slander bears the character of a spreading stain. From the USSR, where no one dares contradict Stalin or his colleagues, the spirit of servility, grovelling and cynicism has spread over the whole Comintern, poisoning the labor movement to the marrow.

Covering Up the Traces of the GPU

The first few days after the attempt the Messrs. Inspirers hid in their lairs. They were afraid that their "military" colleagues might fall into the hands of the police. The insinuations of the GPU press were at first very cautious. But each new day brought these gentlemen courage. Through scores of channels they placed in circulation the stupid and vile version of "self-assault." Until the end of May, the police sidetracked by the moral accomplices in the crime were unable, as is well known, to get on the track of the criminals. In the Stalinist circles spirits became brighter. In the June 1 issue of *La Voç de Mexico* the attempt is already referred to as "This grotesque farce."

"The events which have occurred recently in Mexico, cleverly carried out by the miserable Trotsky and his band, place accusingly in relief all the characteristics of provocation which they contain . . .

"Trotsky is an agent delivered body and soul to international capitalism which he has served as a tool, dedicated to the service of its interests. And in this case he did not find it inconvenient to do it one more service with the 'assault' of which he was the object in the mansion where he lives."

Why this amazing enterprise was required by "capitalism" and Trotsky himself, the newspaper does not explain. "The grosser the lie," reads the precept of Hitler-Stalin, "the more readily people believe it."

La Voç de Mexico strives with might and main to establish an alibi for the Communist party. This is comprehen-

sible to the human mind. But the paper does not stop there, it also takes up the defense of the GPU.

"...the provocation in which Trotsky himself is directly inculpated, has moreover the characteristics of an ANTI-SOVIET provocation." (June 10, 1940)

Evidently! By means of the "self-assault," Trotsky tried to compromise the immaculate purity of the GPU.

In the same number, the editors declare:

"We have received some declarations of the Mexican Section of the Society of Veterans of the Spanish Republic in which they state that the 'attempt' against the counter-revolutionary Leon Trotsky is a vulgar maneuver of reaction and imperialism against the Mexican people."

The chairman of the Mexican section of this society is none other than David Alfaro Siqueiros! The organizer of the attempt protested against "a vulgar maneuver of reaction." The editors completely betray themselves here. To prove their alibi, they are compelled to demonstrate that the GPU from which they cannot dissociate themselves was not implicated in the case. And in order to prove my "self-assault," they find it necessary to refer to the high authority of D. A. Siqueiros. In all this there is an element of the insane asylum. Insolence and impudence easily reach the border of insanity. But in this insanity there is a method, indissolubly linked with the name of the GPU.

Presenting the impartial testimony of Siqueiros, *La Voç de Mexico* writes for its part:

"Trotsky . . . is one of the principal inspirers of the fifth column, a point of support for Mexican reaction and Yankee imperialism, a paid agent of the worst butchers of the Mexican people."

Fear speaks here in hydrophobic language. These people are afraid that they will have to answer for the attempt of May 24.

There is no need to analyze issue after issue this contemptible Stalinist publication, squirming between the Mexican police and the GPU. The conduct of *La Voç de Mexico* during the critical weeks shows incontrovertibly that its directors were well aware from the first that the attempt was organized by Stalin's agency. They knew of D. Siqueiros' role in the attempt. They knew that Robert Harte was not an accomplice in the attempt, but its victim. Creating the theory of self-assault and sowing slanders against Harte they acted in the interests of the GPU and at the same time in their own interests.

The conclusion is self-evident: If an official organ of the GPU had been issued in Mexico it could not have conducted the preparation of the attempt and then covered up the traces of the attempt with greater zeal and shamelessness than did *La Voç de Mexico*.

The Theory of "Self-Assault"

From the first day of my arrival in Mexico (January 1937) the police have taken special measures to protect me from possible attempts. The authorities without doubt must have had serious reasons for this. The police guarded me, one should think, not against the Dies Committee which did not exist as yet in 1937; nor against the "followers of Almazan"; nor against "self-assault." To the question—against whom did the Mexican police guard me in the course of three and a half years prior to the attempt of May 24? only one rational answer is possible: against the GPU

Yet when the attempt did actually take place, and moreover in a way that revealed all the features of Stalin's secret police, a certain section of the Mexican press (*La Voç de Mexico*, and its echoes, *El Popular* and *Futuro*) launched a

campaign intended to prove that the GPU had nothing to do with it. Only the disciplined insolence of the agents of the GPU could have invested the absurd idea of "self-assault" with a semblance of verisimilitude.

What aims could I pursue venturing on so monstrous, revolting and dangerous an enterprise? No one has explained it to this day. It is hinted that I wished to blacken Stalin and the GPU. But can one more attempt add anything to the reputation of a man who has destroyed the entire old generation of the Bolshevik party? It is said that I wish to prove the existence of the "fifth column." What for? Moreover, agents of the GPU quite suffice for the commission of an attempt; there is no need of a mysterious "fifth column." It is said that I wished to create difficulties for the only government which offers me hospitality. What motives could I have to create difficulties for the only government which offers me hospitality? It is said that I want to provoke a war between the United States and Mexico. But this explanation is a complete delirium. To provoke such a war it would have been more natural to organize an attempt against the American ambassador or the oil magnates, but not against a Bolshevik-revolutionary, alien to and hated by imperialist circles.

When Stalin organizes an attempt against me, his objective is clear: liquidate Enemy No. 1. Stalin personally risks nothing; he operates at a distance. On the other hand, in organizing a "self-assault" I would have to bear responsibility for such an undertaking myself, risk my own fate, the fate of my family, my political reputation and the reputation of the movement which I serve. What would I gain thereby?

But even if we grant the impossible, namely, that renouncing the cause of my entire lifetime, outraging common sense and my own vital interests, I did decide to organize a "self-assault" for the sake of an unknown object, there still remains the question: Where and how did I obtain 20 executors? equip them with police uniforms? arm them? supply them with all the things necessary? And so forth and so on. In other words, how did a man who lives almost completely isolated from the outside world contrive to carry out an enterprise that could be undertaken only by a powerful apparatus? I confess that I feel rather embarrassed in subjecting to criticism an idea which does not merit it.

Stalin's Agents Are Preparing To Proclaim Siqueiros . . . Trotsky's Agent

The leaders of the Communist party are now engaged in complicated maneuvers around the person of Siqueiros. The aim of these maneuvers is to sacrifice Siqueiros, discredit me and save themselves. However, the results of such an over-complicated intrigue can prove just the opposite of what the GPU strategists expect.

The maneuver was initiated by David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau, and consequently one of the official leaders of the Communist party. On June 19 his declarations were reported as follows in the press:

"He said that immediately after the event in Coyoacan, the Communist Party had made an investigation in order to discover what had occurred. And that since then this investigation had turned on Alfaro Siqueiros, uncontrolled element who was considered half mad... And that since then they had had suspicions of Alfaro Siqueiros, with whom one Blanco and Antonio Pujol, his disciple and personal assistant constantly appeared."

Such a denunciation of closest co-thinkers, accomplices in the attempt, would have been absolutely impossible in the ranks of a revolutionary party. But among the Stalinists the rule is, "*salus GPU suprema lex.*" In referring to Siqueiros

as "an uncontrolled and half mad element," D. Serrano is seeking to distract attention away from the Kremlin and from himself.

On June 23 when the general character of the assault and the names of the chief participants had already been revealed, *La Voiz de Mexico* published the following declaration by the Communist party:

"Numerous persons appear directly and indirectly implicated, among them David Alfaro Siqueiros, named as the leader of the attack... The Communist Party of Mexico declares categorically that none of the participants in the provocation is a member of the Party; that all of them are uncontrollable elements and agents provocateurs..."

With different variations this declaration was repeated on the following days. Since then Siqueiros has been proclaimed not only "half-mad" but also an "agent-provocateur."

D. Serrano's declarations concerning Siqueiros and A. Pujol were a signal for similar declarations on the part of the remaining arrested prisoners. "Serrano Andonegui gave the first information on Alfaro Siqueiros and then the two women spies wished to amplify their declarations..." The entire responsibility was unloaded by the defendants henceforth on D. Siqueiros. Mateo Martinez, a party member, at first admitted that D. Serrano, member of the Political Bureau, "is a man capable of any enterprise such as the attempt on Trotsky." But obviously under the beneficial influence of his attorney, Mr. Pavon Flores, member of the Central Committee of the party, Mateo Martinez suddenly understood that D. Serrano had nothing to do with it, that only agent-provocateurs like Siqueiros were capable of such acts.

Having entrenched themselves in this position, the Stalinists began to move ahead... By August 2 D. Serrano had already testified, judging from the papers, that I gave Siqueiros money either for some journal or other, or for... the "self-assault." The goal of this new absurdity is clear: David Alfaro Siqueiros is being gradually transformed little by little into a... Trotskyist. "The grosser the lie, the more readily people believe it," reads the precept of Hitler-Stalin.

Intense activity is doubtless going on behind the scenes of the official investigation. The GPU doesn't wish to give up. Despite the corpse of Robert Sheldon Harte, despite the confessions of a number of those arrested, the GPU wishes to revive the version of self-assault. This would be so convenient for a number of people with soiled reputations! Furthermore, the GPU disposes of inexhaustible economic resources.

In totalitarian Moscow a machination of this kind would have been managed without difficulty. It is otherwise in Mexico. Here the agents of the GPU including D. Serrano and his attorney Pavon Flores restrain their zeal. They lie too crudely. They contradict themselves too unceremoniously. They forget today what they did and said yesterday. We shall demonstrate this presently with full evidence. It is the aim of these lines to prevent the GPU from befuddling public opinion, if only for a few days, with its intrigue.

What were the real relationships between the Communist party and Siqueiros prior to the attempt? They were relations of intimate collaboration, complete unity of aim and method; they were the relations of a friendly division of labor. Without doubt, Siqueiros never broke with the Kremlin. Siqueiros undoubtedly had "misunderstandings" with this or that leader of the Communist Party of Mexico. This milieu is generally characterized by rivalries, intrigue, and mutual denunciations. But Siqueiros never broke with the Kremlin. He continued being always a loyal agent of Stalin. In Spain he together with D. Serrano worked under the direction of Soviet GPU agents. He returned to Mexico as a trusted agent of Moscow. All the Stalinist and semi-Stalinist groups paid him

honor. *El Popular* and *Futuro* devoted panegyric articles to him. How is it possible that Lombardo Toledano, V. Villaseñor, Alejandro Carrillo never even suspected that Siqueiros was "half-mad," "agent-provocateur," and even a "Trotskyist"?

In December 1939 when the plan of the attempt was already being elaborated in the narrow circle of the conspirators, the Communist party organized a meeting in honor of Stalin's sixtieth birthday, "The genial guide, pride of the world proletariat." In an account of this meeting in *La Voz de Mexico* for December 21 we read:

"The message transcribed above was approved in the midst of thunderous applause by those attending the commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of Stalin in the Hidalgo theater... In the presidium were comrades James Ford, Alfaro Siqueiros, Rafael Carrillo, Valentin Campa, Andres Salgado and the Spanish writer Margarita Nelkin..."

Thus the "half-mad" and "agent-provocateur" Siqueiros, long ago "expelled" from the party sat in the presidium of the meeting, alongside of Ford, Stalinist party candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States, and other luminaries of the Comintern. David Alfaro Siqueiros (without yet suspecting his "Trotskyism") with decided pleasure signed the enthusiastic telegram to Stalin from whom he had a short time before received the order to organize the attempt.

In the same number of *La Voz de Mexico* we find in an article:

"A similar case is that of comrade David Alfaro Siqueiros, illegally sent to trial by false testimony from lower-rank employees of the Federal District police... In our opinion all the organizations must also be organized in the case of comrade Siqueiros."

La Voz de Mexico calls the "Trotskyist" Siqueiros "comrade" and jealously defends an agent-provocateur against the Mexican police.

On January 14, 1940 when Siqueiros had already initiated the practical organization of the attempt, *La Voz de Mexico* reported another Communist meeting:

"Next Siqueiros took the rostrum in order to demonstrate the true character of the 'independent press,' which sells itself to the highest bidder and which changes its criterion according to the boss who pays it... He aroused everyone, the people and its organizations, to the danger of a reactionary insurrection, affirming that the MEXICAN COMMUNIST PARTY IS MOBILIZED FOR STRUGGLE IN ORDER TO ANSWER IN THE FORM THAT MIGHT BE NECESSARY the aggression of the imperialists and national traitors."

As the main speaker at a Communist meeting, D. Siqueiros not only solidarizes himself with the party that "excluded" him but speaks authoritatively in its name: "affirming that the Mexican Communist Party is mobilized for struggle." Such language can be employed only by a party leader. The editorial board of *La Voz de Mexico* in its turn solidarizes itself completely with the fighting speech of "comrade" Siqueiros.

In the May 1 issue of *La Voz de Mexico* we find the following article.

"FOR THE LIBERTY OF ALFARO SIQUEIROS"

"... The trial of Siqueiros is about to end. THERE IS DANGER THAT HE WILL BE CONDEMNED, because of the corrupting influence of the business-dailies. It is necessary, hence, that the solidarity of the workers should manifest itself in immediate support of the Committee for the Definitive Liberty of Siqueiros."

Only three weeks remained before the attempt; Siqueiros, to whom the police was paying unwelcome attention, was urgently needed by the GPU. The editors of *La Voz de Mexico* came to his defense, unable to foresee that a month or so later they would proclaim their close partisan an "agent-provocateur."

The same cynical contradictions, on a smaller scale, are to be found in the relations of the Communist party to Mr. Rosendo Gomez Lorenzo. According to the press of June 19: "concerning Rosendo Lorenzo he (D. Serrano) said that he knew he had been expelled from the party because of certain fraudulent tricks." This version was also repeated by *La Voz de Mexico* where R. G. Lorenzo is characterized as a common thief who appropriated funds collected for the party.

Later, on June 23, believing surely that the participation of Lorenzo was not proved, and considering that perhaps there might be need of him, *La Voz de Mexico* wrote differently:

"Equal fury has been manifested against the journalist Rosendo Gomez Lorenzo whom the journalists without honor hate with a miserable resentment because of his position in favor of the revolutionary forces."

The man who was yesterday declared to be a thief, is the next day depicted as a martyr for the revolutionary cause!

We have heard how D. Serrano contemptuously referred to Pujol as the "disciple and personal adjutant" of the half-mad Siqueiros. Clearly D. Serrano could have nothing in common with Pujol. Nevertheless, *El Popular* of January 4, 1939 printed a telegram from Barcelona dated the second of the same month and sent to the CTM which reads:

"Mexican veterans nearest repatriation, we wish you Prosperous New Year in united revolutionary struggle against reaction and fascism. For the Committee: Pujol, General Secretary; Talavera, Secretary of Agitation and Propaganda; Justo, Secretary of Organization."

Justo is none other than David Serrano. This telegram only testifies incontestably to the close existing collaboration between D. Serrano and Pujol, and consequently with Siqueiros himself.

Mightn't the GPU demand of Siqueiros tomorrow under the threat of death, that he confess to having been secretly a "Trotskyist"? May not Siqueiros declare that Robert Sheldon Harte was killed during the "self-assault"? May not D. Serrano himself confess that he was merely one of Dies' agents for organizing political murders? May not *El Popular* be already preparing an editorial on this topic? We can foresee in advance the style of patriotic indignation! Let them try! Moscow has long ago created classic models for such transactions. We await the new intrigue calmly. We don't need to invent anything. We shall only aid in elucidating the logic of facts. Against this logic the falsifiers will break their skulls!

Why Do the Stalinists Disavow Their Own Handiwork?

When the absurd version of "self-assault" suffered a miserable fiasco, and the guilt of the Kremlin's agents became apparent to the world, the friends, inspirers, and protectors of Siqueiros made an attempt to dissociate themselves from the attempt on grounds of "principled" character.

