
August, 1941

Fourth International

TROTSKY MEMORIAL NUMBER

Father and Son	Natalia Trotsky
Lev Davidovich	Karl Mayer
Trotskyism Lives	The Editors
Stalin Seeks My Death	Leon Trotsky

The Federal Prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party

Articles By William F. Warde and Felix Morrow

The Soviet Union At War

By John G. Wright

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

A year has passed since the assassination of Leon Trotsky. People who saw in Trotskyism a movement based solely upon admiration for the genius of a man predicted a rapid disintegration of our forces after the Old Man's death.

Yet this year has not only shown an inner solidification of the Trotskyist movement, but has brought an extension of the influence of our press throughout the world. The very process of social and political decay which drives capitalist reaction to persecute us also drives the world working class to assimilate Marxist theory.

The great hunger of the proletariat for an understanding of its life process has never and will never go unsatisfied. The wealth of proletarian revolutionary science will spread — and does spread. The devices a desperate and dying bourgeois world uses to hinder this spread may be subtle or openly terrorist; they are all equally futile historically.

* * *

Excerpts from three communications are illustrative of the opinions of the readers in this country:

"In these times of darkness and chaos the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL stands out as a light of hope and inspiration. But more than that, the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL — like THE MILITANT — is today, even more than before, a living, breathing, fighting instrument of the working-class struggle. We must keep living, breathing and fighting."

"Believe me, after reading for three weeks the filth of the bourgeois press, the columns of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and MILITANT were like a breath of fresh air."

"You comrades are doing a fine job of getting out both revolutionary organs. It will be up to the comrades on the battle front to see that money comes in so the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL can come out."

* * *

The letters which occasionally find their way through social disorganization, war and censorship give us significant insights into the way in which the movement carries on under all conditions.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

Volume II August 1941 No. 7 (Whole No. 14)

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


WILLIAM F. WARDE

FELIX MORROW

Business Manager:

LYDIA BEIDEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Trotskyism Lives	By The Editors	195
Father And Son	By Natalia Trotsky	196
Stalin Seeks My Death	By Leon Trotsky	201
Lev Davidovich	By Karl Mayer	207
The Right of Revolution	By William F. Warde	209
Text of the Federal Indictment		212
The Federal Prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party	By Felix Morrow	214
The Soviet Union at War	By John G. Wright	217
Zinoviev and Kamenev	By Leon Trotsky	222
MANAGER'S COLUMN	Inside Front Cover	 267

One comes this month from Asia Minor. It reads in part: "I turn to you with a request that you send us your papers and other publications with regularity. Among us there is a group which is very much interested in your theoretical explanations which are very new for us but of great fascination."

"The publications we received until the end of last year were completely read by us. Please now send us your latest jour-

nals."

From England we again get a request for a change of address "because of enemy action" and find at the end of the short, business-like note: "The material has been reaching us quite regularly and we are very glad to have it. We find the material on the Military Policy most useful and we are looking ahead with confidence now in the new turn of events."

Our most cherished letter of

the month, however, has the following to say:

"A lot of water has passed through London, and a lot of water has been poured on London, since we last met. That seems a devil of a while ago to me.

"My main purpose in writing is to express my thanks and gratitude to everyone concerned for the way in which you have all endeavored to breach the gap in recent times. I cannot express all I feel about the matter but I would like you to know how very much I have appreciated all the items which you have sent me so regularly. I thank you for those that reached me and I must thank you for those that did not reach me — for I know of course that there have been losses, as you will know too. Many a time during very depressing periods your publications have been most welcome I can assure you. They have helped to break down that feeling of isolation, and in the midst of most trying circumstances have been a beacon of light in an abominable gloom.

"The death of L. T. was a great blow, something anticipated and yet not expected.

"You were no doubt informed that a Memorial Meeting was held here in London. During the meeting an air-raid warning took place, so the process of the meeting had to be held up (according to regulations) to allow anyone desirous of seeking shelter to do so. But needless to say no one left the meeting for that; they had come to pay their tribute to a great leader and preferred to stay.

"Thanks again for all the interesting and enlightening material which you have sent me. I would like to send you quite a number of news items, but you know how things are with us, and anyway, judging from American publications, you must often know more about what has been on than we do over here ourselves."

MEMORIAL PAMPHLETS

Leon Trotsky Memorial Address

"To the Memory of the Old Man"

By James P. Cannon

15 page pamphlet—5c

THE ASSASSINATION OF LEON TROTSKY

The Proofs of Stalin's Guilt

By Albert Goldman

74 page pamphlet—15c

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 55 or F 14

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 Militant.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 2

AUGUST 1941

NUMBER 7

Trotskyism Lives

By THE EDITORS

One year after Trotsky's death, the American Trotskyist leaders are under indictment by the capitalist government of the United States for propagating his ideas. It is symbolically appropriate that the indicted members of the Socialist Workers Party should be arraigned in the federal court in August, just a year after Trotsky was struck down. Thus the class enemy testifies to the growing power of Trotsky's immortal ideas, his program for the emancipation of humanity through the socialist revolution.

The Roosevelt administration has now added its name to the long list of governments which persecute the Trotskyists.

We are hounded by Hitler, Mussolini, Petain (who merely continues where his "democratic" predecessors left off), Franco, Vargas, Batista, Chiang-Kai-shek, Churchill and the British colonial administrations—there was no reason to expect that Roosevelt would long remain an exception to the rule.

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

"If I really think"—I (Coulondre) 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: M. Trotsky." Interrupting me, the Chancellor shouted: "Then why have you given Poland free rein?" (*Diplomatic Documents, 1938-1939*, p. 260, Document No. 242).

By "M. Trotsky," of course, both of them meant the socialist revolution. "War will inevitably provoke revolution," says the frightened representative of "democratic" imperialism to frighten his adversary. "Then why," answers Hitler: fascist and "democrat" speak on the common ground of fear of the revolutionary consequences of the war.

Driven by this fear, fascist and "democratic" rulers alike hound the revolutionists. Whatever else divides them, they join in the relentless persecution of the Trotskyists; they retain the united front of the capitalist class against their class enemy.

Roosevelt and the capitalist class for which he governs have no more abiding faith in their future than has Hitler and the German bourgeoisie in their future. All the imperialists know and fear the fact that out of this war will come a series of workers' revolutions far more extensive and deeper than those which put an end to the last war. The bestiality with which all the imperialists vainly attempt to destroy the

revolutionists is but an index to the certainty with which they expect the revolutionary wave.

Trotsky's Example Under Persecution

The oppressors answer our ideas with physical blows. Trotsky suffered many such blows after he, as a boy of 18, entered the workers' movement. He was imprisoned in Czarist Russia, the French Republic, the Spanish Monarchy, Canada, Norway. He was shot at by White Guards, imperialist interventionists, GPU gangs. His heart and body shook with the death-blows struck at him through the murder of his secretaries, his closest collaborators, his children, by the Cain in the Kremlin. And finally a GPU assassin pierced his brain with a pickaxe on that terrible day of August 20, 1940, and, still fighting, Trotsky died the next day.

Trotsky's inspiring example taught us how to answer the blows heaped on us by the enemies of the workers' revolution. Prison became for him a place of preparation for the next stage of the revolutionary upsurge. He came out of Kerensky's jail to lead the greatest revolution in history. Exile in Asia did not prevent him from maintaining collaboration with the movement. In the darkest days of his life, when his son Leon was struck down, he chained himself to his desk and made of his obituary for his dead son a burning inspiration to the revolutionary youth of all countries. With his brain pierced by the GPU pickaxe, he called to his side a comrade and dictated to him his last message to the workers of all countries: "Please say to our friends I am sure of the victory of the Fourth International. Go forward!"

The blows of our enemies have cost us dearly. Stalin's murder of Trotsky was the most terrible blow that the revolutionary movement has sustained in this epoch. Even now, a year after, we can hardly write of what it meant to us and our co-thinkers the world over to lose his wise counsel, the ever-fresh inspiration of his living being. The loss to the working class movement is underlined every day. We have only to think of what it would have meant to the Soviet masses and the world labor movement were Trotsky alive when the Red Army he founded was confronted with the task of defending the Soviet Union against the Nazi armies.

But Trotsky taught us, over and over, the power of the revolutionary idea, how the political line drives forward and triumphs despite physical losses. Not our numbers at any given moment, but our ideas, our program, is decisive: "It is not the party that makes the program; it is the program that makes the party." And again: "We work with the most correct and powerful ideas in the world, with inadequate numerical forces and material means. But correct ideas, in the long run, always conquer and make available for themselves the

necessary material means." Stalin could kill Trotsky; neither he nor the imperialists can kill Trotskyism.

The last years of Trotsky's life exemplify the power of his ideas. When Stalin expelled him to Turkey in 1929, Stalin made his greatest mistake, which could not be rectified by the success of the GPU assassin eleven years later. Stalin undoubtedly thought he was condemning Trotsky to hopeless isolation by stranding him in Turkey and cutting him off from his comrades in the Soviet Union. In seeking to stifle Trotsky, Stalin had the aid of all the imperialists; he was expelled from France and Norway, refused admittance by "democratic" Germany, Britain, the United States; and only found precarious refuge in semi-colonial Mexico. Yet Trotsky's unconquerable ideas made their way, despite the lack of material means. Before he died he had the happiness of knowing that Trotskyism had penetrated so deeply in the world working class movement that all the forces of reaction could not uproot it.

A Roosevelt Spokesman on Trotskyism

One year after Trotsky's death, while the government persecutes us as revolutionists, the Stalinist apparatus must occupy itself with its endlessly dreary falsification of Trotskyism. Without daring to quote our ideas the *Daily Worker* denounces them; it lies about us, calling us "the fifth column in the labor movement." Stalinism must continue its battle to the death against us and thus involuntarily testify to the fact that the GPU assassin who destroyed Trotsky's brain failed to destroy the vast heritage left to us by that brain.

The bourgeoisie undoubtedly appreciates the services rendered by the Stalinist School of Falsification. But the bourgeoisie must at critical times give itself a true accounting of what Stalinism really is and what Trotskyism really stands for. Such an accounting was given on Tuesday, August 5, 1941, by Senator Barkley, the Democratic Majority leader of the Senate. He warmly defended Stalin against Trotsky, placing sole blame upon Trotsky for any attempt to spread Communism throughout the world.

Senator Barkley said:

"When they (the Russian people after the revolution of 1917) started out, they had a vague, fantastic notion that they would socialize or communize the world; and the fundamental difference between Stalin and Trotsky was over that question. Trot-

sky, as I understand the matter, was a world revolutionist, while Stalin took the position that the Russian Government owed its first duty to the Russian people... the fight between Trotsky and Stalin revolved around the question whether they should undertake to revolutionize the world or should concentrate on Russia. Stalin won, and Trotsky had to leave the country." (*Congressional Record*, August 5, 1941, p. 6908.)

Senator Barkley was explaining to the "isolationists" who, he well understands, only temporarily differ with him on the choice of tactics to advance the well-being and expansion of American imperialism. "Stalin serves us; he is not like Trotsky," Barkley explains to his fellow-imperialists.

Barkley's point is very important for the bourgeoisie. The "democratic" bourgeoisie can rule only with the aid of its labor lieutenants; without the trade union bureaucracy, it could not keep the masses in check for a day. The Stalinist bureaucracy renders a similar service on a world scale to the rulers of the "democracies" today.

Trotsky's Monument

But these props will suffice the imperialists in this bloody epoch of wars and revolutions no more than the Mensheviks could prop up the Kerensky regime, or the Social Democrats could save the regime of the German and Austro-Hungarian Kaisers. By driving the masses of the imperialist countries to support "their" imperialist masters, the labor bureaucracies throughout the world are expending their moral capital.

Now approach years like those of 1916 and 1917—years in which the revolutionary cadres, through their fight against all the imperialists in this war, find their way to the leadership of the great masses. In 1914 and 1915 Lenin and Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht still seemed like voices crying in the wilderness. By all criteria our party is more firmly knit, more adequately organized and prepared for the gigantic opportunities that lie ahead, than were the revolutionary groups of 1914 and 1915.

Trotsky lived to see the triumph of his ideas in the October revolution of 1917. The GPU assassin prevented him from seeing the still greater vindication which lies ahead. Countless future generations will remember with love and gratitude the man who showed humanity the way to freedom. Trotsky is dead. Trotskyism lives and will build for Trotsky the greatest monument conceivable—socialism.

Father And Son

By NATALIA SEDOV TROTSKY

"I can therefore say that I live on this earth not in accordance with the rule but as an exception to the rule." June 8, 1940

Trotsky

Night. Darkness. I awaken. Pale patches of light flicker and then disappear. I raise myself... The sound of shots breaks upon my ears. They are shooting here, in our room. I have always been a light sleeper, and on awakening can quickly orient myself as to what is happening.

* * *

Lev Davidovich was a sound sleeper in his younger years. Insomnia beset him for the first time when attacks against the Opposition began in the USSR, when the pages of *Pravda*

began to overflow with black slander, unimaginable, fantastic slander which overwhelmed and dumbfounded the readers. To defend and justify themselves the slanderers used lies: they had no other weapon at their disposal.

Did the reading public believe them? Yes and no. The colossal tide of raging malice swept over them, engulfed them and they became disoriented... Tired, worn-out by the heroic years of the revolution, filled with fears about the future of its conquests, they began to believe the calumny, just as people begin to place faith in miracles during periods of decline and prostration. I used to see how the hands of readers would tremble as they held up the huge pages of *Pravda*; their hands would drop and then would be upraised again.

Our boys also lost sleep. The younger one, in bitter per-

plexity, would ask me: "What is it? Why do they say these things about papa? How dare they?"* The older one, Leon, became frantic and was in a constant state of excitement. With a pale face he would tell me of his impressions in the circles of the youth and of his struggle against the buffets of the torrent of filth. "Brave little tailor," (a hero of one of Andersen's fairy tales), his father would say observing him with approbation.

"The brave little tailor" took pride in his health, and was not a little upset during that period by the unexpected insomnia, but he did not give in. He remained proud of his health until the last two years of his life, when suddenly it worsened quickly. The black years of the cynical Moscow trials mowed him down. For our son Leon was, though *in absentia*, one of the chief defendants. The venom of criminal slander entered like poison into his young body. His entire nervous system was affected by the murders of Zinoviev, Piatakov, Muralov, Smirnov, Kamenev, Bukharin and many others; Kamenev and Bukharin he knew from his childhood, with the others he became acquainted later on, and he knew them all as honest revolutionists, he learned from them, loved them, respected them and connected them with the revolution, with its heroism, with its *Lenin and Trotsky***

Nights of sleeplessness returned and he did not have the strength to fight them off. Sleeping drugs worked poorly on him. He would doze off only towards morning. And he had to get up between seven and eight in order to begin work, which was rendered still more difficult by the surveillance of the ever-wakeful GPU whose agents, as was later revealed, occupied quarters next to his. He lived at No. 26; they at No. 28.

Father and Son During the Moscow Trials

Our arrest in Norway aroused our son to the very core of his being: he was fully aware of what it meant. Our departure for Mexico, the three weeks' journey on board the oil tanker surrounded only by enemies introduced mortal alarm into his life. When we were at Gourum—the place of our incarceration in Norway—he sent us directions written in invisible ink and in code how to organize our trip. It was not discovered by our enemies and we received it. He sent friends to us from France. But no one was permitted to see us. And none of our friends was allowed to accompany us. Those three weeks of complete uncertainty were a great trial for Leon.