La Voz de Mexico of June 1 wrote:

"The Communist International, the international of Lenin and Stalin, and with it the parties of the whole world have never proclaimed nor practised individual terroristic struggle, but the organized violence of the masses..."

La Voç de Mexico, June 16 repeats:

"The Communist Party has declared a thousand times that its program neither accepts nor proclaims individual terrorism, but the open action of the masses in defense of their interests."

And on June 30:

"How could it be possible then that the Communist Party, denying its own principles, acting against its own interests, could participate in a terrorist act, completely foreign to our tactics and methods of struggle?"

The same thing is repeated by the accused D. Serrano, Mateo Martinez, and their attorneys. All of them talk exclusively of incorporeal "principles" which prohibit individual terror. Not one of them speaks a single word about facts. No one mentions the GPU. Haven't they really heard about the existence of this institution? Are they really unaware that the GPU systematically occupies itself with murders not only on the territories of the USSR but in all the civilized countries of the world?

It is not at all a question whether the so-called "principles" of the Communist party are good or bad. It is a question of the activities in which the Communist party engages and the real relations between the Central Committee of the Communist party and the GPU.

The GPU is not merely the secret police of the USSR, but something far more important. The GPU is the instrument of the totalitarian rule of the Stalinist clique over the USSR and the Comintern. One of the most important and unremitting tasks of the GPU is the physical destruction of the most resolute and dangerous opponents of Stalin's dictatorship. Within the USSR this destruction is semi-camouflaged by legal formalities. Outside of the USSR it is carried out through plots, attempts, and murders from ambush.

As organizations, the GPU and the Comintern are not identical but they are indissoluble. They are subordinated to one another, and moreover it is not the Comintern that gives orders to the GPU but on the contrary it is the GPU that completely dominates the Comintern. This domination finds its expression in the sudden changes of Central Committees of all the sections, as Moscow wills it; in the purges which are carried out by mysterious hands, behind the party's back. Those members of the Central Committee who are agents of the GPU see to it that the party's conduct does not in any way run contrary to the interests of the GPU. Since there is not even a semblance of free discussion or democratic decision in the party, the agents of the GPU, through the Central Committee can force any party member, under the penalty of moral and sometimes physical annihilation, to carry out the decisions of the GPU. Without understanding these mechanics it is impossible to perceive the real motives behind the conduct of *La Voç de Mexico*, the defendants and their supporters.

In June 1937 Mr. Hernan Laborde, on orders from Moscow, subjected the policies of the Central Committee, his own included, to "self-criticism." Here is one of his confessions:

"We demanded that the agreement which permitted the establishment of Trotsky in Mexico should be revoked and we threatened MASS ACTION which we could not unchain because we did not have the necessary force..."

(Hernan Laborde, UNITY AT ALL COST, 1937.)

This quotation is of great importance. Naturally Moscow would have preferred that I be driven out by the pressure of the masses. But the masses were not there and the party only fell into a ridiculous situation. Moscow had hoped that Lom-

bardo Toledano would be more successful in mobilizing the workers under the slogan of expelling Trotsky from Mexico. But despite all Toledano's efforts the workers obstinately refused to respond to this agitation—the toilers dislike to assume the role of persecutors. Meanwhile with the onset of the war Moscow felt with particular acuteness the need of silencing my voice. With every passing day Moscow became more and more impatient and pressed its agency in Mexico. History teaches us that when adventurous organizations lack sufficient political forces to solve a task, the idea of terrorist acts arises by itself. The pistol, the machine gun, or dynamite must replace the inadequate force of the masses. This is the classic formula of individual terrorism.

The renunciation of terrorism by *La Voç de Mexico* is simply a ritualistic phrase for evading responsibility. The fraudulent character of the renunciation is best proved by the conduct of D. Siqueiros himself. On March 5, 1939, speaking as one of the Stalinist orators at a meeting of Mexican teachers, Siqueiros preached the necessity of waging a struggle against "traitors," saying: "... and it is necessary that they should know that we are going to combat them, *not with direct action, but through the unification of the masses.*" (*El Popular*, March 6, 1939, page 1, col. 2.)

Siqueiros adopted here the very same formula which *La Voç de Mexico*, *El Popular* and *Futuro* were later forced to repeat in order to untie themselves from Siqueiros. In vain! Siqueiros has completely discredited this saving formula.

It is impossible to underscore the vast difference between the use of terror by revolutionary parties and by the gangs of the GPU. Russia was the classic country of individual terror. The revolutionary party used to assume openly the responsibility for every sanguinary act it committed. Polish and Irish terrorists behaved similarly in their struggle for national independence. It is entirely otherwise with the Stalinists. After perpetrating a scheduled murder, they not only disown their own handiwork but seek to foist their own crime upon their political opponent. They do not act in the interests of the people but in the interests of a totalitarian gang. They are compelled to deceive the people. This cowardly duplicity invests the terror of the GPU with a dishonest and repulsive character.

What Is the Essence of My Accusation?

On July 2 I reaffirmed in court my assertion that *La Voç de Mexico*, *El Popular* and *Futuro* are tools of the GPU and enjoy its economic aid. Following *El Popular* and *Futuro*, *La Voç de Mexico* deemed it necessary to sue me in the courts for "defamation." Prudent step! The Comintern is as obedient a tool of the Kremlin as the GPU. Just how can *La Voç de Mexico* remain a Comintern newspaper and at the same time consider as "defamation" any reference to its connection with the Kremlin? Obviously, *La Voç de Mexico* has entered its complaint only in order to reduce to absurdity the complaints of *El Popular* and *Futuro*.

Material assistance on the part of Moscow to revolutionary movements in other countries began from the hour the Bolsheviks seized power. On December 26, 1917, the Council of People's Commissars issued the following decree:

AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE SUPPORT OF WORLD REVOLUTION

Taking into consideration the fact that Soviet power bases itself on principles of international solidarity of the proletariat and on the brotherhood of the toilers of all countries; that the struggle against war and imperialism can lead toward complete victory only if waged on an international scale, the Council of

People's Commissars considers it necessary to offer assistance by all possible means, including money, to the left international wing of the labor movement of all countries, regardless of whether these countries are at war or in an alliance with Russia or are neutral. For this reason the Council of People's Commissars decides to grant two million rubles for the needs of the revolutionary international movement and to put it at the disposal of the foreign representatives of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.

V. ULIANOV (Lenin)

President of the Council of People's Commissars

L. TROTSKY

People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs

Not even today am I inclined to withdraw my signature from this decree. It was a question of giving open aid to revolutionary movements in other countries under the control of workers' organizations. The parties receiving aid enjoyed complete freedom of criticism of the Soviet government. At the Congresses of the Communist International a passionate ideological struggle always used to take place, and on more than one occasion Lenin and I remained in the minority.

Under Stalin's regime the question of financial assistance to foreign organizations suffered a complete degeneration. "The Workers' and Peasants' Government" controlled by the party and answerable to the Soviets was transformed into a personal dictatorship based on the totalitarian apparatus of impersonal functionaries. International solidarity was transformed into a degrading submission to the Kremlin. Financial assistance became a form of bribery. Not a single revolutionist would have dared to call "slander" a reference to aid from the Kremlin during the time when the Comintern was a revolutionary organization! This "aid" is felt today even by Moscow's agents as a shameful and degrading dependency not to be openly acknowledged. By bringing against me a suit for "defamation," the Mexican agents of the Kremlin are only corroborating my appraisal of the present Kremlin.

I do not reproach *La Voiz de Mexico* and the other publications with obtaining money from their co-thinkers abroad. There is nothing reprehensible in this. I accused and I accuse them of this, that their co-thinkers in the USSR are not the workers and peasants but the oppressors and hangmen of workers and peasants. I accuse them of fulfilling the shameful and criminal missions of the GPU; of serving the reactionary aims of the parasitic oligarchy; of being compelled to hide their connection with the GPU and their economic dependence on the latter. This grave accusation I wholly maintain!

The Budget of the Comintern and the Economic Aid to Foreign Sections

The intervention of the GPU in the affairs of the Comintern, the system of bribery and corruption of the leaders of the labor movement in countries abroad began to develop systematically at the beginning of 1926 when Stalin placed himself definitively at the head of the Comintern. At the same time the irreconcilable struggle of the opposition (the "Trotskyists") began against the arbitrariness and bribery of the Comintern and its periphery. Thus, for example, the opposition disclosed that Purcell, the well-known leader of the British trade unions, received in return for his "friendship" to the Soviet Union, i.e., the Kremlin, a secret salary of twenty-five pounds a month. All sorts of material boons were likewise enjoyed by other prominent leaders of the same trade unions. Their wives received "inoffensive" gifts of gold and platinum. Needless to say all these gentlemen and ladies, who did not formally belong to the Comintern, considered the Trotskyists as "traitors."

Fearing the revelations of the opposition, Stalin found himself compelled to begin publishing something in the nature of a financial statement of the Comintern. I append to this declaration the financial statements for three years, 1929, 1930 and 1931. It must be said at once that these statements, prepared in the laboratories of the GPU, are completely false. The entire budget is reduced many times. Secret expenditures are not mentioned at all. The source of the funds is camouflaged. The reduced sums indicated in these statements: \$675,000, \$956,000 and \$1,128,000 for the three years mentioned above came almost entirely from Stalin's secret funds.

Despite all these concealments and distortions, or rather thanks to them, one of the items among the expenses assumes an especially convincing character. In each year's budget we find a special item: *Subsidy to party publications*, amounting to \$435,000, \$641,000 and \$756,000 respectively, acknowledged thus by the sharply reduced and false financial statement. In the course of the three years cited subsidies to the publications of Comintern sections rose from a half-million to three-quarters of a million dollars. The statement does not therefore consider it either necessary or possible to hide such a universally known fact as monetary assistance on the part of Moscow to foreign sections and their papers. Obviously, it never even entered the minds of super-cautious accountants of the GPU that *La Voiz de Mexico* would proclaim as an "old slander" a reference to monetary aid from Moscow. The financial statements naturally cover only the official Comintern press, such as *La Voiz de Mexico*; the direct or indirect aid to periodicals not formally adhering to the Comintern but fulfilling very important and delicate missions of the GPU, such as *El Popular* and *Futuro* is left out completely. We shall speak of them separately.

The question may naturally be asked why I use the financial statements of the Comintern only for the years 1929, 1930 and 1931. The answer is simple: After the repression of the "Trotskyists" the publication of statements was suspended. Their falseness provoked suspicion on all sides and satisfied nobody. At the same time such items in the expenditures as subsidies to the sections and publications of the Comintern created difficulties for some of these sections. The fact that the Comintern no longer publishes its budget testifies by itself that it is compelled to hide completely its financial operations.

But this does not mean to say in any way that subsidies to sections and to "friends" have ceased. On the contrary, these subsidies have grown from year to year. They must amount by now to tens of millions of dollars, and furthermore the greater portion of this amount is undoubtedly expended upon publications and "friends" who do not formally belong to the Comintern.

The Indissoluble Tie Between The Comintern and the GPU

In a letter addressed to Albert Goldman, my attorney in New York, B. Gitlow, one of the founders of the Communist Party in the United States, member of its Central Committee for twenty years, member of the E.C.C.I. and of the Presidium of the Comintern, characterizes as follows the relations between the Comintern and the GPU:

Crompond, New York
July 25, 1940

Mr. Albert Goldman
116 University Place
New York City, N. Y.
Dear Mr. Goldman:

When I was a member of the Presidium and Executive Committee of the Communist Interna-

tional I helped direct the affairs of the Communist International and was intimately acquainted with the way in which the organization functioned as an agency of the GPU.

Every representative of the Communist International sent out of Russia to foreign countries always carried special GPU instructions and if not directly an agent of the GPU, worked under the direction of a GPU agent.

The special department of the Communist International in Moscow which took charge of passports, visas and the financial subsidies to Communist parties and to Communist newspapers outside of Russia, was in charge of the GPU and its director was an employee directly responsible to this organization.

It was common knowledge to me that the financial affairs of the Communist International were in the hands of the GPU.

Yours truly,
BENJAMIN GITLOW

Inasmuch as Mr. Gitlow was in a town where there was no Notary Public, the authenticity of his letter destined for the Mexican court was certified to by a special affidavit from Mr. A. Goldman.

Affidavit

Albert Goldman being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says:

1. That he is a resident of the city of New York, State of New York, United States of America.
2. That he received a letter from Benjamin Gitlow dated July 25, 1940, dealing with the relationship of the Communist International to the GPU.
3. That he knows the handwriting of Benjamin Gitlow and knows of his own knowledge that this letter is in the handwriting of Benjamin Gitlow.

Signed and sworn to before me,
this 29 day of July

1940, A.D. ALBERT GOLDMAN
H. E. MINNICK, Notary Public.

In his book *I Confess*, B. Gitlow makes exceptionally important and exact declarations concerning the dependency of the Communist party upon the GPU.

"But the Party was tied to the Soviet government by stronger strings as well. Most important of these was the GPU. Directly upon the request of the GPU, the Party supplied it with Party members who could be added to its espionage staff. These Party members became full-fledged GPU agents, employed and paid by the Soviet government. These agents were the link between the Party and the GPU. Contacts were made for them by the Party Secretariat, who from time to time advised them how to proceed. A Party member who became a GPU agent dropped out of Party activity the moment he was selected. He became subject to the severe discipline which the GPU imposes upon its agents. Only very few of the Party leaders knew when a Party member became a GPU agent, and they kept this information strictly confidential. Every time the Party was called upon by the GPU to help, it was paid for any expenses involved far above what was actually spent, the surplus going into the Party treasury. But we, the Party leaders, who greatly cherished every opportunity to be of service to the GPU, aid in its work and be in its confidence, knew that the GPU kept a close watch on us, too. It was an open secret among us, the Party leaders, that the GPU was supplying Moscow with a complete record of all the leaders of the American Communist Party along with reports on the activities of the Party as a whole... However, we

all knew that the Soviet government did not consider our Party merely a section of the Communist International, which the leaders of the Soviet government dominated, but that they looked upon the American Communist Party as one of its agencies.

"...The Soviet government utilized members of the American Communist Party over a far-flung area that included China, Japan, Germany, Mexico and the countries of Central and South America..." (I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, pp. 302, 303.)

Mexico, as we observe, does not constitute an exception. Denial of ties with the Kremlin is not an invention of *La Voz de Mexico*. B. Gitlow writes on this point:

"...the American Communist Party has always argued that it had no connections whatsoever with the Soviet government, but the fact of the matter is that the American Communist Party is in the same relation to the Soviet government as the paid agents of Nazi Germany in the United States are to the government of the Third Reich." (I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, pp. 300 and 301.)

The Testimony of Mattoras and Krivitsky

Very important although far from complete data concerning the financial dictatorship of the Kremlin over the sections of the Comintern are supplied by Enrique Mattoras ex-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Youth of Spain and member of the Central Committee of the Spanish Communist Party, in his documentary book published in Madrid in 1935:

"The International supports the Communist movement economically with apportionments more or less high, but ordinarily a fixed amount is established for each country, without preventing it under abnormal circumstances from sending greater sums. This support exists not only for the organization properly called the party, but extends to other sectors of the Communist movement in different forms.

"Approximately what is received monthly in Spain in all forms, is the following:

	Pesetas
"The Communist International for the party....	12,000
"The International of Red Trade Unions for the Communist Trade Union movement.....	10,000
"The International Communist Youth for the Youth organizations	5,000
"The International Red Aid for the Spanish Section	5,000
"The International Workers Aid for the Spanish Section	2,000
"The International Red Sports for the Cultural Workers Sports Federation	1,000
"The Press Section of the Communist International for the journal of the party	10,000

Grand Total 45,000

"This amount is aside from the appropriations for the maintenance of the delegates and is sent only in order to increase the activity of the party and its different organizations. It is to be noted that all the members of the 'Political Bureau' of the party and of the Youth organizations, are paid monthly with the designated amount of 400 pesetas as salary; in addition they enjoy ten pesetas daily for expense money in the trips which they make outside the city where they are living and consequently all the expenses of traveling are taken care of also.