His father raged like a caged tiger. Delayed newspaper accounts of the then famous and first staging of the Moscow trials, his inability to answer it and expose the liars, were the greatest torture for Lev Davidovich. To defend himself against slander, to fight it—after all, this was his native element, the organic passion of his being; he found refuge in furious labor and in the struggle against all his contemptible enemies. But here in Gourum where he was doomed to silence, he fell ill.

Our son Leon understood this: his despair knew no bounds. He applied himself to the task which his father could not fulfill. In order to ease the latter's burden he came out himself with the exposure of the vile masters of the "Moscow Trials" whom he branded for what they were and who have

* The younger son, Sergei, grew up to become a scientist. He remained in the Soviet Union when his father was expelled in 1929. He was arrested during the Moscow trials and has never been heard of since.—EDITOR.

** In one obscure little village in the Caucasus, *Lenin and Trotsky* were taken for one and the same person, and a battle song written about him. What happened to it?

written into the annals of history its most shameful and most revolting pages. Leon fulfilled this task brilliantly. In our jail we read his "Red Book" with great excitement. "All very true, all very true, good boy," said his father with a friend's tenderness. We wanted so much to see him and to embrace him!

In addition to his revolutionary activity and his literary work, our son occupied himself with higher mathematics which greatly interested him. In Paris he managed to pass examinations and dreamed of some time devoting himself to systematic work. On the very eve of his death he was accepted as a collaborator by the Scientific Institute of Holland and was to begin work on the subject of the Russian Opposition. He was the only one among the youth who had had an enormous experience in this field and who was exhaustively acquainted with the entire history of the Opposition from its very inception.

Our economic instability used to worry him a great deal. How he yearned for economic independence! He once wrote me about his prospective earnings. The possibilities were good but he did not yet have definite assurance. "It would be a remarkable thing" (i.e., work in the Scientific Institute), he said and then added facetiously, "I would be in a position to assist my aging parents." "Why not dream?" he asked. His father and I often recalled these words of our son with love and tenderness. Mr. Spalding—assistant supervisor of the Russian Department in Stanford University—conducted some negotiations with our son in Paris concerning a prospective work, and here is what he later wrote about Leon:

"The news of Sedov's death came to me as a shock. He impressed me as an extremely able and attractive personality, his future would undoubtedly have been brilliant. We are quite unclear about the circumstances of his death: some sources of our information indicate that it was due to medical negligence, or even something more terrible. Could you find it possible to write a brief note summarizing the conversation I had with Sedov last October (1937), including the tentative agreement which I had concluded with him. I could use such a note in case it is possible to obtain certain information from Trotsky concerning the Russian civil war and war communism."

Leon entered the revolution as a child and never left it to the end of his days. The semi-conscious loyalty of his childhood toward the revolution later matured into a conscious and firmly entrenched devotion. Once in the summer of 1917, he came from school with a bloody hand into the office of the Woodworkers Trade Union (Bolshevik) where I was then working as editor and proof-reader of its organ, "Woodworkers Echo." It was the time of hot debates which took place not only in the Tauride Palace, the Smolny, or the Circus but also in the streets, the streetcars, schools and at work. Early in the morning, as a rule, a multitude of workers milled in the offices of our union, discussing current questions, i.e., the questions involving the impending seizure of power by the proletariat. For the mass of workers these questions were *indissolubly* bound up with the personality of L.D. They discussed his speeches—and in these discussions could be felt the unity and inflexibility of will: a burning desire to march forward, summoning for a decisive struggle with unconquerable faith in victory.

The children were permitted to have their meals together with me in the union's dining room. Lev Davidovich was at the time sitting in the jail of the Provisional Democratic Government. To the queries of comrades concerning his hand Leon replied that he had been bitten by Kerensky (the Premier's son). How come? "I gave him one in his teeth." We all understood what had happened. The same school was

also attended by the children of Skobelev, the then Minister of Labor. Fights were a daily occurrence.

By a blow from ambush the GPU cut short the young and talented life of our son and friend. This price was exacted for the *upward flight* unprecedented in history of the October revolution. Those responsible for its decline are now bringing their despicable work to its conclusion. The Second October will come; it will conquer the whole world and it will mete out their deserts both to the heroes of its predecessor as well as to its grave-diggers.

* * *

Lev Davidovich did not pore over the filthy pages of the Communist Party's paper "Pravda". He would quickly glance over it, and toss it aside with aversion.

* * *

They are shooting . . . Lev Davidovich is now also awake. I whisper in his ear: "They are shooting here, in our room." And pressing close to him, I push him very, very gently, and drop down together with him from the low bed on to the floor.

"They are shooting." I uttered this with the self-same feeling as in the July days of 1917 I had said, "they have come." This was in Petrograd—it was later named Leningrad—when the police of Kerensky's government came to arrest L.D. We had expected arrest at the time—it was inevitable. The attack of Stalin was likewise expected by us. It was also inevitable. Nevertheless the expected came more unexpectedly on the night of May 24, 1940 than did the arrest in 1917.

When Kerensky Arrested Lev Davidovich

Kerensky's government had at that time scored a victory, not for long, but it did nonetheless succeed in arresting the Bolshevik leaders. I recall the manner in which the crisis of the Provisional Democratic Government was resolved. A stormy session was going on in the beautiful Hall of Columns in the Tauride Palace. I was sitting in a box, very close to the speakers' platform which was filled to overflowing with all the Lieberdants (this was how Demyan Bedny had labelled the Mensheviks in one of his poems which gained wide popularity). Suddenly there came the blare of triumphant music. A military band marched into the palace to the accompaniment of deafening applause and ecstatic greetings. The Government had secretly transferred from the front, regiments loyal to it and, as the future proved, these regiments were the last loyal ones. But at the time, they were sufficient. Those in power began to feel firm ground under their feet. I saw how those who filled the platform, the conquerors, were covertly shaking each other by the hand, how they with great difficulty tried to restrain their transports of joy—their faces glowed, they were unable to preserve even an outward appearance of calm as was dictated by the circumstances.

In a few days the arrests began. L.D. and I occupied at the time a small room in the apartment of Comrade Y. Larin. Our boys were in Terioki with some friends. L.D. had spent that entire day as, incidentally, he spent all previous ones, at meetings until late into the white Petersburg night.

At five o'clock in the morning I heard a cautious tramping of feet on the asphalt in the courtyard and when I ran to the window and opened a chink in the shutters, I saw in the early white light uniforms in gray and guns slung across the arms. It was a military detachment of the Provisional Democratic Government. Beyond any doubt, this was for us. And touching L.D. on the shoulder I said, "They have come."

He jumped up and began to dress himself swiftly. The bell rang. Comrade Larin, whom I had warned, did not open the door immediately. They rang again. They asked for Lunacharsky, this was a subterfuge. Then they presented an order

for Trotsky's arrest. Larin did not give in. He forced them to wait. He tried to get the responsible Lieberdants on the telephone. But there was no answer anywhere. We said goodbye. Lev Davidovich did everything to keep up my spirits. They led him away. The general political situation was very grave at the time. The struggle was out in the open, direct actions were already being employed. It was a life and death struggle. But the last look L.D. gave me before he was taken away was full of confidence and challenge. That glance said to me: "We shall see who will vanquish whom."

There were visits to jail to arrange, the sending of packages to attend to, and so forth. I had the assistance of Leon and Sergei who undertook the delivery of packages (food, and so on) and transformed it into a game: "Who'll get there first." The overfilled street cars presented them with a great difficulty, but they hitched on and always arrived in jail exactly at the appointed hour.

They were greatly aroused by their father's second arrest. But the entire situation bore the promise of swift liberation and victory. It was quite different from the time when we were taken off the ship enroute to Russia by the English and separated, in 1917 in Halifax. The boys then remained with me in the status of prisoners not in jail but in a filthy room of a Russian spy in whose house a room was assigned to us. But L.D. was taken away with the others without a word of explanation. Complete uncertainty and isolation oppressed us extremely at the time.

* * *

The Attempted Assassination

We are lying on the floor, beside the wall in a corner and away from the cross-fire which proceeded without interruption for several minutes.

Afterwards we took count of the holes in the walls and the doors of our bedroom: they numbered sixty. Pressing our bodies to the wall, we waited . . . I raised myself a little in order to shield L.D. because it seemed to me that the shots were being directed at him, but he stopped me. "Grandfather!" We both heard the cry of our grandson who slept in the neighboring room into which the criminals had entered. His voice rang out as if part in warning of the danger threatening us and part in a plea for help. Our grandson forgot about it, forgot his outcry, and no matter how I tried to remind him of his experiences and memories, he could not recall it. But this cry chilled us to the marrow. *Everything became silent . . .* "They have kidnapped him," said his grandfather to me quietly. On the threshold which separated our bedroom from that of our grandson, illuminated by the flare of an incendiary bomb, a silhouette flashed: the curve of a helmet, shining buttons, an elongated face flashed by me as in a dream, and then I lost sight of the intruder. The shooting in the room stopped. We heard the sound of gunfire at a distance in the patio.

Quietly, slowly I crossed our bedroom and walked into the bathroom where a window gave to the patio. The little house could be seen where our friends, our guard lived. There also stood an enormous eucalyptus tree, and it was from there that they were firing! Beside this eucalyptus tree, as we later learned, the enemies had placed a machine gun. By a steady stream of fire they thus strategically cut off the guards from us. Investigating magistrates later found on the premises a bomb containing one and a half kilos of dynamite. A record of this is to be found in the minutes of the court in the case of the assault by Siqueiros, who was subsequently released on March 28, 1941: *for lack of material and incriminating evidence!* How monstrous! "The Master of the Soviet Land,"

"The Father of the Peoples," etc., etc., paid out lavishly from the proletarian treasury. According to the records, there was some sort of technical defect in the bomb and it could not be used by the criminals. But the investigation brought out the fact that it had sufficient power to blast the entire house to its foundation.

The shooting in the patio also ceased. Then, all was silence. Silent . . . *intolerably silent*. "Where can I hide you safely?" I was losing my strength from the tension and the hopelessness of the situation. Any moment now, they will come to finish him. My head spun around . . . And suddenly there came again the same voice, the voice of our grandson, but this time it came from the patio and sounded completely different, ringing out like a staccato passage of music bravely, joyously: "Al—fred! Mar—gue—rite!" It returned us to the living. A moment before we had felt the stillness of the night after firing ceased as in a grave, as with death itself . . . "They are all killed."

"Alfred! Marguerite!" No, they are alive . . . alive! But why then does no one come? Why does no one call us? After all, the *others* had left. Perhaps they are afraid, afraid of coming face to face with the irreparable. I seized the handle in the door which leads from our bedroom into L.D.'s work-room. It was closed, although we never locked it as a rule. The door was riddled by bullets like a sieve. They had fired through it into the bedroom. Through the interstices I could see the room suffused with a soft golden light from the shaded lamp on the ceiling; I could see the table covered with manuscripts in complete order; the books on the shelves were not touched; everything was tranquil there; the very background of the reign of thought, of creativeness was there. It was exactly as it had been left on the eve . . . How strange that was: order, tranquillity, light, everything on the table intact . . . Only the door with its black yawning holes bespoke the crime just committed.

I began pounding on the door. Otto came running. "The door is jammed for some reason." With our joint forces we opened the door. We walked into this wonderful, and *at that time* undisturbed room.

Robert Sheldon Harte

Seva, Alfred, Marguerite, Otto, Charlie, Jack, Harold—they were all there. Only Bob Sheldon was not with us. He, poor boy, had been on night duty and they had kidnapped him. A few of his belongings, some clothes and parts of his equipment remained in the empty garage . . . These made one's heart constrict in pain; one wanted to ask them what had happened to our friend, our guard? where was he? what had they done to him? Bob's things shrouded in mystery spoke to us of his doom. Sheldon had behind him altogether 23 years. How many hopes, how much idealism, faith in the future, readiness to struggle for it had perished with this young life! Exotic Mexico enthralled him. He was fascinated by the brightly colored little birds, acquired a few of them, kept them in our garden, and tended them so touchingly. Twenty three years: they lacked in the experience of life; they had not yet been moulded to an awareness of danger, the urgency of keeping on guard, but they were so sensitive as to have acquired all this presently, in a very short time. Sheldon loved to take walks. In his free hours he took walks around the environs of Coyoacan and brought back bouquets of field flowers.

Shortly after his arrival, he received a lesson from Lev Davidovich. Her place was being rebuilt, and it was necessary to open the gates every 15-20 minutes in order to let a worker with a wheelbarrow out into the street and then let

him in back again. Bob was so carried away by building a bird cage that in order not to tear himself away from his work he handed the gate-key to the worker. This did not escape the notice of L.D. The latter explained to Bob that this was very careless on his part and added, "You might prove to be the first victim of your own carelessness." This was said about a month or six weeks before Bob's tragic death.

The day of May 24 began for us early and was full of excitement. The more we probed into an analysis of the bullet-riddled walls and mattresses all the more did we become imbued with the realization of the danger that had threatened us, and all the more did we feel ourselves saved. The nervous tension of the night discharged itself into a state of high excitement kept in check by efforts to remain calm. This absence of dejection later served as one of the arguments in support of the senseless and shameless "theory of self-assault." As I recounted the events of the GPU's night assault to friends who visited us during that day, I felt that I was relating this *almost* with joy. But those who listened heard me with alarm, they cast frightened glances towards the heads of the two beds, where the wall was dotted with bullet holes, and I would say to myself as if in justification: "But after all the enemies did suffer failure."

The following days strengthened more and more in us the conviction that the failure suffered by our enemies on this occasion must be remedied by them; that the inspirer of this crime would not be deterred. And our joyous feeling of *salvation* was dampened by the prospect of a new visitation and the need to prepare for it.

L.D.'s Work During the Last Months

At the same time, Lev Davidovich was taking part in the conduct of the investigation of the case of May 24. Its slothful pace worried L.D. exceedingly. He followed the developments patiently and tirelessly, explaining the circumstances of the case to the court and to the press, making superhuman efforts to force himself to refute the self-evident and hopeless lies or malicious equivocations, doing all this with the intense perspicacity peculiar to him, and not allowing a single detail to escape his notice. He attached the proper significance to every single thing, and wove them all into a single whole.

And he grew tired. He slept poorly, dozing off and awakening with the self-same thoughts. Sometimes I heard Lev Davidovich, when alone, say from his innermost depths, "I am tired . . . tired." A feeling of greatest alarm would seize me: I knew what this meant. But I also knew something else: I knew of the influx of vitality, inspiration and energy he would feel if he only could return quietly to his *real work*. He had outlined an analytical work on the Red Army for which he had been collecting material, another on the international situation; still others on world economy, and the latest period of the war. The day-to-day occurrences and the successive crimes of Stalin made it necessary to relegate these tasks to the second plane.

His book on Stalin had been forced on him by extraneous circumstances: financial necessity and by his publishers. Lev Davidovich more than once expressed a desire to write a "popular" book, as he called it, in order to earn some money thereby and then rest up by working on subjects of interest to him. But he could not bring this about, he was incapable of writing "popular" books. For a long time he hesitated to accept the publisher's offer, but our friends insisted on it. L.D. finally agreed. He planned to finish this work in a short while. But once he undertook it, he began to surround it with a conscientiousness peculiar

to him and with a spirit of meticulousness and pedantism of which he often used to complain to me. Nevertheless he proposed to have it finished completely by March-April 1940. He was not able to. First the controversy in our party—its American section—distracted him, and then the events of May 24.

One of L.D.'s secret and most cherished desires was to depict the friendship between Marx and Engels, their "romance" which, as he told me, had never been investigated in his opinion as he wanted to do it. Lev Davidovich was very much in love with Engels, his whole profoundly human personality. He was greatly enthralled by the coupling of the two great and utterly different personalities of the two friends bound together by their striving for a single goal.

His Projected Book On Lenin

It was not without sorrow that he had to renounce for the time being the continuation of his book on Lenin. His deep and burning desire was to *show* Lenin as he was in *reality* as against all those who had written about Lenin self-obstrusively and measuring him *by their own yardstick*. No figment of the imagination of the epigones, however brilliant, could compare with the original. Lenin must appear before history, he had every right to it, in all his genius and with all his human weaknesses. The epigones, on the other hand, had endowed Lenin with good nature, modesty, simplicity, etc.—but what did all this mean *with reference to Lenin?* They depicted him "in their own image." And Vladimir Ilyich was not one to be squeezed into a common mould. Lev Davidovich would demand also of me the most minute and insignificant recollections, but those which corresponded with reality, and he was very happy when I would recount to him or jot down for him various details he had not known and in which he was able to *discern* the real Lenin.

In 1917, in Petrograd, in the Smolny, our apartment was in the same corridor with the apartment of Lenin and his family. They used the bathroom located on our living area. We used to meet each other often in passing. Lenin was always brimful of energy, cheerful, polite. Once he walked in and seeing the boys, placed them side by side, stepped back a little, and putting both hands in his pockets, astonished me by saying cheerily: "Say, I like this!" The costume of the children had suddenly caught his eye. In those days, textiles were unobtainable and it never entered my mind to get a special order to obtain material for some shirts. We had a velvet tablecloth, with a flowery pattern, which I had cleaned and then cut up and sewed into blouses for the children. The boys were not much pleased. "Why go and make us shirts out of a rug?" I justified myself . . . but it did not do any good. To be sure, they wore them, but not without grumbling. After Vladimir Ilyich's praise, the boys quieted down.

L.D.'s Health

During our ten years in the USSR, there were no great variations in L. D.'s health. In exile, or rather in emigration, his physical condition began to ebb and flow. In exile (Alma-Ata) Lev Davidovich's life was swallowed up by correspondence—in its way this was a continuation of our life during the last period in Moscow; current political and tactical questions were ever under discussion. We received such a quantity of mail as to make it impossible sometimes to read all the letters during the day. Our son Leon Sedov used to reply to a part of them, his father answered the

greater portion. During the last months (of our stay in Alma-Ata) all correspondence, as is well known, was prohibited. It passed into illegal channels and its volume was greatly reduced.

At Prinkipo (Turkey) L.D. found it very hard at first. Inactivity and isolation oppressed him. The questions arose of the means of livelihood, funds for defense, funds for the foreign oppositional groups. All this compelled him to accept a publisher's offer to write his autobiography. It was very difficult for L. D. psychologically to enter into this work. It was so sharply out of harmony with the general bent of his being. He had to force himself to "recollect." This reacted on his nerves and his health on the whole became impaired.

A revival of his moral and physical condition occurred with the establishment of ties with European co-thinkers. Visitors from abroad, discussions with them, correspondence, writing political articles for oppositional organs in Europe—all this restored L.D. to his native element. And this in turn eased for him the compulsory labor over the autobiography.

At the dinner table or during fishing trips in the Sea of Marmora, no one suspected "low tide." Conversations on political topics, jokes, perking up this or that somewhat crestfallen comrade, all these invariably testified to the equanimity of L.D.'s moods. Only our son, when he lived with us, was able to guess that this was not so. How I loved the periods of "floodtide," how happy I was during them! Freshness, youthfulness, joyfulness returned in these periods to L.D. He would then passionately dictate political letters, and suggestions to friends, he would dictate his autobiography and various articles, and go fishing in the blue waters of the sea . . . He seethed in a frenzy. And all this in complete isolation. Behind four walls.

Our life near Royan (France) on the shore of the Atlantic Ocean in the isolated villa "Sea-Spray" which our friends had rented for us, had a turbulent beginning. Friends and co-thinkers from different countries would arrive daily to visit L.D. We had from 15 to 20 visitors a day. L.D. would hold two or three discussions daily. Full of inspiration, vitality and seemingly inexhaustible energy, he astonished and gladdened our friends by his tirelessness and vigor.

And here in France the financial aspect of our life again arose very sharply. There was a lull. I had to go to Paris for medical care. Lev Davidovich insisted on it. In his own physical condition there came the alterations of ebb and flow. From Royan, L.D. once wrote me that despite his poor health he had carried through a discussion, and did it very successfully, with some friends who had arrived and in the presence of our son. "I watched Lyovik," he wrote. "His eyes were shining. He was radiant." After the discussion L.D. went to bed early, because of fatigue and he heard the stormy ocean flinging its spray to the windows of his room, dashing drops against the window panes. Leon came in to bid his father goodbye. He had to return that night to Paris. They exchanged a few warm remarks about the discussion that had just concluded. Our son was very excited and aroused. He approached his father's bed, and dropping his head, "like a child," as his father wrote, on his father's breast, he pressed closely and said, "Papa, I love you very much." They embraced each other and parted with tears.

The ocean continues to live with its stormy ebbs and flows. It seethes in a frenzy. The great fighter might have also lived on . . . Violence. The dealers of violence will meet with vengeance. Violence will *wither away*. Free mankind of the future will bow its head in memory of its innumerable victims.

Stalin Seeks My Death

By LEON TROTSKY

The following article, now published for the first time, was written by Trotsky two weeks after the May 24, 1940 attempt to assassinate him. As the article relates, Stalin's GPU was able to bring powerful pressure on the Mexican police to steer its investigation away from the GPU murder band which had attempted to kill Trotsky. Shortly after this article was written, however, the investigation was brought back on the right track. Our press at the time published all the details of how the police arrested David Serrano, David Alfaro Si-

queiros and a score of other Stalinists; how some of them confessed their complicity, and the guilt of the Stalinist murder machine was established.

For reasons best known to themselves, the Mexican authorities have not yet completed their case against the GPU band. According to Mexican law, the investigating judge is required to complete his investigation and hand down a verdict within a year's time. Although Siqueiros admitted his participation in the attack upon Trotsky's house, he and the GPU found judges who released him

on the ground that he was not seeking to murder Trotsky! The others are still in prison. Similar delay is occurring in the case of "Frank Jacson," the GPU assassin who succeeded in striking the death-blow on August 20, 1940.

Trotsky's article gives us his own description of the May 24th attempt on his life and of the events of the next two weeks. Another article by Trotsky on the attempt was "The Comintern and the GPU," published in the November, 1940 issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

The Night of the Assault

The attack came at dawn, about 4 A. M. I was fast asleep, having taken a sleeping drug after a hard day's work. Awakened by the rattle of gun fire but feeling very hazy, I first imagined that a national holiday was being celebrated with fireworks outside our walls. But the explosions were too close, right here within the room, next to me and overhead. The odor of gunpowder became more acrid, more penetrating. Clearly, what we had always expected was now happening: we were under attack. Where were the police stationed outside the walls? Where the guards inside? Trussed up? Kidnapped? Killed? My wife had already jumped from her bed. The shooting continued incessantly. My wife later told me that she helped me to the floor, pushing me into the space between the bed and the wall. This was quite true. She had remained hovering over me, beside the wall, as if to shield me with her body. But by means of whispers and gestures I convinced her to lie flat on the floor. The shots came from all sides, it was difficult to tell just from where. At a certain time my wife, as she later told me, was able clearly to distinguish spurts of fire from a gun: consequently, the shooting was being done right here in the room although we could not see anybody. My impression is that altogether some two hundred shots were fired, of which about one hundred fell right here, near us. Splinters of glass from windowpanes and chips from walls flew in all directions. A little later I felt that my right leg had been slightly wounded in two places.

As the shooting died down we heard our grandson in the neighboring room cry out: "Grandfather!" The voice of the child in the darkness under the gunfire remains the most tragic recollection of that night. The boy—after the first shot had cut his bed diagonally as evidenced by marks left on the door and wall—threw himself under the bed. One of the assailants, apparently in a panic, fired into the bed, the bullet passed through the mattress, struck our grandson in the big toe and imbedded itself in the floor. The assailants threw two incendiary bombs and left our grandson's bedroom. Crying, "Grandfather!" he ran after them into the patio, leaving a trail of blood behind him and, under gunfire, rushed into the room of one of the guards.

At the outcry of our grandson, my wife made her way into his already empty room. Inside, the floor, the door and a small cabinet were burning. "They have kidnapped Seva," I said to her. This was the most painful moment of all. Shots

continued to ring out but already away from our bedroom somewhere in the patio or immediately outside the walls. The terrorists were apparently covering their retreat. My wife hastened to smother the incendiary flames with a rug. For a week afterward she had to treat her burns.

Two members of our guard appeared, Otto and Charles, who had been cut off from us during the attack by machine gun fire. They confirmed the fact that the assailants had apparently withdrawn since no one was to be seen in the patio. The guard on night duty, Robert Sheldon Harte, had disappeared. Both automobiles were gone. Why the silence from the police stationed outside? They had been bound by the assailants who shouted: "Viva Almazan!" That was the story told by the tied-up policemen.

My wife and I were convinced on the next day that the assailants had fired only through the windows and doors and that no one had entered our bedroom. However, an analysis of the trajectory of the bullets proves irrefutably that eight shots which struck the wall at the head of the two beds and which left holes in four places in both mattresses, as well as traces in the floor underneath the beds could have been fired only inside the bedroom itself. Empty cartridges found on the floor, and the lining of a blanket singed in two places testify to the same thing.

When did the terrorist enter our bedroom? Was it during the first part of their operation before we had yet awakened? Or was it, on the contrary, during the last moments when we were lying on the floor? I incline toward the latter supposition. Having fired through the doors and windows several scores of bullets aimed at the beds and not hearing any outcries or groans, the assailants had every reason to conclude that they had accomplished their work successfully. One of them might have at the last moment entered the room for a final check. Possibly the bed clothes and pillows still retained the form of human bodies. At four o'clock in the morning the room was in darkness. My wife and I remained motionless and silent on the floor. Before leaving our bedroom the terrorist who came in for verification deeming that the task had been already accomplished might have fired a few shots into our beds "to clear his conscience."

It would be too irksome to analyze here in detail the various legends which were the product of misunderstanding or malice and which have served directly or indirectly as the basis for the theory of "self-assault." The press carried reports alleging that my wife and I were not in our bedroom

on the night of the assault, *El Popular* (organ of the Stalinist ally, Toledano,) discoursed concerning my "contradictions": according to one version I reportedly crawled into a corner of the bedroom, according to another version, I dropped to the floor, etcetera. There is not a word of truth in all this. All rooms in our house are occupied at night by designated individuals, with the exception of the library, the dining room and my workroom. But the assailants passed through precisely these rooms and did not find us there. We slept where we always did: in our bedroom. As was already stated, I dropped to the floor in the corner of the room; presently, I was joined by my wife.

How did we survive? Obviously, thanks to a fortunate accident. The beds were under a cross-fire. Perhaps the assailants were afraid to hit each other and instinctively fired either higher or lower than they should have. But that is only a psychological conjecture. It is also possible that my wife and I came to the aid of the happy accident by not losing our heads, not flying around the room, not crying out or calling for help when it was hopeless to do so, not shooting when it was senseless but remained quietly on the floor pretending to be dead.

Stalin's "Mistake"

To the uninitiated it may seem incomprehensible that Stalin's clique should have first exiled me and then should attempt to kill me abroad. Wouldn't it have been simpler to have shot me in Moscow as were so many others?

The explanation is this: In 1928 when I was expelled from the party and exiled to Central Asia it was still impossible even to talk not only about shooting but arrest. The generation together with whom I went through the October revolution and the Civil War was then still alive. The political Bureau felt itself besieged from all sides. From Central Asia I was able to maintain direct contact with the opposition. In these conditions Stalin, after vacillating for one year, decided to resort to exile abroad as the lesser evil. He reasoned that Trotsky, isolated from the USSR, deprived of an apparatus and of material resources, would be powerless to undertake anything. Moreover, Stalin calculated that after he had succeeded in completely blackening me in the eyes of the country, he could without difficulty obtain from the friendly Turkish government my return to Moscow for the final reckoning. Events have shown, however, that it is possible to participate in political life without possessing either an apparatus or material resources. With the aid of young friends I laid the foundations of the Fourth International which is forging ahead slowly but stubbornly. The Moscow trials of 1936-1937 were staged in order to obtain my deportation from Norway, i.e., actually to hand me over into the hands of the GPU. But this did not succeed. I arrived in Mexico. I am informed that Stalin has several times admitted that my exile abroad was a "major mistake." No other way remained of rectifying the mistake except through a terrorist act.

The Preparatory Acts of the GPU

In recent years the GPU has destroyed many hundreds of my friends, including members of my family in the USSR. In Spain they killed my former secretary Erwin Wolfe and a number of my political co-thinkers; in Paris they killed my son Leon Sedov whom Stalin's professional murderers hunted for two years. In Lauzanne the GPU killed Ignace Reiss who had left the GPU and joined the Fourth International. In Paris, Stalin's agents murdered another of my former secretaries, Rudolf Klement, whose body was found in the Seine with

the head, hands and legs cut off. This list could be continued interminably.

In Mexico there was an obvious attempt to assassinate me by an individual who appeared in my house with fake recommendations from a prominent political figure. It was after this incident, which alarmed my friends, that more serious measures of defense were undertaken: day and night guard, alarm system, etc.

After the active and truly murderous participation of the GPU in the Spanish events I received many letters from my friends, chiefly in New York and Paris, concerning agents of the GPU 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 in time to the Mexican police. The outbreak of the war aggravated the situation still further because of my irreconcilable struggle against the foreign and domestic policy of the Kremlin. My declarations and articles in the world press—on the dismemberment of Poland, the invasion of Finland, the weakness of the Red Army beheaded by Stalin, etc.—were reproduced in all countries of the world in tens of millions of copies. Dissatisfaction inside the USSR is growing. In the capacity of a former revolutionist Stalin remembers that the Third International was incomparably weaker at the beginning of the last war than the Fourth International is today. The course of the war may provide a mighty impulsion to the development of the Fourth International, also within the USSR itself. That is why Stalin could not have failed to issue orders to his agents—to finish me as quickly as possible.

Supplementary Evidence

Facts known to everyone and general political considerations thus indubitably demonstrate that the organization of the attempt of May 24th could emanate only from the GPU. There is, however, no lack of supplementary evidence.

1. A few weeks before the attempt the Mexican press was filled with rumors of a concentration of GPU agents in Mexico. A great many things in these reports were false. But the substance of these rumors was correct.

2. Very noteworthy is the exceptionally high technique of the assault. The assassination failed owing to one of those accidents which enter as an integral element into every war. But the preparation and execution of the assault are astonishing in their scope, planning and efficiency. The terrorists are familiar with the layout of the house and its internal life; they are equipped with police uniforms, weapons, electric saw, rope ladders, etc. They succeed completely in tying up the police stationed outside, they paralyze the guards inside by a correct strategy of fire, they penetrate into the intended victim's room, fire with impunity for three to five minutes, throw incendiary bombs and leave the arena of attack without a trace. Such an undertaking is beyond the resources of a private group. There is to be observed here tradition, training, great resources, and a wide selection of executors. This is the work of the GPU.