"Various methods are employed to bring this money into Spain. Sometimes individuals carry it, or

women specialized in this work. Sometimes it is received through the mediation of publishing houses connected with the party. Thus it has been supposed that for more than two years the Cenit Publishers have been receiving this money. In brief, the International manages through all means to have in each country a crew of paid men in its complete service."

(COMMUNISM IN SPAIN, ITS ORIENTATION, ITS ORGANIZATION, ITS PROCEDURES, by Enrique Matorras, Former Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Youth of Spain. Madrid, 1935. Exclusive rights, Ediciones "Pax," Plaza de Santo Domingo 13, Apartado 8001. Madrid. Pp. 13 and 15).

The sums mentioned here are relatively modest. But let us not forget that Matorras' book appeared in 1935, i.e., prior to the outbreak of the Civil War when the intervention of the GPU into Spanish affairs assumed a decisive character. The testimony of E. Matorras proves in any case that subsidies to sections did not cease with the suspension of the publication of the Comintern's financial statements.

In the cited quotation reference is made to assistance on the part of the Communist International and not the GPU. But involved here is merely a question of terminological camouflage. The GPU does not have a treasury of its own. Because of purely practical considerations the Kremlin places upon the transmitted funds the stamp of the Comintern, or International Red Aid, or Society for International Cultural Relations, or "Friends of the Soviet Union," Sports International, etc. etc. Back of these stamps hides the one and the same Stalin whose apparatus for maintaining contacts abroad is the GPU which has every reason for remaining incognito.

As regards the financial dependence of the Comintern sections upon the Kremlin we have the exhaustive testimony of General Krivitsky who was until 1938 the head of Soviet espionage for all Europe.

"The heart of the Comintern is the little known and never publicized International Liaison Section, known by its Russian initials as the O.M.S. (Otdyel Mezhdunarodnoi Svyazi) ... As the chief of the O.M.S. he (Piatnitsky) became, in effect, the Finance Minister and Director of Personnel of the Comintern.

"He created a world-wide network of permanently stationed agents responsible to him, to act as the liaison officers between Moscow and the nominally autonomous Communist Parties of Europe, Asia, Latin America and the United States. As resident agents of the Comintern, these O.M.S. representatives hold the whip over the leaders of the Communist Party in the country in which they are stationed. Neither the rank and file, nor even the majority of the leaders of the Communist Parties, know the identity of the O.M.S. representative, who is responsible to Moscow, and who does not participate directly in party discussions.

"In recent years the OGPU has gradually taken over many of the O.M.S. functions, especially the hunting down and reporting to Moscow of cases of heresy against Stalin ...

"The most delicate job entrusted to the O.M.S. resident agents is the distribution of money to finance the Communist Parties, their expensive propaganda and their false fronts—such, for instance, as the League for Peace and Democracy, the International Labor Defense, the International Workers' Aid, the Friends of the Soviet Union, and a host of ostensibly non-partisan organizations, which became especially important cogs when Moscow embarked upon the popular front ...

"At no time has any single Communist Party in the world managed to cover more than a very small percentage of its expenses. Moscow's own estimate is that it must bear on an average from ninety to ninety-five per cent of the expenditures of foreign Communist Parties. This money is paid from the Soviet treasury through the O.M.S. in sums decided upon by Stalin's Political Bureau.

"The O.M.S. resident agent is the judge, in the first instance, of the wisdom of any new expenditure which a Communist Party wishes to make. In the United States, for example, if the Political Bureau of the American Communist Party contemplates the publication of a new newspaper, the O.M.S. agent is consulted. He considers the suggestion, and if it merits attention he communicates with the O.M.S. headquarters in Moscow ...

"One of the favorite methods of transmitting money and instructions from Moscow to a foreign country for the use of the local Communist Party is through the diplomatic pouches, which are immune from search ... From Moscow ... in packages bearing the seal of the Soviet government, (arrive) rolls of bank notes together with sealed instructions for their distribution. He (the representative of the G.P.U.) personally delivers the roll of bills to the Communist leader, with whom he maintains direct contact. Through carelessness, American, British and French bank notes have several times been sent abroad for Comintern use bearing the telltale stamp of the Soviet State bank." (IN STALIN'S SECRET SERVICE by W. G. Krivitsky, pp. 51 to 54.)

Krivitsky thus establishes that the sections of the Comintern are in absolute financial dependence upon Moscow and that the direct organ of financial control over the Comintern is the GPU.

The passages cited from Krivitsky's book have the weight of juridical testimony since Krivitsky gave the same information under oath before the investigating Committee of the United States House of Representatives and is ready to answer questions put to him by the Mexican court.

Supplementary Evidence of B. Gitlow

In the matter of proving the financial dependence of the Communist parties on Moscow, the sole difficulty consists in the abundance of the available proofs and documents. I am compelled here to reduce quotations to a minimum.

Benjamin Gitlow, who played in the course of twenty years a leading part in the Communist movement in the United States, has published a book containing incontrovertible evidence of the complete financial dependence of the sections of the Comintern upon Moscow. B. Gitlow broke with the Comintern, otherwise he would not have come forward with his revelations. Gitlow's present political tendencies do not interest me. Suffice it that the factual side of his book is based on incontestable facts:

"... The DAILY WORKER, far from paying its way, was constantly losing money; the Comintern had poured many times over the initial sum of thirty-five thousand dollars it had invested to start the paper ... Our hope was that with the transfer of its headquarters to New York, the DAILY WORKER would begin to yield better returns on its investment in the form of increased circulation. The total cost of the building, general repairs, the new printing plant and incidentals ran well over three hundred thousand dollars ..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 307.)

"The Party today has branched out into so many

new fields, its importance to the Soviet Union's foreign policy on account of the Japanese situation makes it necessary for the party to carry on an unprecedented propaganda campaign through every avenue of publicity, even including the expensive use of the radio. Recently the Party has started the publication of two new daily papers, one in Chicago and one in San Francisco, even though the yearly deficit of the Daily Worker has always been over fifty thousand dollars. Obviously the Soviet Union must now subsidize the American Party more heavily than it ever did before..." (I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 389.)

"...I returned from Moscow to attend the 1928 Presidential nominating convention of the Party with five thousand dollars of Russian money in my jeans, as the first installment of Moscow's contribution of thirty-five thousand dollars to our Presidential campaign. That in turn was part of the quarter million dollars we used to receive annually under special grants for specific purposes. For our 1924 Presidential campaign Moscow had contributed fifty thousand dollars. Having started the DAILY WORKER on its career with an initial donation of thirty-five thousand dollars, Moscow has continued to feed into that hopper never less than that sum annually. Of course, Moscow's financial contributions to the American Communist Party in my day were only a very small part of what they are today, when Moscow is undisputed boss..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 496.)

What are the proportions of Moscow's financial aid? B. Gitlow through whose hands funds from Moscow passed on more than one occasion, declares in this respect:

"...Moscow was a generous donor, but far from all of our activities were paid for by the Russians. With a membership never exceeding sixteen thousand in those days, we spent on an average of a million dollars a year, of which the better half was raised right in the United States..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 470.)

Even so wealthy a party as the American one thus covered about half of its expenditures from Moscow sources.

The same author tells us about the founding of the Communist newspaper in London:

"...The British Communist Party was treated like a sickly child. The Party had to receive assistance from Moscow for every step it took... The Comintern tried to force the British Party to raise a certain quota of the money necessary to start a British Communist Daily. The leaders made all kinds of excuses as to why they could not raise the money. When the paper was published it was done with Comintern money, the Russians supplying practically all the money needed to launch the paper and keep it in existence. What was true of the leaders of these countries was in lesser or greater measure true of other countries as well..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, pp. 587-588.)

There is, as we observe, no reason to presume that Mexico is an exception.

I cite Gitlow's book not as a literary work but as the testimony of a witness; first, because B. Gitlow gave the same testimony under oath before a Congressional investigating committee; secondly, because he is ready to answer under oath any questions of the Mexican court.

Financial Aid to the Communist Parties Of Latin America

It is quite self-evident that the Communist parties of Latin America are in a similar relation to Moscow as the Com-

munist parties in other parts of the world. There could be no doubt on this score even if we had no special data. But we do possess such data. I append here the important testimony of Joseph Zack who played a leading part in the life of American Communism including that of Latin America, for 15 years. Here is Joseph Zack's testimony under oath:

Affidavit

Joseph Zack being duly sworn on oath deposes and says:

1. That he resides in the City of New York, United States of America.

2. That for a period of approximately 15 years he was a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America and during that time was a member of the Central Committee of the party and held many responsible posts.

3. That in 1929-1930 he worked for the Red Trade Union International in Moscow and in 1930 was sent by Piatnitsky, Secretary of the Communist International at that time, and Manuilsky, Chairman of the Communist International, to Bogota, Colombia, South America, for the purpose of supervising the work of the Communist Party in Colombia for and on behalf of the Communist International.

That he spent 15 months in Colombia as the representative of the Communist International and seven months in Venezuela, also representing the Communist International.

That while there he was in constant touch with the Bureau of the Comintern residing in Montevideo, Uruguay.

4. That affiant further states that he was authorized to spend and did spend during his stay in Colombia close to \$6500 for the purpose of subsidizing the work of the Communist Party of Colombia then affiliated with the Communist International. While he was in Venezuela, he also spent money for the purpose of subsidizing the work of the Communist Party in Venezuela.

That most of the money came to him from one Kitty Harris, residing in New York and a member of the Communist Party.

That he remembers distinctly that on one occasion personally he received from the representative of the Communist International known by the name of Williams, the sum of \$800. That according to his best knowledge and belief the said Williams was a member of the GPU.

JOSEPH ZACK

Signed and sworn to before me this

20 day of July 1940

Walter A. Sawlor, Notary Public.

J. Zack did not, it is true, have connections with Mexico. But there is no doubt that if the GPU did not forget Columbia and Venezuela it had all the more reason to be concerned about Mexico.

In 1931 the attention of the Mexican government was drawn to a certain Manuel Diaz Ramirez who had large sums to his credit in the bank. *El Universal*, May 6, 1931, wrote on this affair:

"... It is known that he has belonged to the Mexican Communist Party for ten years and is at present the representative in Mexico of the Third International to which he went, remaining in Russia a year. From 1927 to 1928 he was in charge of the treasury of the party, handling thirty thousand pesos. And all the expenses incurred in his trips were paid from these funds."—(EL UNIVERSAL, first section, p. 7. col. 7.)

To my knowledge it was firmly established at the time

that this money came from Moscow. The court authorities have the full, possibility to check this episode.

During the break of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the USSR, the Mexican government had occasion to refer officially to the relationship between the sections of the Comintern and the state organs of the USSR. I leave completely aside the question whether the break of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the USSR was "just" or "unjust;" I also leave aside the persecution of the Mexican Communist Party. I am interested in the facts officially established. The communication of the Mexican government for January 23, 1930 reads:

"The Government of Mexico knows perfectly well... that the Russian Communist groups do not work and could not work independently, because any political organization of that country is subject to the Soviet Government."

The assertion that no organization in the USSR can act independently of the government is absolutely incontestable. The direction of all organizations is concentrated in the hands of the GPU and it becomes especially severe and imperious when foreign relations are concerned. Financial aid to foreign sections of the Comintern as well as to "friendly" publications is the business of the GPU. Mexico does not constitute an exception.

The System of Personal Corruption

The methods of corruption and bribery applied in Moscow toward leaders of the labor movement abroad long ago became proverbial. Moscow either bribes or strangles any opposition within the Comintern. When the delegation of the American Communist Party, elected at a legally held convention, left for Moscow, the leaders knew in advance what their welcome would be in Moscow:

"... We had to protect our delegates against the Moscow system of corruption. We warned those to whom the experience of going to Moscow was a new one that they should expect all kinds of trouble. We also explained to them the ways of the Comintern. We told them the Comintern had tremendous resources, that its agents would entertain them lavishly, that every kind of temptation would be thrown their way, to make them change their views, that, if temptation did not work, pressure would be used. Our delegates solemnly pledged to remain loyal and to fight for the justice we sought, to the bitter end."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 528.)

The rivalry between leaders in the Communist parties is often resolved by the transfer of some of the "leaders" to the GPU. When B. Gitlow fell into disgrace for attempting to conduct an independent policy, the attempt was made in Moscow to transfer him to the GPU. Gitlow himself has the following to relate about the incident:

"... Attempts were made to bribe me. I was offered a lucrative position doing confidential GPU work in the Latin-American countries at a very good salary, including traveling expenses, which would enable me to travel first class and stop at the best hotels... I turned the tempting offer down, because I recognized that it was a bribe and because I knew that if I once put myself in the employ of the GPU, I would be at its mercy for ever after."—(I CONFESS, pp. 568-569.)

This episode sheds a glaring light on the fate of many of those who have been "expelled" or "removed," like D. A. Siqueiros, G. Lorenzo, H. Laborde and others. The attempt

to send so prominent a figure as Gitlow to Latin America demonstrates the special interest paid by the GPU to Latin American countries.

Fred Beal, one of the leaders of the workers in America, tells in his book how he was won over in Moscow:

"The Comintern... began to flatter me with a moving solicitude. They made me feel satisfied in Moscow: good room, good food, and good pay for speeches and writings for the journals." (PROLETARIAN JOURNAL, Fred Beal, p. 257.)

Gitlow relates how the Kremlin won over to its side the well-known American Negro, Ford:

"... He was showered with flattery, given many testimonials and loaded with pins, badges and presents of every description..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 455.)

It is not superfluous to point out that this same Ford represented the Comintern in Mexico during the last overturn in the party which preceded the attempt of May 24.

The examples adduced of personal corruption adopted by the Kremlin are only isolated instances of a finished system. The basic element of this system is the introduction by Stalin of a double wage: one is paid to party employees officially; the other is paid out to the more "responsible" functionaries from a special secret treasury controlled by the GPU. Originating in Moscow, against the energetic resistance of the "Trotskyist" opposition, this system soon extended to the whole Comintern. There cannot be the slightest doubt that it was and is still employed in Mexico. Having secret salaries, members of the Central Committee are able to devote their energies to work in the *friendly* organizations (*El Popular*, *Futuro*) providing for the latter one of the important forms of economic support.

Gitlow recalls how Stalin on solemn occasions loved to talk about the purity and chastity of the Comintern.

"... 'The Comintern is the holy of holies of the working class. The Comintern must not be confused with a stock market.' But that was precisely how Stalin was running the Comintern, buying, selling, and ruining its leaders..."—(I CONFESS by Benjamin Gitlow, p. 553.)

The leaders of the Mexican Communist party do not constitute an exception!

The Disinterestedness of "La Voz de Mexico"

La Voz de Mexico for July 7, 1940, calls my assertion that the paper receives financial aid from Moscow—an "old slander." Disassociating myself from the blustering insolence so characteristic of the Stalinists, I will add another quotation:

"The affirmation of the dirty renegade, repeating the old slander does not surprise us; but we wait in hope of the proof which he offers, with the certainty that he will not be able to present it, since this newspaper lives, with pride and all that modestly could be desired, on the voluntary contributions from the workers, the peasants, and sympathizing elements."

These gentlemen are obviously under the impression that by assuming an insolent tone they are freed from the necessity of reckoning with facts they themselves have acknowledged.

Denying that it receives financial aid from Moscow, *La Voz de Mexico* pretends to believe that the Mexican party is the sole exception in the world to the rules governing the

Comintern. However, this same paper wrote in its May 1 issue of this year:

"The economic situation in which the Party has fallen is rooted in the fact that the former leadership made the Party of the proletariat depend on governors, senators, and deputies, tying the party... to the tail of the bourgeoisie; deforming its principles, renouncing the defense of the interests of the workers and the people, braking and opposing itself to the struggle of the masses for better conditions."

We see that the party was not at all so scrupulous about the choice of monetary sources as it pretends to make out in its declaration of July 7.

At the last party convention (March 1940) one of the party leaders, Salgado, accused Laborde, the former leader of the party, of taking bribes:

"...For a thousand pesos a month, all the pain and hunger of the Yucatan people was sold to the interest of a small group of politicians who control that state." (THROW THE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE OUT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY RANKS!)

Another party leader, Rafael Carrillo wrote in April 1940 in connection with the last party convention:

"...the Extraordinary National Congress has carried out an inestimable labor... it has expelled the leaders responsible for the state of disorganization and of corruption which existed in its ranks..." (Prologue of Dionisio Encina's pamphlet: FUERA IMPERIALISM! Mexico, 1940.)

We thus learn that among the party leadership, which spoke and acted in the party's name, there prevailed not only "disorganization" but also "corruption."

It is not a question of a casual episode. The man responsible for this "corruption," Hernan Laborde, has been at the head of the party since 1928, i.e., for twelve years. His power over the party, especially in the last five years, was unlimited.

Dionisio Encina the new chief has this to say about it:

"What has been the leadership of our Party but a narrow leadership, which did and resolved everything, reducing the other members of the Political Bureau to the role of auxiliaries?"

And farther on:

"...since the Fourth Congress until today, that is to say, for five years in which the Party was under the leadership of Laborde and Campa." (Page 102.)

The leaders of the Mexican Stalinists, among them D. A. Siqueiros, declared one time: "It is better to receive money from Moscow than to take it from Mexican capitalists." In 1940 they publicly acknowledged having received money from Mexican capitalists. This does not of course mean that they did not receive at the same time money from Moscow.

I am in no way concerned here with the relations between the Communist party and the Governors, Senators, Deputies and Mexican capitalists. The foregoing admissions of *La Voz de Mexico* and Mr. Salgado interest me only to the extent that they refute completely the assertion that the newspaper exists solely upon the "voluntary contributions of workers, peasants and sympathizers."

True enough, the last convention (March 1940) did resolve to lead a more virtuous life. But we shall learn only during the next purge how serious this measure is, and, above all, to what degree it was carried out. Today it remains a fact that the Communist party takes money where it can and as much as it can without being embarrassed about the sources.

But even if we accept the pious desire of the last conven-

tion as genuine, there is not an iota of slander in my words. *La Voz de Mexico* considers it wholly admissible to receive money from "sympathetic elements." But doesn't Stalin belong to the category of sympathizers? In the same comment in which there is reference to my "slander," Stalin is called "great Soviet leader, comrade Stalin." Then why is it impossible to accept money from such a sympathizer as the "great Soviet leader"?

But it is not only a question of a "sympathizing" element. The Communist International looks upon itself as the international party of the proletariat. L. Beria, head of the GPU, together with all the members of his collegium and the responsible agents of the GPU are members of the Communist International, and thereby party comrades of the editors of *La Voz de Mexico*. The paper can therefore receive money from Beria and from the collegium of the GPU—comrades of the international party—without any damage to its "pride." There is consequently not a shadow of slander in my assertion. But the disinterestedness of *La Voz de Mexico* must be wholly assigned to the domain of mythology.

A Special Declaration by Walter Krivitsky To The Mexican Court

The present document was almost completed when I received a special declaration made by General W. Krivitsky, the former head of Soviet espionage in Europe, for the Mexican court. This declaration is devoted to the system of the organization of the GPU in the USSR and abroad, the relations between the GPU and the Comintern and the terroristic activity of the GPU abroad. Mr. W. Krivitsky, who was for a number of years one of the most important representatives of the GPU, broke with Moscow when Stalin began, by means of frame-up trials, to destroy the revolutionary generation of the Bolshevik party. The revelations made by Krivitsky in the world press and recently issued in book form are appraised by all serious publications as the most competent and precise evidence on the hidden mechanism of the Kremlin's politics.

To avoid misunderstandings it is necessary to explain that the initials GUGB signify the same thing as the GPU. Because the name of the GPU acquired an especially hated character, the Kremlin tried to change this name to another. But since the gist of the matter remains unaltered in the USSR as well as abroad, the GUGB continues to be called the GPU.

I likewise append the statement of A. Goldman, my attorney in New York, verifying under oath that the statement is genuinely Krivitsky's. General Krivitsky himself avoids public appearances unless absolutely urgent because he is hunted by the professional killers of the GPU.

The date, August 9, on Albert Goldman's statement is likewise the date of Mr. Krivitsky's declaration:

"I want to make the following statement, to be used in any court in Mexico, for and on behalf of Leon Trotsky.

"The General Administration of Security of the National Commissariat of Internal Relations of the State (G.U.G.B.N.K.V.D.) is the department of the secret police of the USSR. The People's Commissar of Affairs—Beria—is at the same time the head of the G.U.G.B.

"The G.U.G.B. is divided into sectors, organized in conformity with the political, economic, and cultural structure of the USSR.

"The principal sector of the G.U.G.B. is the Special Section. This has in its charge the vigilance of the entire organization of the party and the special sections

of the Army and the Navy are subject to it. The Special Section has its secret agents and informers in all the organizations. On their denunciations are based the detentions of the G.U.G.B. The characteristic method of work of the G.U.G.B. is PERIODIC ARRESTS. In the files of the G.U.G.B. people are registered against whom there is no material accusation whatsoever for any crime, people NOT COMPLETELY LOYAL to the Soviet government. The G.U.G.B. considers them as the "potential counter-revolution." Among this army of disloyal citizens they carry out mass arrests (purges). In the jails they convert them into criminals, making them responsible for all the failures in any branch of the life of the country.

"In the agencies abroad the G.U.G.B. has its representatives.

"Officially they occupy some diplomatic post. Under their direction is the surveillance of all the official Soviet organs in the respective country.

"All the work of the Comintern abroad is carried on through the Section of International Relations, the OMS. The entire apparatus of the OMS in Moscow and abroad since the years 1936-37 has been integrated through agents of the GUGB and all the activity of the OMS is under its control. In all the countries where the Communist Party is legal, there is a representative of the OMS of Moscow. Formerly, he occupied some secondary post in the diplomatic corps. Lately, these representatives have gone underground. Their functions are: the control over the activity and the financial situation of the Communist Party, the transmission of instructions and economic subsidies proceeding from Moscow. The Soviet government subsidizes not only the official Communist Party and its press, but also the pro-Stalinist journals which do not belong to the party. For example: the journal CE SOIR of Paris. All the work of the Comintern in Latin America is concentrated in the United States, where the principal representative of the OMS is found, including the Latin American countries. His aides are found in various countries. The instructions and the economic subsidies are received principally through the Embassy at Washington. Aside from this main center, the OMS has at its disposition an illegal interlocking apparatus, with different sections for Europe, Asia, and America. This has been organized and is destined for a case of war or of rupture in diplomatic relations with any country.

"The GUGB organizes terrorist acts abroad. In virtue of the risks and diplomatic difficulties which carrying out orders represents, they are given personally by the chief of the GUGB, National Commissar of Internal Relations, through the sanction of Stalin. The organizers of these terrorist acts are responsible agents of the GUGB abroad. The killers are always foreigners in the service of the GUGB. They are well tested militants of the Communist parties. Some of them because of considerations of a conspirative character, do not officially belong to the party.

"WALTER KRIVITSKY"

Albert Goldman being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says:

1. That he is a resident of the City of New York, State of New York, United States of America.

2. That he received a document of Walter Krivitsky, which begins with the following sentence in English:

"I want to make the following statement to be used in any court in Mexico for and on behalf of Leon Trotsky."

That the said document consists of three pages written in Russian.

3. That he knows the handwriting of Walter Krivitsky and knows that the said document is in the handwriting of Walter Krivitsky.

4. The said Walter Krivitsky is unable personally to make an affidavit because by doing so he would reveal his whereabouts and he is unwilling to do so because of fear of the GPU.

ALBERT GOLDMAN

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this

9 day of August, 1940, A. D.

Meyer B. Carp, Notary Public.

Conclusions

The editorial board of *La Voz de Mexico* has demanded that I be held answerable for "defamation" because I expressed in court the certainty that the directors of *La Voz de Mexico* like all other agents of the GPU receive financial aid from their master.

I tried to prove, and I trust succeeded in proving in this document that *La Voz de Mexico* is an organ of the GPU in the full sense of the term. The paper has no other policy save that which the Kremlin through the GPU instills in its international agents. It defends all the crimes of the GPU and slanders its enemies. The most scandalous torrent of its slander has been directed for several years against me.

I tried further to prove and I hope succeeded in proving the complicity of the Communist Party of Mexico and *La Voz de Mexico* in preparing the attempt and in concealing its traces. The entire leadership of the Communist party participated in the preparation of the attempt; a section of the leadership also participated in the actual execution.

The moral preparation proceeded chiefly in the form of systematic, deliberate and malevolent slander against me; and furthermore this slander contained the gravest and most injurious accusations.

After the commission of the attempt the same individuals tried to dupe the investigating authorities and public opinion by means of a new torrent of slander (the theory of "self-assault" etc).

All this work from beginning to end corresponded to the tasks and interests of the GPU and was fulfilled on its orders. The leaders of the Mexican Communist Party and the editors of *La Voz de Mexico* acted as agents of the GPU. There is no "defamation" whatever in the statement that they, like all other agents of the GPU, must receive the pay of the GPU. I have adduced in addition numerous proofs that the leaders of the sections of the Comintern in all countries of the world are in the pay of the Kremlin.

People who made their political careers on the base of slanders about me should be the last to speak about defamation. I have presented above specimens of this slander. It is impossible to conceive of slander with worse intentions.

I therefore express the conviction that Mexican justice will not only reject the charge of defamation against me but hold the editors of *La Voz de Mexico* responsible for slander and will sentence them to the heaviest punishment corresponding to the systematic nature and malevolent character of their slander.

L. TROTSKY

Coyoacan, Mexico
August 17, 1940

Trotsky's Last Battle Against The Revisionists

By JOSEPH HANSEN

"I grit my teeth upon losing my time in the reading of these absolutely stale documents. The errors are so elementary that it is necessary to make an effort to remember the necessary argument from the ABC of Marxism."—From a letter of Trotsky dated Jan. 3, 1940, commenting upon the faction documents written by the petty-bourgeois revisionists who split from the Fourth International in 1940.

One of the greatest battles of his revolutionary career was fought by Leon Trotsky in the last year of his life—the battle against the petty-bourgeois opposition in the Socialist Workers Party, American section of the Fourth International. When these elements of the party, in response to the pressure of the democratic bourgeoisie, attempted to revise the program of the Fourth International after the outbreak of the second World War, Trotsky put aside the biography of Stalin upon which he was working and turned his full attention to this internal danger that threatened our international organization. His decision was not made without cost—the publishers were clamoring insistently for long overdue manuscripts and had refused to advance him further royalties. The household at Coyoacan faced deprivation, but Trotsky rejected offers for well-paid articles in order to devote maximum time to combating the challenge of Burnham's vulgar empiricism, Shachtman's eclecticism, Abern's school of intrigue. He directed his analytical skill to exposing the anti-working class origin of the ideas of Burnham, intellectual leader of the group. Trotsky fought for the Marxist program which he had painstakingly forged for the Fourth International, and for those willing to learn explained with precision his method, the Marxist method, of arriving at revolutionary answers to the political problems posed before the working class by world events. Trotsky's writings in this struggle—some of the most brilliant and profound he ever wrote—would make a thick book, could well constitute a text of Marxism for new members of the Fourth International.

The battle against the petty-bourgeois revisionists reached success sooner than Trotsky had expected. They deserted from the party last April in the most miserable and cowardly fashion, set up a rival organization based on ideas in complete opposition to those of Leon Trotsky. Within a short time their ideological leader James Burnham deserted—as we had predicted—to the camp of the bourgeoisie. The proletarian majority of the party, strengthened and fortified by what had been learned in the factional struggle, found themselves handling the Marxist method with a new ability and self-confidence, settled down in the trade unions to intensified work which has already brought to the party a twenty-five percent increase in membership since the split.

Now with the death of Trotsky, the revisionists have launched a deliberate campaign to blot out the memory and significance of this last great ideological battle of Trotsky. That this campaign involves slandering Trotsky, belittling him, even presenting evident falsities as truth seems to be of small concern to them. They make "compensation" with choruses of hallelujahs about his greatness in general. They attempted this during the faction struggle, but then it was more difficult, for Trotsky enjoyed the rare historic privilege

of being able to answer them himself, of being able personally to prevent them from converting him into a harmless ikon.

In the Magazine They Stole

This latest attack on Trotsky by the petty-bourgeois revisionists takes the not unexpected form of an "appreciation" of Trotsky's place in history. The "appreciation" appears in the September *New International* in an issue-filling feature article written by J. R. Johnson together with an appendage to this article written by Max Shachtman. It is fitting in a sense that the revisionists should utilize the pages of the *New International* in making public their "appreciation" of Trotsky's place in history. It was not a half year ago that Trotsky scathingly called them to account for betraying their trust and stealing the *New International* from the American section of the Fourth International. He wrote:

"The discussion in the Socialist Workers Party of the United States was thorough and democratic. The preparations for the Convention were carried out with absolute loyalty. The minority participated in the Convention, recognizing thereby its legality and authoritativeness. The majority offered the minority all the necessary guarantees permitting it to conduct a struggle for its own views after the Convention. The minority demanded a license to appeal to the masses over the head of the party. The majority naturally rejected this monstrous pretension. Meanwhile, behind the back of the party the minority indulged in shady machinations and appropriated the *New International* which had been published through the efforts of the entire party and of the Fourth International. I should add that the majority had agreed to assign the minority two posts out of the five on the editorial board of this theoretical organ. But how can an intellectual 'aristocracy' remain in the minority in a workers' party? To place a professor on equal plane with a worker—after all, that's 'bureaucratic conservatism.' . . .

"Long political experience has taught me that whenever a petty-bourgeois professor or journalist begins talking about high moral standards it is necessary to keep a firm hand on one's pocketbook. It happened this time, too. In the name of a 'moral ideal' a petty-bourgeois intellectual has picked the proletarian party's pocket of its theoretical organ. Here you have a tiny living example of the organizational methods of these innovators, moralists, and champions of democracy." (*Socialist Appeal*, May 4, 1940.)

During the last year of Trotsky's life they picked the pocket of his party. Now with his death, they are attempting something on a grander scale, nothing less than wiping out the lessons of one of Trotsky's greatest ideological victories. They forget that Trotsky left a living heritage.

From Herodotus to J. R. Johnson

Upon reading the article featured in the *New International*, the one by J. R. Johnson, one is struck by the fact that no historical name is too distant from the subject at hand to escape the telescopic eye of Johnson. Herodotus, Thucy-

dides, Tacitus, Livy, Amyot, North, Holinshed, Froissart, Baboeuf, Gibbon, Guizot, Abraham Lincoln, Voltaire, Michelet, Green, Macaulay, Mommsen, Carlyle, Oswald Spengler, the Old Testament, George Washington, Cervantes, Souvarine, and dozens upon dozens of others altogether too numerous to repeat in the scope of this reply rush past in a torrent of Johnson's learning. And if they appear without reason or connection and take no part whatever in the basic structure of his "appreciation" of Trotsky, yet they appear and thereby prove that Johnson has them at his finger tips just as if he had bought one of those 25c. review books which the college boys use for cramming, and read it through in a hurry before writing his "appreciation."