3. Strictly in accordance with the whole system of the GPU is the solicitude for switching the investigation to a false track which was included in the very plan of the assault. While tying up the police, the assailants shouted: "Viva Almazan!" These artificial and fraudulent shouts at night before five policemen, three of whom were asleep, pursued simultaneously two objectives: to distract, if only for a few days or hours, the attention of the coming investigation away from the GPU and its agency in Mexico; and to compromise the followers of one of the Presidential candidates. To kill one

opponent while casting the shadow of suspicion on another—that is the classic method of the GPU, more exactly of its inspirer, Stalin.

4. The attackers brought along several incendiary bombs, two of which were thrown into my grandson's room. The participants in the assault thus had in view not only murder but also arson. Their only goal could have been the destruction of my archives. This is of interest only to Stalin, inasmuch as my archives are of exceptional value to me in the struggle against the Moscow oligarchy. With the aid of my archives I was able, in particular, to expose the Moscow juridical frameups. On November 7, 1936 the GPU, incurring great risks, had already stolen part of my archives in Paris. It did not forget about them in the night of May 24th. The incendiary bombs are thus something like Stalin's visiting card.

5. Extremely characteristic of the crimes of the GPU is the division of labor between the secret killers and the legal "friends": while the assault was being prepared, along with the underground work of conspiracy, there was conducted an open slanderous campaign aimed to discredit the intended victim. The same division of labor continues after the perpetration of the crime: the terrorists go into hiding while their attorneys, out in the open, attempt to direct the attention of the police to a false trial.

6. Finally, it is impossible not to call attention to the reactions of the world press: newspapers of all tendencies proceed openly or tacitly from the fact that the assault is the handiwork of the GPU; only the newspapers subsidized by the Kremlin and fulfilling its orders defend an opposite version. This is an irrefutable piece of political evidence!

May 27—The Turn in the Investigation

On the morning of May 24th the leading representatives of the police asked my collaboration in solving the crime. Colonel Salazar and tens of agents called on me for various information in the most friendly way. My family, my co-workers and I did everything in our power.

On May 25 or May 26, two agents of the secret police told me that the investigation was on the correct road and that now it had been at all events already "proven that it is a question of attempted assassination." I was astounded. After all, was it still necessary to prove this? I asked myself precisely *against whom* did the police have to prove that the assault was an assault? In any case, up to the evening of May 27 the investigation, so far as I could judge, was directed against the unknown assailants and not against the victims of the assault. On May 28 I transmitted to Colonel Salazar some evidence, which as the *third* stage of the investigation demonstrated, was very important. But on the agenda at the time was the *second* stage of which I did not have any suspicion, namely, an investigation directed against myself and my collaborators.

During the day of May 28 a complete and abrupt turn in the orientation of the investigation and the attitude of the police toward my household was prepared and accomplished. We were immediately surrounded by an atmosphere of hostility. What was the matter? we wondered. This turn could not have occurred of itself. There must have been concrete and imperative reasons. Not even a semblance of fact or factual data which might have justified such a turn of the investigation has been revealed nor could have been revealed. I can find no explanation for the turn other than the monstrous pressure exerted by the GPU apparatus, basing itself on all its "friends." Behind the scenes a veritable *coup d'etat* occurred. Who directed it?

Here is a fact which might seem insignificant but which merits the most serious attention: *El Popular* and *El Nacional* carried on the morning of May 27 an identical story: "Mr. Trotsky Contradicts Himself," which ascribed to me contradictions on the question of my whereabouts on the night of May 24 and during the very time of the attack. The story, which went absolutely unnoticed by me in those frenzied hours, was a crude invention from beginning to end. Who supplied the "left" newspapers with the story? This is a question of capital importance! The story referred as its source to anonymous "observers." Who are these "observers?" Just what did they observe and where? It is quite self-evident that this *story had as its aim to prepare and justify in the eyes of governmental circles, where these papers are widely read, the hostile turn of the investigation against me and my collaborators.* An investigation of this peculiar episode would unquestionably shed light on many things.

Two servants in our household were questioned for the first time on May 28, i.e., on the day when we were already stifling in an atmosphere of hostility and when the minds of the police were already directed toward the theory of self-assault. On the next day, the 29th, both women were again called and taken at 4 P.M. to Via Madero (Guadalupe) where they were questioned until 11 P.M. inside the building and from 11 P.M. to 2 A.M. in the dark yard, in an automobile. No records were kept. They were brought home at about 3 A.M. On May 30 a police agent appeared in the kitchen with a ready-made protocol and both women signed without reading it. The agent left the kitchen a minute or so after entering it. When both women found out from the newspapers that my secretaries Charles and Otto had been arrested on the basis of their testimony, they both declared that they had said absolutely nothing that could have justified arrest.

Why were these two members of the guard arrested and not the others? Because Otto and Charles served as liaison agents with the authorities and with our few friends in the city. Preparing the blow against me, the investigating magistrates decided first of all to isolate our house completely. On the same day a Mexican, S., and a Czech, B., our young friends who had visited us to express their sympathy, were placed under arrest. The aim of the arrests was obviously the same: to cut off our connections with the outside world. The arrested members of the guard were confronted with a demand that they confess in "a quarter of an hour" that it was I who had ordered them to carry out the "self-assault." I am not at all inclined to exaggerate the importance of these episodes or to invest them with a tragic meaning. They interest me solely from the standpoint of the possibility of exposing those behind-the-scenes forces that were able in the course of 24 hours to bring about an almost magical turn in the direction of the investigation. These forces continue even today to exert an influence on the course of the investigation.

On Thursday May 30 when B. was questioned in Via Madera, all the police agents proceeded from the theory of self-assault, and conducted themselves insolently with me, my wife and my collaborators. During his incarceration for four days, S. had the opportunity to listen to quite a few conversations between the police agents. His conclusion is as follows: "The hand of Lombardo, Toledano, Bassols and others penetrates deeply into police activity and this, with considerable success. The idea of self-assault... was artificially inspired from this source."

The Theory of "Self-Assault"

The pressure of interested circles must have assumed truly irresistible proportions in order to compel the repre-

sentatives of the investigation to take a serious attitude toward the absurd idea of self-assault.

What aim could I pursue in venturing on so monstrous, repugnant and dangerous an enterprise? No one has explained it to this day. It is hinted that I wanted to blacken Stalin and his GPU. But would another assault add anything at all to the reputation of a man who has destroyed an entire old generation of the Bolshevik party? It is said that I want to prove the existence of the "Fifth Column." Why? What for? Besides, GPU agents are quite sufficient for the perpetration of an assault, there is no need of the mysterious Fifth Column. It is said that I wanted to create difficulties for the Mexican government. What possible motives could I have for creating difficulties for the only government that has been hospitable to me? It is said that I wanted to provoke a war between the United States and Mexico. But this explanation completely belongs to the domain of delirium. In order to provoke such a war it would have been in any case much more expedient to have organized an assault on an American ambassador or on oil magnates and not a revolutionist-Bolshevik, alien and hateful to imperialist circles.

When Stalin organizes an attempt to assassinate me, the meaning of his actions is clear: he wants to destroy his Enemy No. 1. Stalin incurs no risks thereby; he acts at long distance. On the contrary, by organizing "self-assault" I have to assume the responsibility for such an enterprise myself; I risk my own fate, the fate of my family, my political reputation, and the reputation of the movement which I serve. What do I stand to gain from it?

But even if one were to allow the impossible, namely, that after renouncing the cause of my whole life, and trampling underfoot common sense and my own vital interests I did decide to organize "self-assault" for the sake of some unknown goal, then there still remains the following question: Where and how did I obtain 20 executors? how did I supply them with police uniforms? how did I arm them? how did I equip them with all the necessary things, etc., etc. In other words, just how did a man, who lives almost completely isolated from the outside world, contrive to fulfill an enterprise conceivable only for a powerful apparatus? Let me confess that I feel awkward in subjecting to criticism an idea that is beneath all criticism.

The GPU mobilized with great skill its agents in order to kill me. The attempt failed owing to an accident. The friends of the GPU are compromised. They are now compelled to do everything in their power in order to fix upon me the responsibility for the unsuccessful attempt of their own chieftain. In accomplishing this they have not a wide choice of means. They are compelled to operate with the crudest methods, and to guide themselves by Hitler's aphorism: the bigger the lie the more readily it will be believed.

The Reactions of the Press

Extremely valuable conclusions concerning the behind-the-scenes work of the GPU can be drawn from a study of the conduct of a certain section of the Mexican press in the days following the attempted assassination. Let us leave aside *La Voz de Mexico*, the official Stalinist publication with its crude contradictions, senseless accusations and cynical slander. Let us likewise leave aside the organs of the Right which are on the one hand guided by a chase after sensation and on the other, try to utilize the assault for their own purposes, i.e., against the "lefts" in general. Politically I am further removed from such newspapers as *Universal* or *Excelsior* than Lombardo Toledano and his ilk. I employ the above-named

papers for self-defense just as I would employ a bus for transportation.

Furthermore the maneuvers of the right wing papers are only a reflection of the politics of the country and, in essence they have a detached attitude on the question of the assault and of the GPU. For our purposes it is much more important to analyze the conduct of *El Popular* and, in part, *El Nacional*. The active policy, in this case is conducted by *El Popular*. As regards *El Nacional*, the latter only adapts itself to its interested colleague.

"El Popular" and the Assault of May 24

Despite the fact reported by newspapers that Toledano left the capital two or three days prior to the attack, *El Popular* had at the critical moment very clear and precise directives. The assault did not at all catch the paper off-guard. The editors did not on this occasion try to turn the attack into a joke, nor did it refer to my "persecution mania," etcetera.—On the contrary, the paper immediately assumed a serious and an alarmed tone. The issue of May 25 across the front page advanced the slogan "The attempt against Trotsky is an attempt against Mexico." The leading editorial under the selfsame heading demanded the most rigid investigation and an exemplary punishment of the criminals *no matter what their political tendency and what foreign power they are connected with*. By its phraseology the article seeks to create the impression of highest impartiality and patriotic indignation. The immediate aim is to dig something like an abyss between the editors of *El Popular* and the terrorists, who might turn up in the hands of the police, if not today then on the morrow. This measure of precaution is all the more necessary the more zealously *El Popular* had conducted in the preceding period a campaign of slander against me.

However, under the literary shell of impartiality there lurk cautious insinuations which are destined in the next few days to receive a further elaboration. It is remarked in passing, in a single phrase that there are "mysterious and suspicious aspects to the assault." That day these words passed unnoticed. But now it is completely clear that the author of the article had reserved for himself beforehand the possibility of advancing the theory of "self-assault" *in the event of failure on the part of the judicial inquiry*. The second insinuation is no less significant: the article predicts that the "enemies of Mexico" will ascribe the attempt to Stalin and Moscow. The enemies of Mexico are here identified with the enemies of Stalin. The solemn call to search out the criminals no matter with what power they are connected, acquires a very limited interpretation.

With all its zigzags and equivocations the article is carefully thought out. The contradictions of the article flow from the contradictoriness and indefiniteness of the situation itself. The outcome of the investigation was as yet unknown. In the event of success of the investigation it was necessary to withdraw as far away as possible. In the event of its failure it was necessary to preserve freedom of action along the lines of old slander and persecution. It was necessary at the same time to distract, so far as possible, attention away from the GPU, without however tying one's own hands completely. Rereading the article today, one can clearly see the white stitching stick out on all sides.

In the issue of May 26 the same line is continued in the main. *El Popular* demands of the authorities energetic punishment of the guilty ones. The danger that the participants of the attempt might immediately fall into the hands of the police is still very great; hence the harsh voice of impartiality.

The issue of May 27 already carries the cynical story

"Mr. Trotsky Contradicts Himself." This is the first attempt to develop the insinuation concerning the "suspicious aspects" of the assault. The story avers that I gave conflicting testimony concerning my whereabouts during the attack. The incongruity of this insinuation hits one between the eyes. If a man living in emigre solitude proved capable of mobilizing twenty conspirators and obtaining for them police uniforms and machine guns, then he ought to be capable of preparing an answer as to his whereabouts at the time of the assault. But let us not be captious about the technique of falsification. One thing is clear: *El Popular* is preparing the ground for the theory of "self-assault."

The investigation meanwhile runs into great difficulties: the GPU is capable of foreseeing a great deal and of covering up well its tracks. Since the time of the assault three days have elapsed. The danger of the arrest of the chief participants in the assault could be considered as eliminated, inasmuch as during this time they had ample opportunity to cross the border with passports prepared in advance. In correspondence with this, *El Popular* takes a bolder tone on May 27. The matter is not limited to the above cited story in the news section. The leading article on that day flatly states that the "attempt with every passing day awakens great doubts and seems more and more suspicious and less and less logical"; further on, the word "camouflage" is mentioned. The article ascribes the attempt to American imperialists who seek to intervene in Mexico and who base themselves apparently on my collaboration. Why the imperialists should have selected as the object of the assault none other than myself remains unknown. And just how the assault against a Russian Bolshevik in Mexico could justify intervention by the United States remains even less comprehensible. Instead of analysis and proof, a selection of noisy phrases.

It remains to recall that prior to the conclusion of the Stalin-Hitler bloc, *El Popular* used to depict me invariably with a swastika. I was suddenly transformed into an agent of the United States only after the invasion of Finland by the Red Army. *El Popular* tries to dispose of me with the same freedom as Stalin uses in issuing orders to his agents. In their verbal agitation and behind-the-scenes maneuvers Toledano and his allies undoubtedly went much further than they did in their own press. As the events of the next few days show, they engaged in especially intense work among the police.

On May 28 the investigating authorities were already completely swung over to the idea of "self-assault." Two of my secretaries, Otto and Charles, and two individuals connected with my household, B. and S., were placed under arrest. Having gained this victory, *El Popular* carefully retreats to the shadows: in the issue of May 28 it once again assumes an objective position. It is clear why the directors of the paper were cautious of engaging themselves irrevocably. They knew more than they told, they placed much less confidence in the version of self-assault than did the police sidetracked to a false trail by them. They were afraid that this version might at any moment be blown up. That is why, after transferring the responsibility to the police, *El Popular* on May 28 once again assumes the pose of an alarmed patriotic observer.

In the issue of May 29, *El Popular* published without comment the declaration of the Communist Party which demanded, not the punishment of the terrorists, but the deportation of Trotsky from Mexico. That day my house and all its inhabitants were cut off from the outside world by a ring of fantastic suspicions. It is noteworthy that Toledano leaves, on this occasion as well, the most candid slogans of the Kremlin to be spoken by the leaders of the Communist party, who

have nothing to lose. He seeks to preserve a bridge for his own retreat.

On June 1 the press carried my letter to the Prosecutor of the Republic, openly naming Lombardo Toledano as a moral accomplice in the preparation of the assault. After this Toledano steps half way out of the shadows. "C.T.M. (Mexican Confederation of Workers) accuses Trotsky of serving as an instrument in the (Yankee) war of nerves (against Mexico)" proclaimed *El Popular* on June 6. What does this mean? It is empty rhetoric without meaning and without any basis in fact! In the name of the C.T.M. Toledano submits to the authorities a document in which the assault is woven into a web of an extensive and extremely indefinite international intrigue. Besides myself, suspected of intrigue are a great many factors, institutions and individuals. A great many, but not the GPU. Only "the enemies of Mexico," as we already know, are capable of suspecting the GPU. Thus in all his maneuvers Toledano remains Friend No. 1 of the GPU.

"El Nacional"

In contradistinction to all other newspapers of the capital, *El Nacional* did not even mention the attempt in the first section of its issue for May 25. In the second section it carried a dispatch under the heading "Trotsky Subjected to a Theatrical (!) Attempt in His Home." On what basis the paper reached its appraisal remained unknown. I am, unfortunately, compelled to assert that in several prior instances the paper attempted to ascribe to me reprehensible actions without a shadow of justification.

It is worthy of the most diligent attention that on the same day on which *El Nacional* called the attempt "theatrical," *El Popular* wrote, "The attempt against Trotsky is an attempt against Mexico." At first sight it might appear as if *El Nacional* displayed a much more hostile attitude toward the victim of the assault than did *El Popular*. As a matter of fact that is not the case. By its conduct *El Nacional* merely revealed that it is much further removed than *El Popular* from the sources of Stalinism, and consequently the source of the assault. *El Nacional* has editors who strive to do all they can to please the Stalinists. They know that the simplest way is to utter some sort of suspicion towards me. When the editors received news of the assault against my home, one of the editors placed in circulation the first ironical formula that came into his head. This very fact shows that the editors of *El Nacional*, in contrast to the editors of *El Popular*, know not of what they write.

In the following days there is to be observed, however, a drawing together of the lines of these two publications. *El Nacional*, gathering from the conduct of *El Popular* that it blurted out very incautiously its hypothesis of a "theatrical" attempt, beat a hasty retreat and assumed a more guarded position. For its part, *El Popular*, becoming convinced that none of the participants of the attempt had been arrested, began to pass over to the position of a "theatrical" attempt. The story of May 27 "Mr. Trotsky Contradicts Himself" was also carried by *El Nacional*.

* * *

On the basis of an analysis of the articles in *El Popular* and a comparison between them and the articles in *El Nacional* it is thus possible to state with certainty that Toledano knew in advance of the preparations for the attempt, even if in the most general way. The GPU simultaneously prepared—along different channels—the conspiratorial plot, the political defense and the disinformation of the investigation. During the critical days *El Popular* received instructions, undoubtedly,

from Toledano himself. It is quite probable that none other than he is the author of the article of May 25. In other words, Lombardo Toledano took moral part in the preparation of the attempt and in covering up its traces.

My Guard

For a clearer understanding of the background of the assault as well as of certain circumstances relating to the investigation, it is necessary to say a few words about my guard. There were reports in the newspapers to the effect that I "hired" almost strangers for the guard, that they were people who worked for pay, etc. All this is false. My guard has existed since the day of my exile to Turkey, i.e., almost 12 years. The composition of the guard was constantly changing depending on the country where I lived, although a few of my collaborators accompanied me from one country to another. The guard has always consisted of young comrades, tied to me by the identity of political views and selected by my older and more experienced friends from among volunteers of whom there has been no lack.

The movement to which I belong is a young movement which arose under unprecedented persecutions on the part of the Moscow oligarchy and its agencies in all countries of the world. Generally speaking, it is hardly possible to find in history another movement which has suffered so many victims in so short a time as has the movement of the Fourth International. My personal and profound conviction is that in our epoch of wars, seizures, rapine, destruction and all sorts of bestialities, the Fourth International is destined to fulfill a great historical role. But this is the future. In the past it has known only blows and persecutions. No one could have hoped during the last 12 years to make a career with the help of the Fourth International. For this reason the movement was joined by people selfless, convinced, and ready to renounce not only material boons but, if necessary, to sacrifice their lives. Without any desire of falling into idealization, I shall nevertheless permit myself to say that it is hardly possible to find in any other organization such a selection of people devoted to their banner and alien to personal pretensions as in the Fourth International. My guard has been throughout recruited from among this youth.

The guard in Mexico was at first constituted of young Mexican friends. However, I soon became convinced of the inconvenience of such an arrangement. My enemies systematically tried to involve me in Mexican politics in order thus to make impossible my stay in the country. And inasmuch as my young Mexican friends, living in my house, actually could to a certain degree appear as agents of my political influence, I was compelled to refuse their participation in the guard and replaced them by foreigners, primarily from among citizens of the United States. They were all sent here after special selection by my experienced and old friends.

Let me add for the sake of complete clarity that the guard is not maintained by me (I lack such resources) but by a special committee which collects the necessary funds among friends and sympathizers. We live—my family and guards—as a small shut-in commune, separated by four high walls from the outside world. All these circumstances suffice to explain why I consider myself justified in placing trust in my guard and believing it incapable of treachery or crime.

Despite all precautions, it is, of course, impossible to consider as absolutely excluded the possibility that an isolated agent of the GPU could worm his way into the guard. The investigation placed under suspicion from the very beginning Robert Sheldon Harte, the kidnapped member of my guard, as an accomplice in the assault. I replied to this: if Sheldon

Harte were an agent of the GPU he could have killed me at night and gotten away without setting in motion 20 people all of whom were subjected to a great risk. Moreover, in the days immediately prior to the assault, Sheldon Harte was busy with such innocent things as buying little birds, repairing a bird cage, painting it, etc. I have not heard a single convincing argument to indicate that Sheldon Harte was a GPU agent. Therefore I announced from the outset to my friends that I would be the last one to give credence to Sheldon's participation in the assault.* If contrary to all my suppositions such a participation should be confirmed, then it would change nothing essential in the general character of the assault. With the aid of one of the members of the guard or without this aid the GPU organized a conspiracy to kill me and to burn my archives. That is the essence of the case.

The Expelled Members of the Communist Party

In its official declarations the Communist Party reiterates that individual terror does not enter into its system of actions, etc. No one supposes that the assault was organized by the Communist Party. The GPU makes use of the Communist Party but is not at all merged with the Communist Party.

Among the possible participants in the assault those who are well acquainted with the internal life of the Communist Party have mentioned an individual who was in his day expelled from the party, and was later, in return for some kind of services, reinstated. The question of the category of the "expelled" is generally of great interest from the standpoint of investigating the criminal methods of the GPU. In the first period of the struggle against the opposition in the USSR, Stalin's clique used to intentionally expel from the party the least stable oppositionists, placing them in extremely difficult material circumstances and thus giving the GPU the opportunity for recruiting among them agents for work among the opposition. Later on this method was perfected and extended to all the parties of the Third International.

The expelled may be divided into two categories: some leave the party because of principled differences and turn their back to the Kremlin and seek new roads. Others are expelled for careless handling of funds or other actual or alleged crimes of a moral nature. The majority of the expelled in this second category have become closely attached to the party apparatus, are incapable of any other work, and have grown too accustomed to a privileged position. The expelled of this type constitute valuable material for the GPU which transforms them into obedient tools for the most dangerous and criminal undertakings.

The leader of the Mexican Communist Party for many years, Laborde, was recently expelled on the most monstrous charges: as a man who was venal, a man who sold out strikes, and even took bribes from . . . "Trotskyites." The most astonishing thing, however, is that despite the extremely opprobrious nature of the charges, Laborde did not attempt even to justify himself. He showed thereby that the expulsion was necessary for some mysterious aims which he, Laborde, dared not oppose. Still more, he utilized the first opportunity in order to declare in the press his immutable loyalty to the party even after his expulsion. Simultaneously with him a number of others were expelled who follow the self-same tactic. These

* Sheldon Harte proved to be another martyr murdered by Stalin. Trotsky's article was written on June 8. On June 25, 1940 the body of Sheldon Harte was found—shot to death by the GPU gang which had kidnapped him.—EDITOR.

people are capable of anything. They will carry out any order, perpetrate any crime, so as not to lose favor with the party. It is even possible that some of them were expelled in order to remove beforehand from the party any responsibility for their participation in the assault that was being prepared. The instructions whom to expel and under what pretext come in such cases from the most trusted representatives of the GPU who hide behind the scenes.

For Stalin it would have been most profitable to have organized the murder in such a way as to represent it before the world working class as a sudden and spontaneous chastisement of an "enemy of the people" by Mexican workers. Worthy of attention from this standpoint is the persistence and eagerness of the GPU in linking me up at all costs with the presidential election campaign, namely, the candidacy of General Alamazan. A number of declarations by Toledano and by leaders of the Communist Party, reveal this strategical plan quite clearly: to find or to create a favorable pretext which would enable them to deal arms in hand with their enemies, on which list I probably do not occupy the last place. There can be no doubt that among the workers' militia of the C.T.M. there are special secret shock groups created by the GPU for the most risky undertakings.

In order to parry this plan in time I persistently demanded on every occasion in the press the establishment of an impartial investigating commission to sift all false reports. But even without this the public opinion of Mexico has obviously up to now rejected the slander. The Stalinists, so far as I am able to judge, have not succeeded in inculcating workers' circles with hatred toward me. Stalin, meanwhile, got tired of waiting for the outburst of "popular indignation" and the GPU received from him orders to act through the more customary and direct methods.

Another Assassination Attempt Is Certain

The accidental failure of the assault, so carefully and so ably prepared, is a serious blow to Stalin. The GPU must

rehabilitate itself with Stalin. Stalin must demonstrate his power. A repetition of the attempt is inevitable. In what form? Possibly once again in the form of a pure terrorist act where along with machine guns will appear bombers. But it is not at all excluded that they will try to cover up the terrorist act by means of faked "popular indignation." The slanderous campaign which is being conducted with ever increasing venom by Stalin's agents in Mexico is aimed precisely for this purpose.

To justify their persecution of me, and to cover up the assaults of the GPU, the agents of the Kremlin talk about my "counter-revolutionary" tendency. It all depends on what one understands as revolution and counter-revolution. The most powerful force of the counter-revolution in our epoch is imperialism, both in its fascist form as well as in its quasi-democratic cover. Not one of the imperialist countries wishes to permit me inside its territories. As regards the oppressed and semi-independent countries, they refuse to accept me under the pressure of imperialist governments or of the Moscow bureaucracy which now plays an extremely reactionary role in the entire world. Mexico extended hospitality to me because Mexico is not an imperialist country; and for this reason its government proved to be, as a rare exception, sufficiently independent of external pressure to guide itself in accordance with its own principles. I can therefore state that I live on this earth not in accordance with the rule but as an exception to the rule. In a reactionary epoch such as ours, a revolutionist is compelled to swim against the stream. I am doing this to the best of my ability. The pressure of world reaction has expressed itself perhaps most implacably in my personal fate and the fate of those close to me. I do not at all see in this any merit of mine: this is the result of the interlacing of historical circumstances. But when people of the type of Toledano, Laborde *et al* proclaim me to be a "counter-revolutionist," I can calmly pass them by, leaving the final verdict to history.

June 8, 1940

Coyoacan.

Lev Davidovich

By KARL MAYER

When Engels, revered patriarch of international social-democracy passed away peacefully in London, burdened with years, the end of the century was approaching which separated the revolutions of the bourgeoisie from those of the proletariat, Jacobinism from Bolshevism. The transformation of the world, announced by Marx, was to become the immediate task, and revolutionists were to know unparalleled vicissitudes. And in fact the heads of the three greatest revolutionary leaders since Engels sustained the blows of reaction. The historian of the future will not fail to see in this one of the characteristic marks of our epoch. Nor should he fail to note the source of these blows. Lenin's head was pierced by a bullet from the "Socialist Revolutionary" Fanny Kaplan. Rosa Luxemburg's head was shattered by the butt-ends of the guns of the "Social Democrat" Noske's soldiery. Trotsky's head was laid open by the pick-axe of one of the "Communist" Stalin's mercenaries.

Our epoch of crisis, with its abrupt jumps and feverish tempo, devours men and parties more and more rapidly. Those who only yesterday represented the revolution become the instruments of the darkest reaction. This struggle between

the head of the historic process and its leaden, dragging rump assumed its most dramatic form in the duel between Trotsky and Stalin, precisely because this struggle unfolded against the background of a workers' state already established. Trotsky, borne to the summits of power by the revolutionary explosion of the masses, persecuted and harassed when the defeats of the proletariat succeeded each other, became the very incarnation of the revolution.

He was aided by an astonishing physique. What struck you first was his forehead—phenomenally lofty, vertical, and not heightened by baldness. After that his eyes, blue and deep, with a gaze powerful and sure of its power. During his stay in France Lev Davidovich very often had to travel incognito in order to simplify the problem of guarding him. Then he would shave off his goatee and brush his hair to one side dividing it by a part. But when it came to his leaving the house and mingling with the public I was always worried: "No, it's really impossible . . . the first one to pass by will recognize him, he can't change that gaze of his . . ." Then, when Lev Davidovich began to speak, what attracted attention was his mouth. Whether he spoke in Russian or a for-

eign language his lips constrained themselves to shape words distinctly. He was irritated at hearing confused and precipitate speech from others, and always compelled himself to enunciate with complete distinctness. It was only in addressing Natalia Ivanovna in Russian that on occasion his enunciation became more hurried and less articulate, descending sometimes into a whisper. In conversations with visitors in his study his hands, resting on the edge of his work-table at first, would soon begin moving with large, firm gestures, as though aiding his lips in molding the expression of his thought. His face with its halo of hair, the set of his head, and the whole carriage of his body were always proud and stately. His stature was above medium, with a powerful chest and a broad, stalwart back, and in comparison his legs appeared somewhat slender. It is undoubtedly easier for someone who paid him one visit to say what he saw in Trotsky's face than for one who was at his side for many years in the most variegated circumstances.

The one thing I never saw was the faintest expression of vulgarity. Nor was there any greater likelihood of finding what is called bonhomie. But a certain sweetness was not lacking, which no doubt originated in the formidable intelligence of whose readiness to understand everything you were always aware. What you usually saw was a youthful enthusiasm which joyously undertook everything, and at the same time was strong enough to induce others to cooperate in the undertaking. When it was a question of cudgeling an opponent this sort of gaiety swiftly changed into irony, biting and malicious, alternating with an expression of contempt, and when the enemy was particularly swinish, you would, for a moment, almost find a hint of malevolence. But his vivacity returned quickly. "We'll fix 'em!" he would say then with animation. In the isolation of exile the most dramatic circumstances where I could see Lev Davidovich were his conflicts with the police, or incidents with adversaries of bad faith. At these times his face would harden, and his eyes would flash, as though in them had suddenly been concentrated that vast will-power which ordinarily could be measured only by the labors of his entire life. Then it was obvious to everyone that nothing, nothing in the world could make him budge an inch.

How Trotsky Worked

In daily life this will-power expended itself in strictly organized labor. Any unmotivated disturbance irritated him extremely: he hated pointless conversations, unannounced visits, disappointments or delays in keeping engagements. To be sure there was nothing pedantic in any of this. If an important question turned up he would not hesitate a moment in upsetting all his plans, but it had to be worth it. If it had the slightest interest for the movement he would heedlessly give his time and energy, but he showed himself all the more miserly of them when the carelessness, lightmindedness, or bad organization of others threatened to waste them. He hoarded the smallest particles of time, the most precious material of which life is made. His whole personal life was rigidly organized by the quality called singleness of purpose. He set up a hierarchy of duties, and brought to a conclusion whatever he undertook.

As a rule he did not work less than twelve hours a day, and sometimes, when it was necessary, much more. He remained at table as briefly as possible, and after sharing his meals for many years I could not say that I ever noticed on his face any mark of enjoyment for what he ate or drank. "Eating, dressing, all these miserable little things that have to be repeated every day . . ." he once said to me.