Why, I asked myself, did the editors of the *New Internationalist* see fit to let their blue pencil pass up these flights of high school essay writing? By wringing ten or twenty thousand useless words out of Johnson's article, they would have had room in their memorial issue for more material on Trotsky, perhaps even a few words about their appreciation of the issues which were important enough to end with their breaking with Trotsky. They would have had room to say a few words about what they think now of the relation between materialist dialectics and Marxist politics, the class analysis of the state and defense of the Soviet Union, bureaucratic conservatism and Bolshevik organization of the party.

However, the mystery of their forbearance with the blue pencil is not difficult to solve. Let us examine Johnson's article a little more closely, turning aside for the moment from the fireworks of "erudition" which are there for no other purpose than to blind the reader's eyes.

Johnson's Thesis

What is the thesis of Johnson's "appreciation" of Trotsky? Johnson himself states it: "And yet this superbly gifted theoretician, executive, and leader of men on the grand scale, who achieved so much in the realm of politics, was a very defective politician." This sentence expresses the main purpose of the entire article: Johnson praises Trotsky's brilliance as a theoretician only in order to lay down an authoritative basis for making Trotsky out a gullible and pathetic fool in practical politics, and therefore in the politics of the last faction struggle in which Trotsky engaged and in which Johnson bitterly opposed Trotsky.

Here is how Johnson elaborates his thesis: "In a different age he would not have been a politician at all . . . It is characteristic of him that, immersed in his work, he never saw the dangerous growth of bureaucracy until Lenin, with an agonized urgency, pointed it out to him and asked for help. Lenin's immediate preoccupation was to take the political and practical steps necessary to break up Stalin and his clique. Here Trotsky failed completely . . . found himself pushed out of power as if he were a fourth-rate bureaucrat . . . his political naivete and the idealism of his character are almost incredible but for his own unsuspecting documentation . . . in the hands of Kamenev and Stalin he was a child . . . warned and warned and warned again, wandered about like a child in a forest of wild beasts."

We learn from Johnson that ". . . actual power Trotsky had none. . . . Trotsky was rooted nowhere . . . Trotsky's power in the party was seen for what it was—a glittering shell . . ." And the crown of thorns Johnson places on Trotsky's brow as a politician: "But this — and nearly all his other mistakes—flowed from a constant incapacity to acknowledge perhaps even to himself, the full depravity of Stalinism."

How could Johnson say this? It has been a truism in our movement that the whole battle against Stalinism, the entire continuation of the Marxist tradition in opposition to Stalinism is due precisely to no one else but Trotsky. No one understood the "full depravity of Stalinism" better than Trotsky.

If Johnson had been with Trotsky when he received the news of the slaying of his son Leon Sedov by Stalin's GPU, he would not have been capable of uttering this abomination.

And here we draw attention to a peculiar characteristic of all these off-hand "appreciations" of Trotsky's practical ability as a politician—they lack any supporting *evidence* . . . They jut out from Johnson's copious references to ancient history, to literature, and to esthetics like unlanced boils.

If we take Johnson's "appreciation" at its face value, we are faced with an absolutely astounding contradiction in Trotsky's character. A man of action on the "grand scale," one of the world's greatest theoreticians, "One of the most powerful agents of social dynamics who has lived in this or any other time," yet turns out to be naive in politics, a "child in a forest of wild beasts." How is this possible? One would think that Johnson must have racked his brains to discover an explanation or at least a historic precedent, even a minor one, to make understandable how a revolutionary politician who stands beside Marx, Engels, and Lenin nevertheless completely unlike them found himself ludicrously incapable of uniting theory and practise—that is, of understanding one of the first elements of the materialist dialectics of which he was a master.

Nature abhors a vacuum, even in Johnson's articles. Johnson seems to feel this. He tries to fill the vacuum with an explanation of sorts for this first rate puzzle. ". . . whatever policy Trotsky was following," runs Johnson's explanation, "whatever tactical compromises he found it necessary to make, he himself, being the man he was, was bound to fail." This is Johnson's analysis of Stalin's coming to power over Trotsky's opposition. ". . . *being the man he was*, was bound to fail." Because of psychological reasons, personal failings, Trotsky could be nothing but a child in practical politics, and so was inevitably beaten by Stalin!

Such an explanation explains nothing, as Johnson himself remarks quite correctly elsewhere in his article. "The bourgeois critic will explain it in terms of personal ability . . . idiots and bourgeois scoundrels always emphasize Trotsky's personal brilliance whereby they seek to disparage Trotsky's method..." We do not take upon ourselves the prickly task of determining in what category Johnson is placed by his disparagement of Trotsky's political abilities through his emphasis of Trotsky's brilliance.

Rather than accept Johnson's explanation that it was due to psychological reasons that Trotsky was incapable of uniting in himself the theory and practise of politics, we prefer a different explanation: that Johnson himself has made an artificial division in Trotsky's character which does not exist in fact.

In the struggle for power in the Soviet Union following the death of Lenin, the Left Opposition under the leadership of Trotsky organized tens of thousands of workers into a nation-wide struggle against the bureaucratic degeneration that had set in under the leadership of Stalin. Their battle shook the bureaucracy to its foundations; but the ebb of reaction following the revolution, strengthened by the defeat of the workers' revolution in one country after another in Europe and especially in Germany, bolstered up the Stalinist bureaucracy, and it conquered.

This titanic struggle has been reduced by Johnson to

nothing but a personal feud between Trotsky on one hand and Stalin on the other. We learn that Trotsky was too lofty and noble to "grub" in politics and that Stalin being vile, vicious and underhanded was bound to win. Johnson leaves out the class struggle in his explanation. History according to this type of analysis is nothing but the affair of great men who win or lose according to their personalities. Did the Czar lose to the Russian Revolution because he had an "idealistic approach to life," was unable to lower himself to "grub" with "tricks and dodges" in nasty politics? Did the workers win the Russian Revolution because Lenin was a schemer, a trickster, with a "trace of rascality"? Johnson will answer of course that the Russian Revolution was won because there was a revolutionary upsurge of the Russian workers, that is, the class struggle at that time was favorable to a revolutionary victory of the workers. It is easy for Johnson to see the class struggle at work in a period of victory; but in a period of defeat it is not so easy for him. In the war of classes he sees only personal feuds, "idealist" Trotsky opposed to "unscrupulous men not fit to clean his pen." And of course Trotsky "being the man he was, was bound to fail." Johnson reveals his limitations; they are the limitations of a tendentious petty-bourgeois historian not too concerned about the accuracy of his facts, a vulgar politician lacking the dialectic method.

Trotsky, a Working Class Politician

Johnson's views of politics are the views of a petty-bourgeois intellectual drawing back from the class struggle, talking about morals, not too careful about his own, and hence convinced that it is all a dirty low business. Johnson's views of politics were never Trotsky's views. Trotsky understood and lived politics; Johnson does neither. Johnson is only projecting his own subconscious in his article and naming it "Trotsky." Trotsky was incapable of separating his practical life from his ideas. Politics was his lifeblood. When he returned to Russia after the February revolution, *Trotsky returned as a Leninist and he remained a Leninist to his death.* Whoever has worked closely with Trotsky knows how he loved the battleground of politics. He was a fighter from head to foot. So perfectly had he united theory and practise in his own life that it was impossible for him to sit back placidly in an armchair and watch the class struggle pass by like scenery from a train window. No, far from being the "idealist" who kept "somewhat aloof" from his fellows, Trotsky was a man of action through and through. He kept aloof only from philistines and sycophants. As has been exactly remarked by one of his closest co-workers, Trotsky "chained himself to his desk like a galley slave." He was a writer simply because writing was a powerful weapon in the class struggle and because for long years he was prevented by the class enemy of the workers from using more powerful weapons. The heart and brain of Leon Trotsky were the heart and brain of a working class politician. His life was completely political. In this epoch that is the same as completely conscious. Johnson would not comprehend this.

Even in small personal things, Trotsky was an activist. I doubt that Johnson would ever have dared to write down his theory of a writing desk Trotsky if he could have enjoyed the opportunity of being with us on a trip Trotsky once took to Guadalajara before the modern highway was constructed. Some hundreds of miles of mud holes—Trotsky out of the car mile after mile up to his knees in mud, splattered from head to foot with mud, red brick mud even in his white bushy hair, pushing the automobile, losing his white cap, organizing campesinos, ropes, drivers when we were completely bogged down,

at every point at the front in the struggle with the mud, happy as a boy in the country on the first day of summer when he takes his shoes off. Trotsky really enjoyed that trip. It was as full of action as if we had been a contingent of the Red Army enroute for battle. "Just like the good old days," Trotsky said enthusiastically, face flushed. "The road is just like a Russian road." Trotsky knew how to get down and "grub." He was no back seat driver.

Trotsky waded into politics the way he waded into that mud. For forty years of his life he was in the forefront of the political battles of the working class. Not once in those forty years did he falter, not once become faint-hearted, or concede to moods of despair. *He was an activist.* He carried out his ideas in daily practise. He went through three revolutions, helped organize the Third International, founded the Fourth. In those forty years he fought Czarists, bourgeois statesmen and diplomats, petty-bourgeois centrists and ultra lefts of all hues of the rainbow, Stalinists, thieves, traitors, careerists, every conceivable type of politician who is an enemy of the workers, Trotsky met them all in action. He knew all their tricks and dodges, answered their lies before they themselves saw the necessity for the lie. Trotsky understood all aspects of the politics of the class struggle from practical experience. That was not the least part of his great value as a teacher of revolutionary working class politics.

A Conversation with Trotsky

Johnson mentions the materialist dialectic, the Marxist method, so many times in his article that one cannot escape being impressed with the fact that Johnson must be a dialectician. This was a wise provision on Johnson's part and shows that in his universal range and erudition he is not unacquainted with the lowest type of politics. For if Johnson had not so patiently repeated so many times his reference to the dialectic in general, we should have surely taken him for what he is, an unconscious empiricist and formalist. It is his lack of acquaintance with the dialectic which explains Johnson's peculiar handling of certain well-known historical facts. This observation is not original with us. Trotsky was the first to note it on the occasion of Johnson's visit to Coyoacan. In *Internal Bulletin* Vol. II, No. 7, Trotsky's remark about Johnson is recorded: "I have noticed here the same fault . . . and that is a lack of dialectical approach, Anglo-Saxon empiricism and formalism which is only the reverse of empiricism."

While I am on this point I might report a conversation I had with Trotsky almost exactly a year ago during the opening stages of the factional struggle but before Johnson had taken a definitive position with either of the factions, still limiting himself to a sideline resolution on the Russian question which was closer to the position of James Burnham than any other.

Trotsky asked me about Johnson's other political activity in New York—was he working well in the party? learning some of the elements of Bolshevik organizational practise? "He seems to be working with great energy for the party," I responded rather cautiously; "but I know only in general what he is doing."

Trotsky seemed satisfied at hearing this news. "It would be very good if he could launch some serious work with the Negroes."

"He seems to be making some successes in that field. His department is going night and day."

"That is good."

I could not resist a question: "Do you think that Johnson is greatly influenced by Souvarine?"

Trotsky hesitated—spoke in the rather intimate tone

which meant he preferred that for the time being it remain "between us." "When he visited me, I waited during his whole visit for him to mention his relations with Souvarine. I thought he would surely want to discuss it, but he left without saying a word. I felt that it was disloyal of him." The Old Man told me this almost apologetically.

It was clear that he had been hurt by Johnson's silence about his well-known relations with Souvarine, bitter enemy of Trotskyism, that he was uneasy about this silence, nevertheless wished to place nothing in the way of the possibility of Johnson's developing into a Bolshevik.

"You know," he added, "he is a typical product of British empiricism. He has the Oxford tradition. It is not a good tradition. He has many handicaps to overcome."

Later, in December, as it became clear that Johnson was definitely with the petty-bourgeois revisionists, Trotsky included the following paragraph in his article, "A Petty-Bourgeois Opposition in the Socialist Workers Party":

"Gangrenous skeptics like Souvarine believe that 'nobody knows' what the dialectic is. And there are 'Marxists' who kowtow reverently before Souvarine and hope to learn something from him. And these Marxists hide not only in the MODERN MONTHLY. Unfortunately a current of Souvarinism exists in the present opposition of the S.W.P. And here it is necessary to warn young comrades: beware of this malignant infection!"

Bearing this warning in mind, let us now see what kind of pillars support Johnson's "appreciation" of Trotsky's errors in practical politics.

Trotsky's "Errors" as Outlined by Johnson

In addition to Trotsky's acting like a "child among wild beasts," Johnson informs us that "twice his enthusiasm, his love of the idea, nearly wrecked the Russian Revolution." From a *friend* of Trotsky and especially from one who claims to be a *follower*, this is news indeed. Previously we were aware that such views were held only by the Stalinists. One might ask Johnson why during his visit with Trotsky he did not bring up the question of the two times the Russian Revolution was "nearly wrecked" by Trotsky. A discussion on this question between Johnson and Trotsky would have proved of interest to the Fourth International. But let us proceed immediately to an examination of the pillars supporting Johnson's thesis.

Trotsky we learn from Johnson "made a terrible error in 1918" at Brest-Litovsk... "Trotsky persisted in chasing a mirage of his own imagination and his obstinacy cost Russia dearly..."

What was the "terrible error"? Johnson does not inform us.

What was the "mirage" Trotsky "persisted in chasing"? Johnson is silent, offers not even a single historic reference.

In what did Trotsky's "obstinacy" consist? A complete erudite blank.

How did it "cost Russia dearly"? Incredible but true—Johnson does not offer even one word of explanation!

Like the confessions of the defendants in the Moscow Trials who testified for Stalin, Johnson merely informs us that Trotsky "nearly wrecked" the Russian Revolution. Argument, proof, evidence—not a single *shred*. Why? Is it perhaps because Johnson after going back to Herodotus wishes to spare his reader further wearisome references from the dust bin of history?

Lenin, Johnson informs us, saved the Soviet Union from Trotsky's "error" at Brest-Litovsk.

It is well-known to all students of the Russian Revolution that *Trotsky and Lenin were in agreement in all matters of principle concerning Brest-Litovsk; they differed episodically only on secondary questions.*

Up until now only the Stalinists have attempted to dispute this.

The next "error" of Trotsky we learn was in 1920 during the dispute on the Trade Union question, when "oblivious to the reality, he let his imagination run away with him again... Had Trotsky had his way he would have placed the Soviet state in mortal peril!"

This pillar of Johnson's argument, unlike the first, does not rest on a solid erudite vacuum. He bases it on "evidence." We quote his "evidence" in full:

"He did not want to militarize labor as the Stalinist liars report, but he wanted to fuse the trade unions with the state administration. His basic argument was that Russia was a workers' state and therefore the trade unions, as the workers' organizations, could administer the state. Lenin's reply was devastating. 'Comrade Trotsky says that Russia is a workers' state. Excuse me, that is an abstraction.'"