He could find his only diversion in great physical activity. Merely walking was scarcely a relaxation. He walked actively and in silence, and you could see that his mind was always at work. Now and then he would ask a question: "When did you answer that letter?" "Can you find me that quotation?" Only violent exercise gave him repose. In Turkey this consisted of hunting, and especially fishing, deep-sea fishing, complicated and agitated, where the body had to spend itself recklessly. When the fishing had been good, that is, very fatiguing, he began work on his return with redoubled enthusiasm. In Mexico, where fishing was impossible, he invented the gathering of cacti, of enormous weight, under a blazing sun.

Of course the necessity for security created certain obligations. During the eleven and a half years of his third emigration it was only for a few months, at certain times during his stay in France and in Norway, that Lev Davidovich could walk about freely, that is, unguarded, in the countryside around his house. As a rule each one of his excursions constituted a minor military operation. It was necessary to make all arrangements in advance, and fix his route carefully. "You treat me as though I were an object," he sometimes said, jokingly dissimulating whatever impatience there might have been in this remark.

He demanded the same methodical spirit he observed in his own work from the comrades who assisted him. The closer they were to him, the more did he demand of them and the less did he trouble himself with formalities. He desired precision in everything: an undated letter, an unsigned document always irritated him, as did in general anything easygoing, slipshod, or happy-go-lucky. Do whatever you're doing well, and do it till you finish. And in this rule he made no distinction between petty day-to-day chores and intellectual work: conduct your thoughts to their conclusion, is an expression that often sprang from his pen. He always displayed great solicitude for the health of those around him. Health is revolutionary capital that must not be wasted. He grew angry at seeing someone read in a bad light. It's necessary to risk your life for the revolution without hesitating, but why ruin your eyes when you can read comfortably and intelligently?

Trotsky's Conversations

In conversations with Lev Davidovich what visitors were struck by chiefly was his capacity to find his bearings in a novel situation. He was able to integrate it in his general perspective, and at the same time always give immediate and concrete advice. During his third emigration he often had the opportunity of conversing with visitors from countries he was not acquainted with directly, perhaps from the Balkans or Latin America. He did not always know the language, did not follow their press and had never had any particular interest in their specific problems. First of all he would allow his interrogator to speak, occasionally jotting down a few brief notes on a slip of paper in front of him, sometimes asking for a few details: "How many members has this party?" "Isn't this politician a lawyer?"

Then he would speak, and the mass of information that had been given him would be organized. Soon one could distinguish the movements of different classes and of different layers within these classes, and then, bound up with these movements, there would be revealed the play of parties, groups and organizations, and then the place and the activities of various political figures, down to their profession and personal traits, would be logically fitted into the picture. The French naturalist Cuvier used to boast of his ability to reconstruct an entire animal from a single bone. With his vast

knowledge of social and political realities Trotsky could devote himself to a similar work. His interrogator was always astounded at seeing how deeply he had been able to penetrate the reality of the particular problem, and would leave Trotsky's study knowing his own country a little better.

At every moment you felt in Trotsky a huge fund of experience, not merely engraved in his memory but organized and reflected on lengthily and profoundly. You could also see that the organization of this experience had taken place around indestructible principles. Though Lev Davidovich hated routine, though he was always anxious to discover new trends, the least attempt at innovation in the realm of principles made him prick up his ears. "Trimming Marx's beard," was his expression for all these attempts to put Marxism in line with the current fashion, and he did not dissimulate his contempt for them.

Trotsky's Style and Writing Methods

Trotsky's style is universally admired. It is undoubtedly to be best compared with that of Marx. However, Trotsky's sentences are less spacious than those of Marx, in whom one is aware of a wealth of scholarly resources, especially in the youthful works. Trotsky's style achieves its effects by extremely simple means. His vocabulary, especially in his more properly political writings, is always rather limited. The sentences are short, with few subordinate clauses. Their power arises from a sturdy articulation, most often with strongly marked but always well balanced oppositions. This temperance of means gives his style a great freshness and, one might say, youthfulness. In his writing Trotsky is considerably more youthful than Marx.

Trotsky knew how to take advantage of that Russian syntax whose inflections permit the word-order within a sentence to be upset, giving the expression of the thought a force and emphasis difficult to attain with the limited means of modern western languages. And also difficult to translate. Lev Davidovich demanded a mathematical fidelity from his translators, and at the same time kicked against the rules of grammar in the foreign language which forbade a similarly concise and direct rendition of his thought. Compared to that of Lenin, Trotsky's style is superior, by a large margin, in its lucidity and elegance, without any loss of power. Lenin's sentences occasionally become cumbrous, too heavy, disorganized. It seems as though the thought sometimes cripples its expression. Trotsky once said that in Lenin you could discover a Russian mushik, but one raised to the level of genius. Even though Lenin's father was a provincial functionary and Trotsky's a farmer, it is Trotsky who is the city-dweller, as opposed to Lenin, doubtless because of his race. This may

be seen at once in the difference of styles, without any attempt being made here to uncover this opposition in other aspects of these two giant personalities.

When Trotsky was deported to Turkey, the passport the Soviet authorities gave him put down his profession as writer. And in truth he was a great, an exceedingly great writer. If the bureaucrats's inscription causes a smile it is because Trotsky was so much more than a writer. He wrote with ease, being able to dictate several hours at a sitting. But then he would go over the manuscript and correct it carefully. For some of these great writings, such as the History of the Russian Revolution, there are two successive drafts behind the definitive text, but in the majority of cases there is only one. His enormous literary production, in which are to be found books, pamphlets, innumerable articles, letters, hurried statements to the press, and notes of all sorts is, needless to say, uneven. Some parts are more worked over than others, but not a sentence in any of them has been neglected. You can take any five lines in this ponderous accumulation of writing and you will always recognize the inimitable Trotsky.

Their volume is also impressive, and would alone bear testimony to a very rare will and capacity for labor. Thirty volumes of Lenin's complete works have been collected, in addition to thirty-five volumes of correspondence and odd notes. Trotsky lived seven years longer than Lenin, but his writings, from his long books to his brief personal notes, would undoubtedly come to triple that amount. In the eleven and a half years of his third emigration he amassed a labor which would honorably fill an entire lifetime. It may be said that the pen never abandoned his hand, and what a hand it was!

He Lives in His Books

Trotsky has put all of himself into his books. Personal contact with the man himself did not modify the portrait that emerged from a reading of his works, but deepened it and made it more precise: passion and reason, intelligence and will, all carried to an extreme degree, but at the same time blending into one another. In everything Lev Davidovich did one had the feeling that he had given his whole being. He often repeated Hegel's words: Nothing great is done in this world without passion; and he had nothing but contempt for the philistines who object to the "fanaticism" of the revolutionaries. But intelligence was always present, in miraculous harmony with the fire. Nor could one dream of discovering a conflict: the will was indomitable because the mind saw very far. Hegel would have to be quoted once again: *Der Wille ist eine besondere Weise des Denkens*. Will is a specific function of thought.

The Right Of Revolution

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

The defendants in the Minnesota case have been indicted on the ground that the Socialist Workers Party seeks to persuade workers and farmers "that the Government of the United States is imperialistic, capitalistic and organized and constituted for the purpose of subjecting workers and laborers to various and sundry deprivations and for the purpose of denying to them an alleged right to own, control and manage all property and industry in the United States," and that it is desirable and necessary that the workers and farmers bring about a revolutionary change in this system.

This is one point in the indictment that the Socialist Workers Party acknowledges as true. We are the Party of the Socialist Revolution in the United States. We maintain that the present capitalist government does not represent the interests of the American masses but acts on behalf of the few rich families who monopolize economic and political power. We propose that the organized workers and farmers of the United States replace this utterly reactionary regime with their own administrative power, which shall govern on behalf

of the laboring majority instead of the exploiting minority of the plutocrats.

We further insist that the working people of this country have every right to take this revolutionary step and that our party has every legal and democratic right to advocate it. We advocate this openly in our publications and public meetings and not, as the FBI-Gestapo falsely alleges, by secret and conspiratorial methods. We have no reason to conceal our aims or camouflage our revolutionary position. We have nothing to hide from the American people, for our party has no interests separate and apart from their interests. Our program can be realized only through the action of the popular masses. They must first be convinced of its correctness and educated in its spirit. This requires that our program persistently and publicly confront the programs of all other parties and display its superiority over its competitors in the political arena.

There *are* conspirators at work today against the welfare of the American people. But they are not the Trotskyists. They are the Roosevelts, the Stimsons, the Knoxes—leaders of the imperialist plunderbund, who lie to the conscripts, who conclude secret diplomatic and military agreements, and are ready to drag the U.S. into war against the will of 80 per cent of the people. Behind these stooges stand the Mellons, Rockefellers and Morgans, who dictate their actions and impose their private profiteering policies upon the nation. These are the real conspirators against the people!

The indictment charges us with being followers of Lenin and Trotsky and of holding up as an example to the American workers the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. We proudly plead guilty to this charge. The Socialist Workers Party consciously carries on the great traditions of revolutionary Marxism, exemplified in the teachings and actions of the Bolshevik movement led by Lenin and Trotsky. But we are not only international revolutionists; we are also American revolutionists—and we are equally proud of carrying on the traditions of revolutionary struggle that created the United States and made it in many respects paramount among the nations of the earth.

The American Revolutionary Tradition

It is no exaggeration to say that no other section of humanity has had a more revolutionary career than we Americans. No other people has displayed more revolutionary energy.

We Americans won our independence through a revolutionary uprising. We gained and preserved our democratic rights by militant measures. We eliminated chattel slavery from this continent by civil war. If ever any people had reason to trust in the effectiveness of revolutionary methods to attain their ends, it is the American people.

The history of the American people is a history of uninterrupted revolution. The original settlements on this continent were offshoots of that great social revolutionary movement of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries which transformed Europe and was eventually to change the world. This was the struggle of the rising capitalist system against the dying feudal order. The breakup of the old Europe under the impact of the new capitalist forces gave the impetus to the discovery, exploration and exploitation of the New World and supplied the elements for building up its colonies. Early American history derives its world-historical significance from the part it played in this process of continuous world revolution that accompanied the expansion of capitalism.

That bourgeois-democratic revolution, which started out from western Europe in the 15th century, marched forward from city to city, from country to country, from continent to

continent, until by the end of the 19th century it had conquered and joined together the whole globe from its most civilized centers to its most remote and barbarous regions. This social revolutionary movement was fundamentally responsible for the existence of American civilization as we know it today. Without that international revolution, the Indians might still be enjoying peaceful possession of North America, the Roosevelt family might never have left Holland nor Tobin's forebears Ireland.

In the further course of their historical development, the American people passed through two tremendous national revolutions: one at the end of the 18th and the other in the middle of the 19th century. These revolutions marked great steps forward in the lives of the American people.

The First American Revolution won independence for the oppressed colonists, eliminated many vestiges of feudalism, united thirteen colonies into one nation, and set up a democratic republic. It gave the United States of America the most advanced form of government, which became a model and inspiration for progressive forces throughout the world in the following century.

But that did not end the need for revolutionary action. In order to maintain the social gains and extend the political conquests acquired through the First Revolution, it became necessary to initiate another in 1861. This Second American Revolution preserved the unity of the United States against the attempts of the secessionist slaveholders to split it in two. It defended the plea of equality at the base of American democracy against the degenerate counter-revolutionary clique which made slavery the cornerstone of the Confederacy. It emancipated the slaves and destroyed the economic and political power of the slaveholders who had misruled the country for 60 years. The victory of the North helped safeguard not only this country's independence but the independence of the rest of the American peoples from the vultures of European imperialism.

The victorious revolution of the Union over the Confederacy paved the way for the prodigious achievements of that Golden Age of national progress and world prosperity which followed the Civil War. It encouraged the virile young European labor movement and the democratic forces in Latin America.

Such have been the accomplishments of the American people in their revolutionary vigor!

Whatever else they may be taken to signify, these mighty events testify that revolution is no less native to our soil than to Europe. They confirm the fact which lies at the basis of Marxist theory, that fundamental social problems involving antagonistic class interests cannot be settled fully and finally by mutual accommodation but must find their solution in life and death battles between opposing social forces.

The Written Heritage of American Revolution

In line with their bold and heroic struggles, the most cherished traditions of the American people are permeated with the spirit of revolutionary democracy. Take the text of that extremely subversive document, "The Declaration of Independence," written by Thomas Jefferson, to whom Roosevelt's so-called "Democratic" Party pays homage yearly. In its second paragraph there is this categorical justification for the right to revolution:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty

and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

Further, "It is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government and to provide new Guards for their future security." To our militant forefathers, revolution was not simply a right but, under certain circumstances, even a duty!

The history of the Republican Party is likewise tainted with revolutionary doctrine. In a speech before the first Republican state convention in Illinois in 1856, Abraham Lincoln, the idol of the Republican Party, declared:

"The government, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

We Trotskyists take our stand beside Jefferson and Lincoln in defense of the right of revolution. This is the most precious and inalienable of democratic rights, the foundation and safeguard of all others. If the patriot leaders of 1776 had not acted upon this right against the cries of the conservatives and the Crown, the American people might today still belong to the British empire. If the Radical Republicans had relinquished their revolutionary rights during the Civil War, the slave-holders might not have been crushed.

In prosecuting us as revolutionists, Roosevelt ranges himself alongside of King George, the slaveholders and all the other tyrants in American history. The Smith Act which Congress passed in 1940 under White House pressure and under which the Socialist Workers Party members have been indicted, makes it a state crime to republish these words from the Declaration of Independence or these speeches of Lincoln. Will Roosevelt's Department of "Justice" arraign Jefferson and Lincoln together with us for asserting the right to revolution?

Ruling Class Always Acts This Way

Throughout history, the ruling class has sought to set limits upon the action of the masses in defense of their legitimate rights and well-being. Thus today workers are told: "You can beg the bosses for higher wages but you cannot strike to get them." Or—"You can strike in peace-time but not during war." Or—"You can strike against a private employer but not against the Federal Government." Or—"You can strike in non-essential plants but not in war industries." The one purpose of all these admonitions is to restrain workers from exerting their full strength to improve their status.

Reactionaries have always been even more concerned with setting limits upon the political activities of the working class. "We will permit you to vote for one of two capitalist parties, but you cannot have your own class Labor Party. You can ask us for reforms but you cannot remove us from power. We demand the privilege of dictating governmental policy, and if you attempt to take this supreme power away from us, we shall not abide by your majority decision." Such are the haughty ultimatums ruling-class politicians always have issued to the people.

Fortunately, the progressive sections of the American people have never been intimidated by such dictatorial threats, nor have they heeded the prohibitions of would-be master classes for long. Whenever the entrenched powers of reaction

have placed signs across the road to revolution, marked: "No Thoroughfare," the masses have knocked aside both the obstructions and the obstructors—and they have not done so in a polite and peaceful manner.

This is the main lesson to be drawn from American history—and it is one that the present capitalist rulers of the country wish above all to keep the people from learning. Just a few months before Roosevelt tried to remove the proletarian revolutionists of the Socialist Workers Party from the ranks of labor by means of trumped-up accusations, he endeavored to efface these revolutionary lessons from the course of American history. In a speech on January 6th of this year, Roosevelt set forth this falsified version of the permanent revolution in American history. "Since the beginning of our American history, we have been engaged in change—in a peaceful perpetual revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly, adjusting itself to changing conditions..."