What are the facts? Lenin and Trotsky were polemicizing not over the nature of the workers' state in 1920 but (1) over Trotsky's proposals to remedy certain ills in the Soviet economy, proposals of Trotsky's that were actually a preliminary draft of the New Economic Policy, but which were mistakenly opposed at that time by Lenin, (2) over a substitute plan of Trotsky's when the first was rejected that the "war" methods of communism be applied properly and with system, thus eliminating an independent role for the trade unions, a position in which Trotsky basing himself on purely economic considerations was mistaken. The factions proved very temporary and the dispute lost all importance when Lenin from political considerations formulated the New Economic Policy which relieved the tension in the economy. Trotsky immediately accepted the NEP, seeing in it his own plan of the year before. *The differences between Lenin and Trotsky in 1920 as at Brest-Litovsk were only episodic differences.*

Curiously enough the petty-bourgeois revisionists attempted to utilize this same discussion on the Trade Union question against Trotsky while Trotsky was still alive. He had an opportunity to answer it himself. Here is Trotsky, at his best in polemics, posing the truth against falsehood:

"To camouflage his failure to understand the essence of the problem of the nature of the Soviet state, Shachtman leaped upon the words of Lenin directed against me on December 30, 1920, during the so-called Trade Union Discussion. 'Comrade Trotsky speaks of the workers' state. Permit me, this is an abstraction... Our state is in reality not a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state... Our present state is such that the inclusively-organized proletariat must defend itself, and we must utilize these workers' organizations for the defense of the workers against their state and for the defense of our state by the workers.' Pointing to this quotation and hastening to proclaim that I have repeated my 'mistake' of 1920, Shachtman in his precipitance failed to notice a major error in the quotation concerning the definition of the nature of the Soviet state. On January 19, Lenin himself wrote the following about his speech of December 30: 'I stated "our state is in reality not a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state"... On reading the report of the discussion, I now see that I was wrong... I should have said: "The workers' state is an abstraction. In reality we have a workers' state with the following

peculiar features, (1) it is the peasants and not the workers who predominate in the population and (2) it is a workers' state with bureaucratic deformations." From this episode two conclusions follow: Lenin placed such great importance upon the precise sociological definition of the state that he considered it necessary to correct himself in the very heat of a polemic! But Shachtman is so little interested in the class nature of the Soviet state that twenty years later he noticed neither Lenin's mistake nor Lenin's correction!

"I shall not dwell here on the question as to just how correctly Lenin aimed his argument against me. I believe he did so incorrectly—there was no difference of opinion between us on the definition of the State. But that is not the question now. The theoretical formulation on the question of the state, made by Lenin in the above-cited quotation—in conjunction with the major correction which he himself introduced a few days later—is absolutely correct. But let us hear what incredible use Shachtman makes of Lenin's definition: 'Just as it was possible twenty years ago,' he writes, 'to speak of the term "workers' state" as an abstraction, so it is possible to speak of the term "degenerated workers' state" as an abstraction.' It is self-evident that Shachtman fails completely to understand Lenin. Twenty years ago the term 'workers' state' could not be considered in any way an abstraction IN GENERAL; that is, something not real or not existing. The definition 'workers' state,' while correct in and of itself, was INADEQUATE in relation to the PARTICULAR task; namely, the defense of the workers through their trade unions, and only in this sense was it abstract. However, in relation to the defense of the U.S.S.R. against imperialism this self-same definition was in 1920, just as it still is today, unshakably concrete, making it obligatory for workers to defend the given state." (New International, March 1940)

Even C. R. James, to whom Johnson refers and whom he seems to admire, takes a view of the Trade Union discussion in variance with that of Johnson:

"In 1920 Trotsky, whose work took him about the country, had observed that the economy of the country could stand the forced requisition no longer and had proposed the first outlines of the New Economic Policy. The Central Committee rejected the proposal. This was the origin of Trotsky's insistence on organizing the Trade Unions as organs of the State. If War Communism continued, he foresaw collapse unless the unions were knit tightly into the fabric of the Soviet State. The moment Lenin agreed to N.E.P., Trotsky accepted Lenin's Trade Union policy." (World Revolution, p. 127.)

The importance of a correct version of the 1920 Trade Union discussion is apparent. Johnson's analysis of Trotsky as an idiot in politics rests upon a falsification of historical fact!

The Superstructure of a Falsification

We now come to the most astounding bit of sleight of hand in Johnson's article. After giving us the two "errors" that "nearly wrecked the Russian Revolution," and then explaining to us contrary to all the basic principles of Marxism that the rise of Stalin to power was due to Trotsky "being the man he was" rather than due to class forces in struggle, Johnson flicks his wand and presto changeo! we see why he concocted these two "errors" and made Trotsky's personality lose out to that of Stalin.

"The last of his blunders," says Johnson of Trotsky, "which may be conveniently (sic!) dealt with here was his political

position on the Russian invasion of Poland and, particularly, of Finland. As in 1920, pursuing an idea to the end, he repeated his formula: Russia is a workers' state and therefore it must be defended."

"AS IN 1920!"... The whole trick is laid bare for the shoddy and contemptible politics it is. Not a word about the issues of the great battle Trotsky waged in 1940. Not a single phrase of reference or explanation either pro or con about principles at stake—nothing but a false reference to an "error" concocted out of a misunderstanding already answered by Trotsky! That is Johnson's "appreciation" of this great battle Trotsky waged in 1939-40 for the basic principles of Marxism.

Now we see why Johnson referred on such a grand scale to Gibbon, and Herodotus, and Abraham Lincoln, the *Origin of Species*, Livy, Thucydides, Oswald Spengler and Souvarine. It was a careful build up to establish his own authority as a scholarly historian so that when he mentioned Trotsky's "errors" casually in passing, they would be accepted by the unsuspecting reader as the truth. And all this humbug for no other purpose but to cover up the revisionist role of the petty-bourgeois opposition in their struggle against Leon Trotsky in the last year of his life! They are anxious, you see, about the heritage left by Leon Trotsky.

And now we have the key to understanding the vague insinuations levelled by Johnson in this same paragraph in regard to the petty-bourgeois revisionists splitting from Trotsky's organization and the reasons for it. "But sharp as were the differences," we are assured by Johnson, "between the present Workers' Party (the name the petty-bourgeois group assumed) which was expelled from the Socialist Workers Party, a split was not necessary on this question alone. Trotsky knew that, but despite his unwillingness he was cunningly maneuvered into a position in which his authority and energy were unscrupulously used for an aim he did not have in mind. When he recognized what was happening, it was too late."

Please, Mr. Johnson, why are you afraid to name names? Don't you mean James P. Cannon and the majority—those in the United States who supported Trotsky against Burnham? Then why not say so? I confine myself to answering your provocative slanders with some exact quotations from Leon Trotsky indicating very clearly his views on the split, its "necessity" and who was responsible for it:

"Only the other day Shachtman referred to himself in the press as a 'Trotskyist.' If THIS be Trotskyism then I at least am no Trotskyist. With the present ideas of Shachtman, not to mention Burnham, I have nothing in common. I used to collaborate actively with the NEW INTERNATIONAL, protesting in letters against Shachtman's frivolous attitude toward theory and his unprincipled concessions to Burnham, the strutting petty-bourgeois pedant. But at the time both Burnham and Shachtman were kept in check by the party and the International. Today the pressure of petty-bourgeois democracy has unbridled them. Towards their new magazine my attitude can only be the same as toward all other petty-bourgeois counterfeits of Marxism. As for their 'organizational methods' and political 'morality,' these evoke in me nothing but contempt.

"Had conscious agents of the class enemy operated through Shachtman, they could not have advised him to do anything different from what he himself has perpetrated. He united with anti-Marxists to wage a struggle against Marxism. He helped fuse together a petty-bourgeois faction against the workers. He refrained from utilizing internal party democracy and

from making an honest effort to convince the proletarian majority. He engineered a split under the conditions of a world war. To crown it all, he threw over this split the veil of a petty and dirty scandal, which seems especially designed to provide our enemies with ammunition. Such are these 'democrats,' such are their 'morals'!

"But all this will prove of no avail. They are bankrupt. Despite the betrayals of unstable intellectuals and the cheap gibes of all their democratic cousins, the Fourth International will march forward on its road, creating and educating a genuine selection of proletarian revolutionists capable of understanding what the party is, what loyalty to the banner means, and what revolutionary discipline signifies.

"Advanced workers! Not one cent's worth of confidence in the 'third front' of the petty-bourgeoisie!"

That Trotsky was "cunningly maneuvered into a position" for "an aim he did not have in mind," that is, split—what nonsense! Trotsky anticipated this argument long before Johnson thought it up. It is not the first time it has been hurled against Trotsky in a faction struggle. Here is how Trotsky anticipated politicians such as Johnson:

"Rumors, personal speculations and simple gossip cannot help but occupy an important place in petty-bourgeois circles where people are bound together not by party ties but by personal relationships and where no habit has been acquired of a class approach to events. It is passed from ear to ear that I have been visited exclusively by representatives of the majority and that I have been led astray from the path of truth. Dear comrades, don't believe this nonsense! I collect political information through the very same methods that I use in my work generally. A critical attitude towards information is an organic part of the political physiognomy of every politician. If I were incapable of distinguishing false communications from true ones what value could my judgments have in general?" (From a Scratch to the Danger of Gangrene.)

When the threat of split was raised by the revisionists Trotsky wrote:

"In any case, threats of split will not deter us from presenting a Marxist analysis of the differences. For us Marxists, it is a question not of split but of educating the party. It is my firm hope that the coming convention will ruthlessly repulse the revisionists." (Internal Bulletin No. 9, January 1940.)

After the revisionists consummated their split, Trotsky wrote:

"The petty-bourgeois minority of the S.W.P. split from the proletarian majority on the basis of a struggle against revolutionary Marxism. Burnham proclaimed dialectical materialism to be incompatible with his moth-eaten 'science.' Shachtman proclaimed revolutionary Marxism to be of no moment from the standpoint of 'practical tasks.' Abern hastened to hook up his little booth with the anti-Marxist bloc. And now these gentlemen label the magazine they filched from the party an 'organ of revolutionary Marxism.' What is this, if not ideological charlatanism?" (Socialist Appeal, May 4, 1940.)

In the archives left by Trotsky are three pages of notations I saved from his table after a discussion he held with some members of the revisionist group in July. These three pages are of rare historic interest. They are notes made by Trotsky in English during the discussion for his closing speech. Written in black, red, and blue pencil, with interconnecting arrows, brackets, underlinings, numberings, they constitute the outline of his remarks. I quote only what pertains

to the slander concerning Trotsky's estimate of the split: "Orr: 'Cannon forced us in the spleet... spleet... The spleet came in spite of us...'" Trotsky took up that point in his speech and ridiculed it with the most withering blasts I have ever heard in a polemic. The essence of his argument was, what kind of politicians do you consider yourselves if you let someone force you to make a split? Then he listed point by point everything the majority did to prevent a split—the democratic discussion in which literally hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of words were written, the guarantees of democratic rights for the minority made at the convention, the continuance of the minority in all posts they held; then comes the following notation: "The spleet is accomplished, as inevitable historic fact... No reason for a spleet? The spleet is not accident—*inevitable*."

Trotsky knew as well as anyone in the proletarian majority that we would have preferred not to have had a split. He knew as well as Johnson that it was the petty-bourgeoisie who deserted from the party behind the coat tails of "snob Burnham!" as Trotsky's notation spells it on one of the pages.

Trotsky's estimation of the split did not change before his death. The following is taken from the stenographic record of a discussion held with him later in July:

"We have the fact that the minority split away from us, in spite of all the measures taken by the majority not to split. This signifies that their inner social feeling was such that it is impossible for them to go together with us. It is a petty-bourgeois tendency, not a proletarian. If you wish a new confirmation of this, we have an excellent example in the article of Dwight Macdonald." (Pre-Plenum Discussion Bulletin, September 1940.)

Trotsky's vast experience in proletarian politics made it clear to him that given a petty-bourgeois wing gone mad, turned irretrievably in stampede toward the bourgeois camp, who rejected all guarantees for their continued existence as a group in the party, who could be kept in the party only by conceding to their demands for a complete revision of the theory and practise of Marxism, the condition for further growth of the party was a split. The initiation of the split and therefore the assumption of responsibility for the split by the revisionists was one of the decisive empirical evidences of the hopelessness of saving the group from its headlong flight away from the Marxist party. That was why Trotsky called the split "*inevitable*."

Whom Does Johnson Serve?

Trotsky was such a "defective politician," such a "gifted intellectual," had such an "idealist approach to life," according to Johnson, that he was even incapable of detecting the politics of the GPU agent who murdered him. "He had been warned against his murderer but this GPU agent earned his favor by an exaggerated devotion to Trotsky's political position. For six months he discussed politics with the greatest living master of politics and Trotsky never detected a false note, apparently set no trap for him."

This is contrary to fact.

Who warned Trotsky? When? Who of all Trotsky's friends had the slightest notion that Jacson was an agent of the GPU before August 20?

As for discussing politics for "six months," Trotsky met Jacson for the first time on May 28, saw him—merely because he was the husband of Sylvia Ageloff—but a few times and was alone with him only once before the assassination.* The

*See the article by Natalia Sedoff Trotsky in the SOCIALIST APPEAL Oct. 26, 1940.

story that Trotsky carried on many political discussions over a long period of time with Jacson *is the GPU story*.

Shachtman's Appendage To Johnson's Article

"Appreciations" of Trotsky by anti-Marxists seem to be the fashion now among those anxious to cut down Trotsky's role in history. An "appreciation" of Trotsky in the style of Johnson's article has appeared in Dwight Macdonald's *Partisan Review*. The *New Leader* ran a series worthy of that despicable rag. The *Modern Quarterly* did not forget to give him a few pages. Shachtman, however, contents himself with an appendage to Johnson's article in which he repeats much that Johnson says, adding however his own characteristic note:

"Our comrades, the writer included, had more than one difference of opinion with Trotsky, not only while the split was taking place in the American section of the Fourth International, but often before it. But what weight in the scale have even our differences on the question of the Soviet Union in the war compared with all that Trotsky taught us about the principles of the Russian revolution, about the course of its development and its decay? What weight in the scale have our differences with him on the estimation of the regime in the Socialist Workers Party and of the merits of the respective groups compared with what he taught the whole revolutionary movement about bureaucratism and workers' democracy, beginning with THE NEW COURSE in 1923 (and even earlier), compared with the truly titanic and uncompromising struggle he conducted for almost twenty years against the most vicious and most powerful bureaucracy the labor movement, and perhaps society as a whole, had ever seen?"

If the differences were so minute, of such light weight in the scale—just why did Shachtman decide to join Burnham in opposition to Trotsky and split from the Fourth International? Are splits made so lightly in the proletarian party? "What weight in the scale" indeed have "our differences" with Trotsky? Precisely the weight of a petty-bourgeois opposition to a proletarian line. And let us once more make clear to Shachtman—he quite evidently does not learn easily from Trotsky—the differences were not minor episodic differences as Shachtman's article would indicate. Trotsky pointed out that the differences went right down to the most basic concepts of Marxism, and not only the Marxist concept of party regime, but the Marxist concept of the class nature of the state, and the significance in politics of the Marxist method of analysis. Trotsky's description of Shachtman in the faction struggle applies with equal validity to the appendage Shachtman wrote for Johnson's article:

"Shachtman's own explanation concerning the past bitter factional struggles," writes Trotsky, "is worthy not of a responsible political figure but of a nurse-maid:—Johnny was a little wrong, Max a little, all were a little wrong, and now we are all a little right. Who was in the wrong and in what, not a word of this. There is no tradition. Yesterday is expunged from the calculations—and what is the reason for all this? Because in the organism of the party Comrade Shachtman plays the role of a floating kidney..."

"Shachtman has left out a trifle: his class position. Hence his extraordinary zigzags, his improvisations and leaps. He replaces class analysis with disconnected historical anecdotes for the sole purpose of covering up his own shift, for camouflaging the contradiction between his yesterday and today. This is Shachtman's procedure with the history of Marxism, the history of his own party, and the history of the Russian Op-

position. In carrying this out, he heaps mistakes upon mistakes. All the historical analogies to which he resorts, speak, as we shall see, against him." (From a Scratch to the Danger of Gangrene.)

These lines were not written hastily by Trotsky. They were the culmination not only of a long experience with Shachtman but of the profundity and sharpness of Shachtman's break with Marxism. For years Trotsky in conversations and correspondence had labored to break Shachtman loose from the petty-bourgeois intellectual fringe of the movement and turn his face toward the workers. This personal interest Trotsky took in the development of Shachtman was not an especial tribute to Shachtman but an evidence of one of Trotsky's political characteristics. Trotsky never let anyone depart from the movement without a struggle to save him. Trotsky never came in contact with anyone with the slightest possibilities whom he did not try to bring closer to Marxism. Trotsky understood the value of cadres.

This characteristic of Trotsky as a politician is revealed with especial clarity in a letter he wrote to Shachtman during the factional struggle which was published in *Internal Bulletin* No. 6, January 1940:

"... I don't hope to convince you with these lines, but I do express the prognosis that if you refuse now to find a way towards collaboration with the Marxist wing against the petty-bourgeois revisionists, you will inevitably deplore for years and years the greatest error of your life.

"If I had the possibility I would immediately take an airplane to New York City in order to discuss with you for 48 to 72 hours uninterruptedly. I regret very much that you don't feel in this situation the need to come here to discuss the questions with me. Or do you? I should be happy..."

Trotsky signed this letter with a warm expression of friendship. Shachtman did not see fit to waste a postage stamp in reply to Trotsky. The differences you understand had no "weight in the scale."

In order that one may measure the stature of Trotsky, as revealed in this letter with that of those who are now "appreciating" him, it is necessary to relate a story which Trotsky told more than one of his secretaries, and which he told the last time in the presence of myself, James P. Cannon and Farrell Dobbs. It is the story of a small incident, one afternoon in the life of Leon Trotsky. To those who know the participants, the truth of it will appear self-evident.

During the trip in a tanker across the Atlantic after Trotsky was expelled from Norway, the food was horrible. Natalia, in delicate health for years, just released from nerve-racking months of internment while friends were shot down in Moscow, worrying about the fate of her youngest son, found herself forced to go hungry. She grew weaker, more ill. As they neared tropical Mexico she had dreams of some kind of fruit, oranges. At Tampico, one of the burning hot ports in the Gulf, they were taken by Shachtman to a hotel. Trotsky asked Shachtman as a personal favor to go out immediately and get some fruit for Natalia. He himself was hungry too. Shachtman promised, took the key to the room, locked the old couple inside for safety, and went out for fruit. Natalia and Trotsky waited.

They waited fifteen minutes, thirty minutes, forty-five minutes. One hour.

It was stifling in the room. No water. No tea. Nothing but heat. They were afraid to hammer on the door. They did not speak Spanish. The first person who came might prove to be a Stalinist. Trotsky told us he could never forget that wait...

Two hours.

Three hours.

They began to fear for Shachtman's safety.

Late in the afternoon they heard the key rattle in the door. It was not a GPU agent—it was Shachtman finally returned.

"And the fruit?" asked the Old Man.

"Oh," said Shachtman laughing light-heartedly at his own expense. "I forgot it."

He had been sight-seeing.

"It's not that he had bad intentions," explained Trotsky. "It's just that he does nothing seriously. But I could not forget his leaving us like that, especially leaving Natalia after she had been thinking of fruit when we reached Mexico."

The Petty-Bourgeois Anti-Trotskyists

In a delicate little foot-note Johnson informs us that "This does not mean that this writer, for instance, is in complete agreement with everything Trotsky wrote. There are not negligible sections to which he is absolutely opposed. These will be taken up in good time. But the disagreements are family disagreements."

No one asks that a follower of Trotsky be in "complete agreement with everything Trotsky wrote." Trotsky himself was not in "complete agreement" with everything he wrote. In the last faction struggle for instance, he pointed out that he made serious errors in the field of party organization before the October Revolution. He added that the petty-bourgeois oppositionists in 1940 were committing errors greatly similar to those he had made in the days before he became a Leninist. It is safe to assume however that Johnson is not referring to that period, but to the period *after* Trotsky became a Leninist. What are these differences—these "not negligible sections"? In an "appreciation" that sets out to give Trotsky's "place in history" it is only fair to the reader that he be warned wherein the author differs in views from those of the man he is "placing" in history. There is no other way for the reader to judge the relative value of the writer's estimation. If he agrees with the historian then he will consider the estimation all the more solid. If he disagrees he will at least know that this much of the worth of the estimation hinges on the value of the disagreements. Unlike a Marxist politician whose motto is to say what is, Johnson leaves us completely in the dark. We see only the vague forms of misty shapes called "not negligible sections." From a man of Johnson's erudition they might be fearful monsters!

A review of the past faction struggle however may shed a little light on these hobgoblins.

When the second world war broke out shortly after the pact between Hitler and Stalin was signed, Burnham, Abern, and Shachtman formed their grouping. Under cover of differences over how we should estimate the invasion of Poland and Finland by the Red Army they began a campaign for revision of the program of the Fourth International in regard to its estimate of the need to defend the Soviet Union. The differences however were discovered to be more profound as the struggle developed. In place of a highly disciplined cohesive proletarian party fighting as a unit for the socialist revolution, they advocated a heterogeneous party in which a minority at any time might publicly advocate views conflicting with those officially adopted by the majority of the party. Instead of a party built on the lines advocated by Lenin and Trotsky, they advocated a party built on the lines of the Mensheviks—a Norman Thomas all-inclusive party, a Dwight Macdonald dream party. Differences were discovered on the class analysis of the state, and on the applicability of the

method of Marxism in analyzing world events. The opposition was clearly petty-bourgeois, alien to the working class. Trotsky summoned the ranks of the Fourth International to give them battle. Trotsky personally led this last great ideological struggle. When the revisionists found themselves a minority at the convention which was called to settle the differences, they deserted the party and set up a rival organization.

The revisionists prefer silence now about the lessons of this historic struggle.

When they found themselves in opposition to Trotsky, the revisionists retaliated with a demand for "independent thinking." An independent thinker according to them was a person who joined their group in independence from the majority—the implication was independent of Trotsky. The proletarian majority of the party was interested in arriving at a correct solution to the burning political questions posed by the outbreak of the world war, including the attack on the program of the Fourth International. "Independent thinking" in their estimation was a petty-bourgeois concept reflecting the wish of the petty-bourgeois to be "independent" of the class struggle. We do not know whether the revisionists still advocate "independent thinking." They have not seen fit in recent numbers of their press to inform us about this burning requisite for a revolutionary. But Johnson apparently still believes in "independent thinking." He demonstrated it in action by his splitting Trotsky into two personalities: the one, Trotsky a genius in theory; the other, Trotsky a simpleton in practice. Neither of these personalities correspond to the real Trotsky; in fact Johnson may be said to have demonstrated by this attempt that he has arrived at complete independence from anything in common with Trotsky either as theorist or practical politician.

From independent thinking the revisionists proceeded to discover that Trotsky was so two-faced, devious, double dealing, and "mesquin" that he propagates two political lines—one line for the unscrupulous and hypocritical sheep in the party, that is the Cannonites, another line in complete opposition to the first for the more intelligent general public and followers of Burnham. This was called "shame-faced defensism." Dwight Macdonald even published a document on the "shame-faced defensism" of Trotsky which was never disavowed by any of his fellow-factionalists. And now Macdonald is busy continuing this sort of politics by publicly attacking the "basic tenets of Marxism," including in his attack an "appreciation" of his own on Trotsky's place in history. Neither Johnson nor Shachtman naturally are interested in defending the "basic tenets of Marxism." They are interested only in presenting to the world their own "appreciation" of Trotsky's place in history.

The culmination of politics of this "idealist" sort came with Burnham's accusation that Trotsky in "capitulating to Stalinism" had become a "left cover for Hitler." Monstrous charges! Neither Johnson nor Shachtman saw fit to defend Trotsky against Burnham when the renegade levelled these charges. In fact they saw fit instead to follow Burnham out of the party within a few days. Do Johnson and Shachtman still believe that Trotsky capitulated to Stalinism and became a left cover for Hitler? Is this what Johnson means when he says that there are not "negligible sections" of what Trotsky wrote to which he is opposed?

If they think they can reduce such differences to the status of a "family disagreement" they are mistaken. Trotsky threshed out in public all his differences with these modern pygmy representatives of Menshevism. They lack the elementary honesty to state their differences with him even in their

"appreciation" of his place in history. This also is a characteristic of a petty-bourgeois politician. Like the shopkeeper whose mentality they reflect, they peddle adulterated goods with the most moral expression in the world.

The "appreciation" these moralists offer of Trotsky far from being an honest attempt to estimate his historical role and to carry out in action the necessary consequences of that estimation, is nothing but a continuation of their struggle against the Fourth International. It is the spreading of the

gangrene of petty-bourgeois revisionism already diagnosed by Trotsky. But like themselves as a political current, their "appreciation" is doomed to oblivion. Under the stainless banner of Trotsky's Fourth International the coming period will see the triumph of the armies of socialism. All the dirt and filth of capitalism will be swept into the garbage can and along with it the faint-hearted skeptics and revisionists who thought through their puny and dishonest voices to halt Trotsky's Fourth International from going forward.

War Strips The Lovestonites

By JACK WEBER

The Lovestonites have been engaged in reexamining their attitude on the war. Revolutionary Marxists are accustomed to such a procedure, its purpose in their case being to strengthen the strategy and tactics of the working class to meet new turns and developments in the class struggle. But this is emphatically not the aim of the "Independent" Labor League of America. The voluminous discussion carried on in the *Workers Age* reveals this group shifting over the helm so as to ride more comfortably with the stream. Far from being concerned with the political independence of the working class in the most acute phase of the class struggle, the Lovestonites engage in giving their "independent" reasons for half-hearted support to one imperialist side as against the other. Reasons aside, this has been the ideological procedure of the petty bourgeois radicals from the very outset of the war. The "Independent" League is merely the latest to fall in step and it is not yet in full stride. It has first to pass through that uncomfortable period in which the old uniform is properly cast aside and the new one donned.

"Principles—But Not Now!"

It was Bismarck who said: "To accept 'in principle' means in the language of diplomacy to reject in actuality." This applies with perfection to the Lovestonites. Principles above all, but not now! We stand by our principles, but we must face the actuality. Marxist analysis is correct, but we must not be rigid about applying it in the next six months. Let us dip into this muddy well. S. Meffan writes (July 20): "I quote this because I believe traditional Marxist analysis can be applied to the present world situation, but that most traditional socialist cure-all slogans might as well be thrown in the ash-can." That is, the doctrines we accepted for years must now be cast aside. The situation has changed and they have become "cure-alls." Meffan obligingly illustrates with the Leninist heritage of the first imperialist war of which the present one is the continuation. Revolutionary defeatism, we are told, is not a principle but merely a tactic which cannot be applied now. At bottom this can only be interpreted as meaning that the working class must not attempt to seize the power during the war. The very way in which Meffan poses the problem (and this applies to all the Lovestonites) shows the dependence of these petty bourgeois ideologists on the capitalist class and its aims and actions. "So the question is, I repeat: Under what conditions can the socialist movement benefit most or suffer least?" That is, victory of the Allied capitalists or the fascist imperialists. How can we suffer least? That is the momentous decision involved in their whole discussion. Like all the others Meffan starts with an account of the reactionary nature of the imperialist war, the aims of both sides, the fact that an allied victory would also result in a totalitarian society—but not to the one and only

genuine brand of Hitler totalitarianism! "Socialists would have a much better chance in a Europe run by a harassed (!) ALLIED dictatorship than in a Europe run by Hitler's well-oiled Nazi machine." And Meffan believes seriously that he is using the method of Marxism when he at the same time ignores all the lessons (the cure-alls) learned at such cost in the past. Every single great event of the past period warns the working class that to tail behind any section of the capitalist class is to do so at the risk of utter rout and defeat. The capitalist system in decay poses before us one all-embracing problem: what independent course *must* the workers in each country pursue to save civilization by ridding the world of capitalism. All that the Lovestonites can ask is which of the capitalist countries decay less rapidly *and must therefore be supported—or not resisted!* Under which regime will we suffer the least—the sum total of the independent politics of Lovestone and Co.

The complete perversion of Marxism is seen in the wind-up of Meffan's argument. Apparently the war has reached the stage, for the Lovestonites, where the power is no longer in the hands of the national capitalist class but in the hands of "the people." (We will see this also in Lovestone's brain-storm.) "What of England? I believe the slogan of revolutionary defeatism has no meaning there any more than in France. I do not know exactly what socialists in England are doing, but in line with this article it would seem that revolutionary defense (if we must have a slogan) should be the order of the day." In a feeble attempt to sugar-coat this monstrous idea, Meffan explains that he means the advocacy by the workers of the sort of peace only possible if the workers had the power. The Independent League would thus tie the working class to the capitalists even to the extent of covering up the real aims of those actually in power, their imperialist robber aims, with the aims of the workers. Revolutionary defensism by the workers of their exploiters in the seats of power!! This is the aim held in common with the Labor Party ministers who dragoon the proletariat to fight the war for the imperialists.

Gorkin, Who Supported People's Front

The same issue of *Workers Age* contains an article by the POUMist Gorkin. There is a spicy piquancy in its utterly correct condemnation of the Popular Front in France, in view of the fact that Gorkin participated so actively in the Popular Front in Spain which betrayed not a potential but an actual revolution. With painstaking accuracy we sum up Gorkin's article: "We must hold fast to our principles but we must not act according to them." He himself places the two in violent contradiction: "We cannot fall into either of two errors: an underestimation of present-day realities in the name of prin-

ciples, or a lapse from principles under pretext of present-day realities." The principles must continue to exist and to make their way—but not in this world! Gorkin tells us: "The only possible peace is a socialist peace, and this can be attained only by the revolutionary destruction of capitalism." If this were meant for anything more than a decent piety, he would have to add that the only way to achieve this is not by a passive, fatalistic, "lesser evil" policy but by active, independent, positive revolutionary politics on the part of the workers and their leaders, particularly where they still have their own class organizations. If Hitler appears so powerful today, it is only because as yet there exists no organized force inside Germany to combat him. What does Gorkin propose? A peace today would mean a Hitler peace. "The proletariat can, therefore, neither desire nor support such a peace which would seal its fate of slavery and postpone the hour of its revolutionary emancipation." How combat a Hitler peace? "Six months or a year more of war would undoubtedly weaken their (Hitler and Mussolini) regimes, despite past victories, and would place the Italo-German proletariat in a position to initiate their own revolution, coincident with the revolutionary struggle in France (written before the final collapse of France) and in the colonies." A short six months will now suffice Gorkin. And what preparations are necessary in this brief space of time? None. The only remaining organized proletarian forces must show the German workers what can be done by playing possum and not moving an eyelash. We must leave to the English bourgeoisie (and socialists) the task of holding on so that the workers can benefit from a Hitler defeat. "We must not from near or far (!) solidarize ourselves with British imperialism and with the war it is conducting against German-Italian imperialism. This imperialist war, today like yesterday, is not our war. But in the present situation, we must not systematically oppose its continuation. Nor can we oppose the shipment of war materials from America to England. Everything which will contribute to the weakening of the power of Hitler and Mussolini and to the liquidation of the material conditions and the moral effect of their victory is progressive, revolutionary." If it is progressive, nay revolutionary, why not whole-heartedly support it? Gorkin proposes to leave the task of downing fascism to the English bourgeoisie, and on top of that not to give them any active help. The answer? "This, of course (of course!), does not represent a betrayal of our principles and of our political line, which we must maintain with the greatest firmness." What political line does Gorkin mean? Firm opposition to the class enemy, the main enemy, the one at home? No, that is to be postponed—for six months only! We have always preferred the outright 'principled' opportunists to the hypocritical, completely bankrupt variety. But since everything in this world is relative, Gorkin is almost principled compared to some of his confreres.