This official picture of American history, purged of all its mighty struggles and class conflicts, of all its progressive revolutionary content, no more resembles reality than does a Hollywood scenario. The American people have not moved forward in "peaceful, perpetual revolution," as Roosevelt would have us believe, surmounting obstacles in their path as effortlessly as a millionaire's Cadillac climbs hills. Nor have they, "steadily, quietly adjusted themselves to changing conditions."

The Real Course of American History

On the contrary, at every stage of their progress, the American people have experienced other than peaceful struggles. The armed forces of half a dozen European powers fought against each other and against the aborigines throughout the Colonial period. The English colonists waged war against the Indians, the French, the Spanish, and finally against the mother country itself. As an independent nation, the United States warred against France, the Barbary Coast pirates, Canada, England, Mexico, Spain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, China, the Soviet Union—and, as Roosevelt himself can best testify, its military adventures have only begun.

Side by side and interwoven with these external conflicts, there have unfolded profound and prolonged struggles between antagonistic sections of American society. Landless colonists against landed proprietors, indentured servants and slaves against their masters, small farmers against wealthy planters and capitalists, Patriots against Loyalists, plebeian revolutionists against reactionary patricians. In the first part of the 19th century American history revolved around the contest between the pro-slavery and anti-slavery forces, which culminated in civil war. Between the Civil and First World Wars, the exploited petty-bourgeois masses of city and country contended against the trusts and monopolies. In our own day, the strike struggles of organized labor against Big Business have involved greater numbers than the soldiers engaged in the Civil War. And, as the Memorial Day massacre at Chicago so recently reminded us, these battles exact many victims.

Those who condemn all use of force and violence thereby condemn the whole course of American history. For that history is the greatest of all advocates of force and violence. The present capitalist masters of the United States did not acquire state power by legal or peaceful means; they conquered and defended it arms in hand during the Second American Revolution. To establish their supremacy within the nation, they had to suppress the slave-holders on their right and the workers on their left. They have maintained power since against

foreign rivals and against the working masses at home through force and violence. Only force and violence keep the Cubans, Filipinos and Porto-Ricans under American domination.

What We Teach the American Workers

The Federal indictment accuses the Socialist Workers Party of advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence. This is a lie. We work to win the majority of the American people to our ideas by education and propaganda and we would prefer to have socialism established by peaceful means. This would undoubtedly be the most economical and desirable method of effecting the social changes which are needed to assure peace and security.

At the same time, we point out to the American people the lessons of their own history. The British Crown would not permit the Colonists to obtain their just rights and national independence without the most violent struggle. When the Republican Party was first elected to national power, the slaveholders would not abide by this democratic decision but sought, like Franco's regime, to find salvation in counter-revolution. In both these national crises, the progressive majority was obliged to resort to measures of revolutionary self-defense in order to repel and crush the counter-revolutionary minority.

Therefore, we say to the American people: Do not yield up your elementary right of self-defense. Strikers have the right to protect themselves against the attacks of employers' thugs and strike-breakers. Unions, like Local 544-CIO, have the right to defend themselves by union defense guards against fascist bands. The American workers and farmers have the right to safeguard themselves both from foreign and from domestic fascists.

Indeed, Roosevelt and the warmakers invoke this very principle of national self-defense in justifying their impending participation in the imperialist conflict. Violence is permissible in their code when it serves plutocratic interests but it is forbidden in defense of the rights of the people.

Where are the real practitioners of violence to be found? Not amongst the Trotskyists but amongst their prosecutors. The Department of Justice uses the force of the FBI and the courts to persecute revolutionists for their opinions and to deprive them of their constitutional right of free speech. Daniel Tobin hurls 300 strong-arm men against the Minneapolis motor transport workers. Franklin Doublecross Roosevelt sends 3,000 troops against the North American strikers. And then they accuse the Socialist Workers Party of advocating force and violence!

The capitalist statesmen are extremely inconsistent in

their attitude towards the right of revolution. Roosevelt himself approved Churchill's call to the German people to revolt against Hitler. His administration gives shelter and recognition to governments-in-exile, plotting revolutions in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium and half a dozen other conquered countries. Recently Roosevelt appealed to the French people over the heads of their present rulers, asking them to repudiate Vichy's policies.

To the upholders of the present capitalist regime in the United States, therefore, revolution is not always and everywhere so reprehensible an affair. Some highly useful technical processes are excluded from this country because they endanger the vested interests of great corporations. They are, however, permitted to be used in other countries. So it is with revolution, as far as Roosevelt is concerned. A revolution would be bad for home consumption; it is good only as an article for export!

Revolution Is Still the Motor of History

At this point some citizens may object: Revolutions were permissible and profitable here in the 18th and 19th centuries, but we Americans have no further need for a revolution. This aversion to revolution is scarcely original. The defenders of the status-quo have never at any time admitted the need for revolutionary change desired by the masses. The Loyalists of 1776 condemned resistance against King George's men; the patriots answered these defenders of British oppression by reciting the ideas and recalling the deeds of the 17th century English revolutionists from Locke and Milton to Oliver Cromwell. The conservatives of John Brown's day were willing to have the American people remain slaves of the slave-holding oligarchy. But that did not prevent the revolutionists from fighting for their liberty and saving it for the nation.

Whatever repressive governments and short-sighted individuals may say or do, the revolutionary annals of the American people did not end with the 19th century. On the contrary, all signs point to the approach of another and greater revolutionary crisis here in the not too distant future. To those who have eyes to see and minds to think, the Third American Revolution is now being born.

This 20th Century revolution can only be proletarian in its leadership and socialist in its aims. It will complete the tasks of social reconstruction left unfinished by the great bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the two previous centuries. The Socialist Workers Party aspires to guide the workers and farmers of the United States through this inevitable revolutionary struggle and to lead them forward to victory and to a better world.

"If this be treason, make the most of it!"

Text of the Federal Indictment

At a stated term of the District Court of the United States of America for the district of Minnesota begun and held at the City of St. Paul, within and for the district and division aforesaid, on the first Tuesday in April, being the first day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-one, by a duly empaneled, charged, and sworn grand jury of the United States of America within and for said district, it is presented in manner and form following, that is to say:

The Grand Jurors of the United States

of America within and for said district in the name and by the authority of the said United States of America, upon their oaths present that from and before the 16th day of July, 1938, and continuously thereafter until the day of the filing of this indictment, in the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, in the State and District of Minnesota, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, and in the City of Chicago, State of Illinois, and in the City and State of New York, and elsewhere, one

Vincent Ray Dunne, Carl Skoglund,

James P. Cannon, Farrell Dobbs, Miles B. Dunne, Felix Morrow, Grace Carlson, Oscar Coover, Harry DeBoer, Jake Cooper, Max Goldman, Carlos Hudson, Alfred Russell, Edward Palmquist, Rose Seiler, Albert Goldman, Oscar Schoenfeld, George Frosig, Emil Hanson, Dorothy Schultz, Kelly Postal, Clarence Hamel, Carl Kuehn, Roy Orgon, Ray Rainbolt, Grant Dunne, Harold Swanson, Walter Hagstrom and Nick Wagner hereinafter referred to as "defendants," then and there being, did unlawfully, wilfully, knowingly, and feloniously con-

spire, plan, combine, confederate, and agree together and with each other, and with divers other persons to the Grand Jurors unknown, hereinafter referred to as "co-conspirators," to overthrow, put down, and to destroy by force the Government of the United States of America, and to oppose by force the authority thereof.

And the Grand Jurors do present that as part of said conspiracy and as ways and means by which it would be accomplished, the following steps, among others, were to be and were taken, all in the city of Minneapolis, State and District aforesaid, and elsewhere within the period of time alleged in this indictment:

1. The defendants, who were officers, leaders, active members, and in control of a certain political party or organization known as the Socialist Workers Party, which said party or organization was composed of a large number of persons, the exact number being to the Grand Jurors unknown, would procure, induce, influence, incite, and encourage the members of the Socialist Workers Party, and divers other persons, whose names are to the Grand Jurors unknown, to join with them to bring about the overthrow by force of the Government of the United States, and the destruction thereof by force, and the opposition by force to the authority thereof.

2. The defendants would seek to bring about, whenever the time seemed to them propitious, an armed revolution against the Government of the United States, and the authority thereof.

3. Said armed revolution would be brought about and joined in by the workers and laborers and farmers of the United States, or as many of them as said defendants and their co-conspirators could procure and induce to engage therein.

4. Said workers, laborers and farmers would be by the defendants and their co-conspirators urged, counseled, and persuaded that the Government of the United States was imperialistic, capitalistic and organized and constituted for the purpose of subjecting workers and laborers to various and sundry deprivations and for the purpose of denying to them an alleged right to own, control and manage all property and industry in the United States, all to the end that said workers and laborers would be willing to take part in the armed revolution envisaged and projected by said defendants.

5. Members of the Socialist Workers Party would be placed in key positions in all major industries, among others the transportation, mining, lumbering, farming, shipping, and manufacturing industries, so that said party members could and would induce, persuade, and procure the workers and laborers in said industries to join said party, embrace its principles and objectives and obey the commands of its leaders, thereby enabling the defendants and other leaders of said Socialist Workers Party to obtain and exercise absolute control of all industries in the United States to the end that by pa-

ralyzing the same, said projected armed revolution could be more easily and successfully accomplished.

6. Members of the Socialist Workers Party would be placed in key positions in all trade unions and said party members would especially endeavor to obtain absolute control over such trade unions, so that the members thereof, comprising a vast number of workers and laborers in the United States, would be subject to the will and commands of said party leaders, thus enabling the defendants and their co-conspirators to bring about a complete stoppage of work in the major industries of the United States at any given time, and preventing thereby the duly constituted Government of the United States from adequately defending itself against the armed revolution the defendants conspired to bring about.

7. The defendants and their co-conspirators would endeavor by any means at their disposal to procure members of the military and naval forces of the United States to become undisciplined, to complain about food, living conditions, and missions to which they would be assigned, to create dissension, dissatisfaction and insubordination among the armed forces, to impair the loyalty and morale thereof, and finally to seek to gain control of said naval and military forces so that the enlisted personnel thereof would revolt against its officers, thereby enabling said defendants to overcome and put down by force and arms the constitutional Government of the United States.

8. When the Selective Service Act was passed, the members of said Socialist Workers Party would be urged to willingly accept service, but after being induced into the army of the United States, to do everything in their power to disrupt, hinder, and impair the efficient functioning thereof, and when the appropriate time came to turn their weapons against their officers.

9. The defendants and their co-conspirators would, and they did, advocate and attempt to bring about control of the militia by the workers and laborers of the United States, especially by trade unions; and the defendants would advise, counsel, and encourage the said workers and laborers to arm themselves and to become proficient and trained in the use thereof so that they would be better equipped to overthrow, destroy, and put down by force the Government of the United States.

10. Workers and laborers would be, and they were, organized into military units which would be armed and drilled and taught how skilfully to use pistols and rifles, which said units would be, and were, called "Union Defense Guards"; said units would ostensibly be used for protection against violent attempts to destroy trade unions, but were in truth and fact, designed and intended to be used ultimately to overthrow, destroy, and put down by force the duly constituted, constitutional Government of the United States.

11. The said defendants and their co-conspirators would, and they did, by and for the use of themselves and other persons to the Grand Jurors unknown, procure certain explosives, fire-arms, ammunition, weapons and military equipment, for the aforesaid purpose.

12. The said defendants and their co-conspirators would, and they did, accept as the ideal formula for the carrying out of their said objectives the Russian Revolution of 1917, whereby the then existing Government of Russia was overthrown by force and violence, and the principles, teachings, writings, counsel and advice of the leaders of that revolution, chiefly of V. I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky, would be, and they were, looked to, relied on, followed and held out to others as catechisms and textbooks directing the manner and means by which the aforesaid aim of the defendants could, and would be, accomplished; and accordingly, certain of the defendants would, and they did, go from the City of Minneapolis, State and District of Minnesota, and from other cities in the United States to Mexico City, Mexico, there to advise with and to receive the advice, counsel, guidance, and directions of the said Leon Trotsky.

13. The said defendants and their co-conspirators would, and they did, endeavor to procure and persuade as many other persons as possible to join with them in their undertaking by printing, publishing, selling, distributing and publicly displaying and by causing to be printed, published, sold, distributed, and publicly displayed, written and printed matter, including leaflets, pamphlets, newspapers, magazines and books which advocated, advised and taught the duty, necessity, desirability, and propriety of overthrowing and destroying by force and violence all governments in the world said by the defendants, their mentors and leaders, to be imperialistic and capitalistic, and of the governments so characterized, the Government of the United States of America was said to be the foremost. Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and especially contrary to Section 6 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

SECOND COUNT

And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present that heretofore, to-wit: beginning the 28th day of June, 1940, and continuously thereafter until the day of the filing of this indictment, at the Cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, in the State and District of Minnesota, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, and in the City of Chicago, State of Illinois, and in the City and State of New York, and elsewhere, one Vincent Ray Dunne, Carl Skoglund, James P. Cannon, Farrell Dobbs, Miles B. Dunne, Felix Morrow, Grace Carlson, Oscar Coover, Harry De Boer, Jake Cooper, Max Goldman, Carlos Hudson, Alfred Russell, Edward Palmquist, Rose Seiler, Albert Goldman, Oscar Schoenfeld, George Frosig, Emil Hanson, Dorothy

Schultz, Kelly Postal, Clarence Hamel, Carl Kuehn, Roy Orgon, Ray Rainbolt, Grant Dunne, Harold Swanson, Walter Hagstrom, and Nick Wagner, hereinafter referred to as "defendants," then and there being, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly and feloniously conspire, plan, combine, confederate and agree together and with each other, and with divers other persons to the Grand Jurors unknown, hereinafter referred to as "co-conspirators" to commit certain acts prohibited by certain statutes of the United States, namely, Sections 9 and 10 of Title 18 of the United States Code, in that they in the Cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, State and District of Minnesota, and elsewhere, and during the period of time alleged in this count:

1. With the intent to interfere with, impair and influence the loyalty, morale and discipline of the military and naval forces of the United States, would

a. Advise, counsel, urge, and cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States, and

b. Distribute written and printed matter which advised, counseled, and urged insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States, and

2. Knowingly and willfully would, and they did, advocate, abet, advise and teach the duty, necessity, desirability and propriety of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, and

3. With the intent to cause the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States would, and they did, print, publish, edit, issue, circulate, sell, distribute and publicly display written and printed matter advocating, advising, and teaching the duty, necessity, desirability and propriety of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, and

4. Would, and they did, organize and help to organize societies, groups and assemblies of persons to teach, advocate and encourage the overthrow and destruction of

the Government of the United States by force and violence, and

5. Would be, and did, become members of and affiliated with such societies, groups and assemblies knowing the purpose thereof.

And the Grand Jurors do present that the said defendants and their co-conspirators would, and they did, attempt to carry out and accomplish said conspiracy in the manner set out in numbered paragraphs 1 to 13, inclusive, in the first count of this indictment; Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and especially contrary to Section 11 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and against the peace and dignity of the United States. Dated July 15, 1941

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General
HENRY A. SCHWEINHAUT,
Special Assistant to the
Attorney General
VICTOR E. ANDERSON,
United States Attorney for
the District of Minnesota

The Federal Prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party

By FELIX MORROW

The text of the indictment drawn up by the United States Department of Justice and handed down by a federal grand jury in St. Paul, Minnesota, on July 15, appears on page 212.

This indictment makes strange reading, not only to the friends of the Socialist Workers Party, but to all politically literate people. Even the "left" liberal friends of the government (*The Nation*, *New Republic*, *New York Post*), haunted by memories of other frameups, are embarrassed by the government's attempt to distort the anti-war and anti-fascist slogans of our party into criminal offenses.