Brazen Class Collaborationism

To see class collaboration not in shame-faced but in brazen form, one has to read the ignominious Herberg. The same Herberg, we must remind the reader, whose principles permitted him knowingly to condone the bloody frameups against the Russian Bolsheviks by Stalin (until they were exposed against Herberg's opposition) on the ground that these frameups would be forgotten in a century or two when the Revolution would be acknowledged to have been a tremendous step forward. Unbelievably Herberg revives the old Lovestone theory of American exceptionalism. We thought this so well buried that it would have been indecent on our part to disinter it. Here is its present form, after all the years of crisis.

"If we (who?) can so reorganize our economic and social system as to provide jobs for those who are able and willing to work, opportunity and a future for the youth, and a measure of security, welfare and freedom for all, we will have no reason whatever to fear the advent of fascism in this country no matter what happens in Europe." Herberg is talking not about the socialist era after the revolution but about American capitalism in 1940. "If America manages to keep out of the blood-bath in Europe it may still be able to play a powerful part in saving the world from utter ruin after the war." The "independent" policy of Herberg thus consists in advising, calling upon the American capitalists to utilize their power and their system for the true benefit of the masses. After Hitler demonstrates that the fraud of autarchy was merely preparation for imperialist war, Herberg proposes that the United States take over this fraud from Hitler and establish its own economic system free from the rest of the world. Herberg suggests that the ruling class here give up its imperialist aims. His is a voice unhappily lost in the wilderness. This ruling class is entering upon a new stage involving the most gigantic arming ever seen to prepare for imperialist adventure. Today the course of America is clearly charted; the United States will surely enter the imperialist war, unless the workers take the power away from the capitalists in the interim, be it six months or two years. Short of that, the United States threatens to become as totalitarian as any of the states of Europe. Here as elsewhere only the workers can defeat fascism by defeating their own capitalists and taking power. Lovestone propounded his theory of exceptionalism on the eve of the greatest economic crisis ever experienced; Herberg proposes it anew on the eve of American entry into the imperialist war. This pleasant theory enables Herberg to make a division of labor. The workers here must see to it that America stays out of the war. But Herberg graciously approves the efforts of the English socialists in furthering the cause of national defense. Herberg will not permit his own capitalist government to lend any aid—he will leave that to the socialists of England. Such is the internationalism of this Lovestonite.

Least Common Denominator

Jay Lovestone's attitude distinguishes itself from that of Gorkin only in being more demagogic and hypocritical. Part of the essence of Marxism consists in distinguishing clearly between the aims of the capitalists and those of the workers in each situation, and advocating those policies which will further the aims of the workers as against those of their exploiters. All that Lovestone does is to jumble together the aims and tasks of the capitalist imperialists with those of the proletariat, a process that leads only to lulling the working class into passivity. "What we want most as a result of this war is the social revolution.—But what we fear most is a Nazi victory with its total destruction of all democratic rights and labor organizations, with its liquidation of the national independence of many countries."

In mathematics we call this kind of reasoning finding the least common denominator; namely, defeat of Hitler. "Our categorical opposition to a Nazi triumph does not mean that we should dedicate ourselves to the cause of an Allied imperialist victory. Our resolute opposition to a Nazi triumph does not mean that we look forward to an Allied victory as the solution of the basic problems—" To arrive at a least common denominator Hitler is endowed with exaggerated power, as is the case with all petty bourgeois ideologists. "A Hitler triumph would totally preclude the likelihood of a social revolution, while a Nazi debacle would offer fertile soil

for a proletarian revolt—despite any desires, maneuvers or moves to the contrary by the Allied ruling classes.” The soil remains quite fertile for revolution under Hitler, but the task becomes more difficult and requires more time, no doubt. But Lovestone proposes to utilize the remaining democracy and the remaining legal organizations of the workers in England, for the purpose not of guaranteeing a victory for the workers by preparing for the taking of power, but rather to assure a victory for Churchill. This wily capitalist meantime prepares behind the scenes to maintain capitalism, whether in victory or defeat. Already he shows his fangs to the Laborites in parliament. If he is victorious, he will hand the Laborites their dismissals and will clamp down on their constituents with the best brand of totalitarianism. If he is defeated he has prepared beyond question for the same kind of military dictatorship that appeared in France after defeat, and which was prepared for in advance. Finally, should the workers threaten Churchill with downfall at home, he will make every effort to hand England over to Hitler for preservation of the capitalist system. Isn't it clear that any support to the Churchills leads the workers into a trap, an impasse? This is the era of the decay of capitalism, says Lovestone. Yet, the bourgeoisie, despite themselves, can play temporarily a progressive role. In this case the English and French bourgeoisie would play the progressive role of overthrowing Hitler—for the working class! Lovestone winds up with a gem of thought—he advocates a “belated and thin” victory for the Allies. We will not embarrass him by asking him what a belated and thin victory looks like. Nor are we told who is to keep it thin and how. No doubt to keep the victory properly thin Lovestone will not permit the United States to join in the fray. He thinks American capitalism should stay out of the war, in order to preserve the labor movement here and the legal conditions under which it still flourishes.

“Our enemy is at home.” Quite correct, says Lovestone. But there are also other enemies of the working class, in this case the Nazis, more dangerous at the moment. Only after defeating this enemy will the workers be able to turn later on their “final” enemy. Lovestone then reminds us of Marx' attitude in the Franco-Prussian War and Lenin's on the defense of Kerensky against Kornilov. The analogy with the Franco-Prussian War let us dismiss at once as specious. The age of creation of national unity and national states in order to strike the finishing blows against feudalism and to permit capitalism to grow, is long past. In the present resumption of the first World War we witness a phase of the death agony of capitalism. Not a single feature of the imperialist war is progressive. As to the Kerensky analogy it is sheer fraud. With far more justice than is the case now, Kerensky tried to argue that if Russia were defeated in the war, it might mean defeat for the revolution and the restoration of czarism by the Germans. Lenin demonstrated for all time that the most certain way to preserve the revolution was to carry it thru to completion and to establish the workers' power firmly, despite defeat in the war. If this applied in backward Russia, how much more it would apply in advanced England. Can anyone doubt for a moment that the surest blow at Hitler would be a proletarian revolution in England or any other country? In the Kornilov affair there was involved not an imperialist war between Kornilov and Kerensky (the true analogy is with Kerensky and the war), but a civil war with the workers playing an independent role. Even while “defending” Kerensky, Lenin and Trotsky prepared openly to overthrow Kerensky by strengthening the Soviets and arming the workers. In what way does Lovestone pursue a course of strengthening the dual power of the workers?

Lovestone and Churchill

Does it make a difference who wins the war? To American capitalism the difference is so great that they plunge headlong into arming to the teeth in fear of a Hitler victory. To English capitalism a Hitler victory would bring bankruptcy. If Hitler loses then German capitalism is rendered impotent and bankrupt. Who will impose totalitarianism on the English workers if England is defeated? We repeat: behind the scenes Churchill is already preparing to do this whether in defeat or victory. Tomorrow English capitalists will combine with Hitler to enslave the workers. If England wins, Churchill will perform the same service for German capitalism. Behind the question there lurks in reality a substitution. What worker would not prefer a democratic regime to a fascist one? Is there a difference between democracy and fascism? Of course. But is the imperialist war a war between democracy and fascism? Squirm as he will, Lovestone answers basically: Temporarily, yes. In short he equates the imperialist war with an ideological war. Having done so, he seizes on every pretext to make it so. Churchill, you see, is arming the entire British people for defense. This puts a new face on matters. “In a conflict between an armed British people—the decisive majority of which is the working class—and the savage Nazi bandits, no self-respecting, no class-conscious worker can doubt or hesitate for a moment where he stands or whose victory he wants.” This is nothing more than a way of psychologizing the idea of an ideological war between democracy and fascism. We are for the arming of the entire British people, including those in the colonies, but we are unalterably opposed to the use of these arms to further the interests of the imperialists. We shall expose every attempt to call the war of the capitalist governments over imperial plunder a war of one imperialist government against “the people” of the other.

Basically there is nothing new in all the arguments of these shabby opportunists. They say they are not for English imperialism, only against German. The social chauvinist David used precisely the same expression in voting the war credits to the Kaiser in the last war. He was “not for the war, but against defeat,” in order to preserve the German labor movement. How well it was preserved by the social democrats we know. Lenin devoted himself to combatting this form of working class betrayal in the last world war. He said: “The petty bourgeois viewpoint differs from the bourgeois one—outright justification of imperialist war—in that the petty bourgeoisie renounces annexations, ‘condemns’ imperialism, ‘demands’ from the bourgeoisie to cease being imperialistic while remaining within the framework of world imperialist relations and the capitalist structure of society.” This applies to all the defenders of bourgeois democracy today, including the Lovestonites. Their present attitude is merely the bridge to their attitude tomorrow. If it was correct for the English socialists to aid their government, how much more correct it will be to aid the United States government in a war with Hitler if England is defeated. The working class can find no solution of its problems of life and death along this path. Support to the “democratic bourgeoisie” in this war means support to the narrowing down of democratic rights to the point where there is no longer any difference between the democratic and the fascist country. The way to preserve democratic rights is for the workers to defend these rights against their own bourgeoisie, their own main enemy. Only the proletarian revolution can bring about the doom of fascism, whether in Germany or elsewhere. The task of defeating Hitler remains the task of the workers, not of the bourgeoisie.

America's Productive Capacity

By C. CHARLES

PRODUCTIVITY, WAGES AND NATIONAL INCOME, by Spurgeon Bell; the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., 1940; pp. 344, including index.

* * *

Between the years 1923-1924 and 1936-1937 productivity, the power of a unit of labor to achieve a desired result, increased in manufacturing by 50%; in mining by 89%; in railroads by 43% and in electric light and power by 111%. We use the average of the year 1936-1939 because this marks the high point in industrial production achieved since the crash, although the present year (1940) promises to equal and possibly surpass it. The above four industries account for 75% of the wage workers in the country, and without a doubt similar rates of increase in productivity hold true for the other industries.

Has the greatly increased productivity that has marked these fifteen years resulted in economic benefit to the masses? asks Mr. Bell in his book.

First, has this greatly strengthened power of man over nature meant an increased output? In 1937, the high year since 1929, according to information given by the Federal Reserve Board, total industrial production reached 109% of the average of 1923-25. In manufacturing production was 124%, in railroading 112%, in electric light and power, the only really expanding industry, it reached 233%. Thus realized production was far below what the potential productivity and increased labor supply makes possible. In the meantime the population increased by about 115%.

How did wages fare in this period? In the words of Mr. Bell: "Annual earnings of workers attached to industry have shown a very substantial decline. In terms of money . . . over 30% and even with allowances for a change in the cost of living it was something like 20%" (computed in real wages—the amount of goods and services monetary wages can buy). In this period, hourly wages increased roughly 20% in monetary terms and 45% in buying power; weekly wages were reduced 10% in money and increased 10% in buying power.

The real gain to the working class in this period is in shorter hours for the employed workers. Working 20% less time, the employed worker was able to buy as much as he formerly did. However, when one considers that very few workers are employed throughout the year, and when one considers the class as a whole, both employed and unemployed, the decrease in real and monetary wages has been, as pointed out, drastic.

The salaried employee in the manufacturing, railroad and electric light and power industries, received \$34 less in his annual

pay envelop. This would mean a real increase in wages of about 13.6% for each employee, working substantially fewer hours. However, and this is a point that Mr. Bell does not mention, the concept "salaried employee" is a very misleading one: it runs from the corporation official earning \$100,000; \$50,000; \$25,000 or \$10,000 a year to the typist who draws \$14 or \$16 a week. These high "salaries" are merely a form of disguised profits. The improvement in the position of the salaried employee is exaggerated, to speak conservatively.

A decrease of 6% was registered in this period in the income of the capitalist class, from \$5,070 millions in 1923-24 to \$4,768 millions in 1936-37; in the rate of return to capital the figures are 6.37% and 5.55%, a decrease of 13%. This does not take into consideration hidden profits.

Did prices fall proportionately to the increase in the rate of productivity? In manufacturing prices fell by 33%, in railroads by 20% and in electric light and power by 40%. Or by another method of computation, in manufacturing the unit wage cost fell to 76 while wholesale prices fell to 83.7; in the railroad industry the unit wage cost fell to 78.6 while the unit price on freight fell to 85.9 and the passenger unit price fell to 60.9, thanks to bus competition; in mining the unit wage cost fell to 56.1 while the wholesale price was 81.4; and in electric light and power, the unit wage and salary cost sank to 62.9 while revenue per kilowatt hour was 76.6. These are two different methods, and space does not allow us to go into the basis of the difference in result.

Prices are substantially above the level that increased productivity would allow. The old motive force for a lowering of price with a reduction in the amount of labor involved in producing a commodity is for long periods non-operative in this day of concentration and monopolization of industry.

Capitalist economists are smugly proud of the hourly wage increase from 50.3 cents in 1933 to 58.3 cents in 1934, 62.2 cents in 1935 and up to 71 cents in 1938.

Yet there was no scarcity in labor due to boom conditions with a resultant increase in the price of labor. Labor was not scarce—the opposite is true. Production did increase it is true but even so there was a large proportion (26%) of the labor supply unoccupied. In the prosperous period from 1923 to 1929, with a far less supply of labor, money wages went up only 5.7 cents an hour and real wages 6.8 cents an hour. Yet in 1933-38 real and monetary wages increased tremendously. Why this difference? The answer is not to be found in the workings of the capitalist system, but in the intervention in these workings of the labor movement. The answer to the question, why did hourly wages go up, is not a benevolent Washington government, but the growth and militancy of the trade union movement. This was absent in the previous period.

Mr. Bell believes in the capitalist system. He does not see that capitalism is a barrier to economic progress not only because of the large share of the income taken by the parasitic ruling class,* but also because the present social system stands in the way of even an approach to the full utilization of the productive potentialities its laboratories and research institutes have discovered.

Capitalism has thrown the country into an economic crisis that has resulted in the loss between 1929 and 1938 of 200 billion dollars. Just as it must undergo periodic crises to keep functioning so it must undergo periodic wars. It keeps the consuming power of the masses of the people down by low wages and high prices. Capitalism has shown the world how to produce. That has been its great historic function. Now it must give way to a new society that will be able to use this productive potentiality.

The forces of production have come in conflict with the property relations of society. This conflict can be "reconciled" temporarily on the Procrustian bed of fascism, or can be really solved by socialism, which will end private ownership of the means of production and thereby give their development an enormous impetus.

For the facts and figures contained in this book we recommend it. It is an excellent case book for the study of Capital—which I imagine was furthest from the writer's mind when he wrote it.

C. CHARLES

*The following figures give the proportion of the income from each industry appropriated by the capitalist class in 1936-37:

Manufacturing	24.7
Railroads	32.4
Electric light and power	64.1

If your number on your wrapper reads:

N 48, or F 6,

your subscription expires with this issue. In order to avoid missing a single issue of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**, be sure to send in your renewal order immediately. \$2.00 for one year, \$3.00 for one year in combination with the **SOCIALIST APPEAL**.

BOOKS MAKE THE BEST GIFTS

CHRISTMAS OFFER

History of the Russian Revolution by Trotsky \$3.00

Living Thoughts of Marx by Trotsky 1.00

BOTH FOR \$2.79

Other Gift Suggestions

ALL THE BRAVE (*drawings of the Spanish civil war by Quintanilla*) (*was \$1*) .. .29

FONTAMARA by *IGNAZIO SILONE*19

MAN'S FATE by *ANDRE MALRAUX* 1.25

AMERICA'S 60 FAMILIES 1.39

STUDS LONIGAN by *JAMES FARRELL*..... 1.25

FATHER AND SON by *JAMES FARRELL*..... 2.75

U. S. A. by *JOHN DOS PASSOS* 1.25

and

ALL BOOKS OF ALL PUBLISHERS

MODERN BOOKSHOP

27 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

(Written orders must be accompanied by remittance)