These distortions, though fantastic, are nevertheless necessary to the government's attempted frameup of the Socialist Workers Party. The wildly false charges in the indictment had to be concocted in order to provide a semblance of a basis for bringing the Socialist Workers Party under the stricture of laws which are in no way applicable to our party.

If the laws of the United States were to be observed by the present government, it could not find a way to indict us. The most the government could truthfully say of us is that we are revolutionists, irreconcilable opponents of its imperialist war plans. But the right to advocate revolution and oppose imperialist war is in no way prohibited by American law. Were revolutionists condemned by the law, we would scarcely have been permitted the legal existence which has been ours. What has actually happened is that the Roosevelt administration has reached the point where it is desperately attempting to suppress every voice raised against American entry into the war. When Roosevelt and Stimson go to the length of accusing so respectable a gentleman as Senator Wheeler of "verging

on treason," they will scarcely hesitate at engineering a frameup against the Socialist Workers Party.

Roosevelt Violates the Bill of Rights

In drawing up this indictment the Department of Justice, representative of the ruling bourgeois class of today, had to cope with the revolutionary past of that class. For that class once led the most progressive forces in American society. It successfully carried through two revolutions. Those two revolutions left their indelible marks on the laws of the United States, making it impossible for the Department of Justice to indict us except by doing violence to the law.

Neither of the two American revolutions could have been successful without the aid of the great masses of the American people; to draw them into the struggle necessitated democratic-revolutionary doctrines, and those doctrines became in part incorporated into the Constitution and legal tradition of the United States.

The Constitution, written after the first American revolution, is far more conservative than the great inspirational document of the revolution itself, the Declaration of Independence. But the makers of the Constitution could not entirely escape the democratic doctrine of the Declaration: the Constitution was adopted only on condition that the Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments—became part of it.

The Bill of Rights expressed the democratic aspirations of the small farmers and working artisans of the cities. They had borne the brunt of the first American revolution. They were to reap few of its benefits. But they did succeed in securing the Bill of Rights.

The courts, serving the ruling class, have often enough

done violence to the Bill of Rights. Only by lawless violence can the courts pervert the plain and simple meaning of those first ten amendments to the Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution says clearly:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

The Roosevelt administration has violated this Constitutional provision in its attempt to railroad to prison the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party.

This Constitutional provision rendered unconstitutional the Smith "Omnibus Gag" Bill, as the American Civil Liberties Union reminded Roosevelt when it appealed to him to veto that bill. However, the Civil Liberties appeal fell on deaf ears; Roosevelt signed the bill on June 29, 1940, and we are the first to be indicted under it. The truth is that the appeal for a veto to Roosevelt must be considered as rather naive since the key sections of the Smith Act, its "sedition" provisions—Congressman Howard W. Smith, the bill's sponsor, is authority for this fact—were drafted by the Navy Department, that is, by the Roosevelt administration. But there can be no doubt in any honest mind that the Smith Act violates the Bill of Rights. Here are the relevant portions of the Smith Act, which constitute Sections 9, 10 and 11 of Title 18 of the United States Code:

"9. *Advocating disloyalty of military or naval forces of the United States* (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of military or naval forces of the United States—

"(1) to advise, counsel, urge or in any manner cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(2) to distribute any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States . . .

"10 *Advocating overthrow of any government in the United States by force or violence* — (a) It shall be unlawful for any person—

"(1) to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability or propriety of overthrowing any government in the United States by force or violence . . .

"(2) with the intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States, to print, publish, edit, issue, circulate, sell, distribute, or publicly display any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence;

"(3) to organize or help to organize any society, group or assembly of persons who teach, advocate or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States by force or violence; or to be or become a member of, or affiliate with, any such society, group or assembly of persons, knowing the purpose thereof.

"11. It shall be unlawful for any person to attempt to commit, or to conspire to commit, any of the acts prohibited by the provisions of this Title."

Quite apart from the fact that none of the activities of the Socialist Workers Party can be justly described in the language of the Smith Act, it is obvious at a first reading of these provisions of the Smith Act that they are unconstitutional. To make it a crime to "advocate, advise, teach" anything is a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution which guarantees freedom of speech.

Government Knows Smith Act Is Unconstitutional

The Department of Justice officials are admittedly aware of the unconstitutional character of the "sedition" provisions of the Smith Act. The Washington correspondent of *The Nation*, I. F. Stone, who talked to the Department of Justice officials, writes:

"'Off the record' at least one official engaged in the prosecution is prepared to admit that the Supreme Court may find the sedition provisions of the Smith Act unconstitutional. For the first time in peace since the Alien and Sedition Laws of John Adams a mere expression of opinion is made a federal crime. Under these provisions a man might be sent to jail for ten years because he circulated such un-American documents as the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's Second Inaugural, for both 'advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government' by force." (*The Nation*, July 26, 1941.)

Feeling so unsure of the Smith Act, the Department of Justice did not limit the indictment to that Act, but also added another count under Section 6, Title 18, of the United States Code. As the Washington correspondent of *The Nation* says: "It is felt in the Department that though this (the Smith Act) may be too much for the court, the convictions will stand under Section 6." The extremely cynical implications of this fact scarcely require comment; if they can't get us under one law, the Department of Justice officials concoct additional charges—i.e., "facts," to bring us under another law.

Anti-Slaveholders Law Used Against Us!

Section 6 has nothing whatsoever to do with the doctrines and activities of the Socialist Workers Party. It does not prohibit the right to advocate revolution. Such a prohibition could never have been adopted at that time. Section 6 was adopted by Congress on July 31, 1861—in the midst of the Civil War. The right to advocate revolution was then still explicitly recognized by the American bourgeoisie. And for good reason! The American bourgeoisie chanced to have formal legality on its side in its revolutionary struggle against the counter-revolution of the Southern slavocracy, by virtue of the fact that Abraham Lincoln, although securing only a minority of the votes, was legally elected president in November, 1860, and legally took office in March, 1861. But in the decades of political struggle leading up to the actual civil war, the bourgeoisie could not possibly have been sure that it would be legally in control of the state institutions at the moment when the "irresponsible conflict" finally took the form of armed battle. From 1848 to 1860, the Southern slavocracy was in well-nigh complete control of the federal state apparatus. Had the South not broken its solid front in the elections — there were four presidential candidates, three of them favorable or semi-favorable to the South — the election returns of November, 1860, might have left the American bourgeoisie in the position of having to overthrow the legal government controlled by the Southern slavocracy.

Furthermore, above all in the first year of the war, the North was by no means assured of success. There was at least a likelihood that it would be defeated, or would be forced to an armistice or compromise, and the bourgeoisie would then have had to await a more propitious moment for crushing the slavocracy, perhaps in the form of a revolution against an administration controlled by or favorable to the slavocracy.

Such were the conditions under which, on July 31, 1861, Congress adopted Section 6 of Title 18 of the United States Code. It was directed not against the right to advocate revolution, but against the armed counter-revolution that was then being conducted by the Confederacy. Section 6 reads:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than six years, or both."

On the same day that Congress passed this it adopted many other provisions against the Confederacy: one appropriating money to pay for arms for Unionists in Southern states; an appropriation for the regular army; an increase for the medical corps of the Navy; further powers to the president to declare a state or part thereof to be in a state of insurrection; an act reimbursing volunteers for expenses incurred in employing regimental or other bands, etc., etc. Not even the elastic judicial mind can with any plausibility claim that Congress was thinking of outlawing the right to advocate revolution, including socialist revolution. On the contrary, the attitude of the bourgeoisie, during the time when it was making the second American revolution, is symbolized by the fact that it commissioned Joseph Wedemeyer, Marx's leading disciple in the United States, a colonel in the United States Army.

The Judicial Interpretation of Section 6

It would not be surprising if, after the Civil War, Section 6 had been systematically perverted by the courts despite its plain meaning. Interestingly enough, however, this is not the case.

Baldwin vs. Franks (7 SCR 656) is what jurists call the leading case under Section 6. The case had nothing to do with radicalism. It arose in the 1870's out of the bitter conflict in California over the importation of cheap Chinese labor, which the defendants had been opposing. The Supreme Court freed the defendants and laid down a clear ruling as to the specific limits of the meaning of Section 6, a ruling which excludes the present use of Section 6 against us. The court said:

"The offense (any offense under the Section 6) . . . means something more than putting the laws themselves at defiance. There must be a forcible resistance of the authority of the United States while its officers are endeavoring to carry the laws into execution."

In short, only actual resistance to law enforcement was legally punishable.

Section 6 was invoked against trade unions and working class parties during the first World War. However, in those cases where the defendants during the trial challenged the applicability of Section 6, the higher courts agreed that the section was not applicable. In 1921, the latest decision of that period, *Anderson et al vs. U. S.* (273 FR 20), the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals approvingly quotes the ruling we have already cited from *Baldwin vs. Franks* and dismisses the count in the indictment under Section 6. This was a case against members of the I.W.W. Similarly, in 1920, in the famous case of *Bill Haywood and Vincent St. John* (268 FR 795), the Circuit Court of Appeals had ruled that Section 6 could not be made to apply to violations of the Selective Service Act and the Espionage Act. The court said:

"Granting that Section 6 of the Penal Code, on which count

1 is predicated, is broad enough in its terms to cover conspiracies to use force in preventing, hindering, or delaying the execution of the Selective Service Act and the Espionage Act, the penal provisions of these last-named acts constitute the specific directions of Congress for the punishment of all obstructions, forcible or otherwise, of the recruiting and enlistment service. Congress did not intend, in the face of the constitutional prohibition, to inflict punishment twice for the same offense."

The Smith Act, being later and more specific than Section 6 is, by the federal court decision just cited, obviously the only available basis for the indictment against us. The only reason the Department of Justice dragged in Section 6, as we have said before, is its own realization of the unconstitutionality of the Smith Act.

It is fantastic that an act adopted for the suppression of slaveholders shall now be invoked to suppress the party of proletarian emancipation. Fantastic—but necessary, because the bourgeoisie, then leading the battle against slavery, is now the most reactionary force in society.

Even in the First World War cases we have just cited, in which the higher courts sustained the conviction of *Bill Haywood, Vincent St. John* and other working class leaders on counts brought under the so-called Espionage Act (which comes into operation only after an official declaration of war), the higher court felt it necessary to sharply warn against attempts to expand the meaning of Section 6. In the case of *Bill Haywood* already cited, the Circuit Court of Appeals wrote, against the attempt to make the trade union activity of revolutionists an offense under Section 6:

"But the question now before us (on count 1) concerns the true meaning of Section 6. That was enacted long before the war. It must be enforced after the war is officially ended. Manifestly in each period, before, during and after, it must be given the same meaning and effect.

"So the question under Section 6 covers not only war supplies but also any peacetime supplies which the government might intend to buy . . . How are the laws of the United States executed? By officials upon whom the duty is laid. Performance of the duty cannot be delegated. Producers who have contracts to furnish the government with supplies are not thereby made officials of the government. *Defendants' force was exerted only against producers in various localities.* Defendants thereby may have violated local laws. With that we have nothing to do . . . Section 6 should not be enlarged by construction. Its prima facie meaning condemns force only when a conspiracy exists to use it against some person who has authority to execute and *who is immediately engaged in executing a law of the United States.*" (Our italics).

This precisely-worded decision of the federal appellate court means, in our case, that there is no juridical basis for the Department of Justice to invoke Section 6 against our advocacy of Union Defense Guards and our other trade union activities, which are the main target of the Department of Justice.

We have no doubt that the Department of Justice officials, reading these cases in a vain attempt to find a more plausible basis for a case against us, must have sighed at the fact that the United States is not now officially at war, so that the prosecution could use against us the wartime "sedition" provision of the so-called Espionage Act under which most of the cases against the labor movement were prosecuted during the first World War.

Prosecution Will Push Frameup Ruthlessly

But despite everything that Roosevelt has so far been able to do, he has not succeeded in officially committing this country to war, and the law used against our comrades in 1917 and 1918 is not legally operative today. Roosevelt's

agents can prosecute us, therefore, only by violating the letter and spirit of the existing laws. Deliberately, cynically, they concoct charges which they and all politically literate people know to be false. On the same moral level as any cop in the pay of the local open-shoppers, the Department of Justice officials twist and pervert both the facts and the laws.

That the government is demonstrably lawless does not breed in us the illusion that our demonstration of its lawlessness will suffice to free us. The government in its lawlessness is not any the less powerful than when it is within the law. Having put its prestige at stake in this case the government will prosecute with utter ruthlessness. Reactionary governments are even more ferocious in their frameups than in their other activities. Witness the Dreyfus case, the Moscow trials, Sacco-Vanzetti, Tom Mooney—the list is very long.

The flimsiness of the government's frameup against our party and Local 544-CIO reflects the panic and desperation of the Roosevelt administration as it drags the unwilling

American people deeper into the war. The War Party knows that it cannot have its way by the voluntary assent of the masses. It can prosecute the imperialist war only by simultaneously conducting class war against the American labor movement. The first victims of this "war for democracy" will be the democratic rights of the American people, if Roosevelt has his way.

This frameup is an alarm signal to the American working class. And it has been so recognized by CIO's political body, Labor's Non-Partisan League which has warned: "If this prosecution is successful, many informed observers are expecting other indictments of labor figures who do not toe the mark . . . If Minneapolis teamsters can be jailed for their opinions, so can anybody. That is why the case is of national importance to civil liberties."

The fight to repel the FBI-Gestapo attack upon the 29 defendants is an integral part of the fight for the life and liberty of the American labor movement.

The Soviet Union At War

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

As these lines are being written, the German imperialist attack upon the Soviet Union enters upon its eighth week. Seven weeks of Blitzkrieg have failed to bring the Nazi strategists those decisive military results which they had so confidently expected and claimed in advance. The "time-table" of the German High Command has been very seriously disrupted. They cannot now attain their most immediate objectives: seizure of raw materials, stocks of oil, etc. and above all, the crops of the Ukraine.

The armies of German imperialism still retain the offensive. The territories of the USSR have been deeply penetrated. Strategic centers, the industrial heart of the country, including Moscow itself, are under direct threat, and so is the whole of the Ukraine. But the Red Army has already accomplished what no other, including the vaunted army of French imperialism, once hailed as "best in the world," was thus far able to do: the Red soldiers have withstood two furious offensives, and have twice checked the full force of the greatest military machine ever constructed in history.

Had such achievements, or even far lesser ones been recorded by any army in the "democratic" imperialist camp, the capitalist press would be shrieking at the top of its voice in frenzied and ecstatic acclaim. The grudging recognition accorded the heroic struggle of the Red Army constitutes an admission by the bourgeoisie that the October revolution is now being justified on the military arena as it justified itself in the economic field by the successes of industrialization.

The October revolution is demonstrating once again to the world the unprecedented power and resources lodged in it. Seven weeks of the Soviet-Nazi war bring still another overwhelming proof of how correct Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks were in leading the Russian masses in 1917 to the conquest of power and the building of the first workers' state in history.

The present war is the second struggle of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack and internal counter-revolution. In the infancy of the Soviet regime, when its material resources were infinitely weaker, with the Russian masses exhausted by three years of imperialist slaughter, the national economy ravaged seemingly beyond repair and the relationship of forces such as to make all resistance appear futile, the

Bolshevik methods of political and military struggle united the living forces among the Russian people, created a new army and disintegrated and disheartened its most powerful opponents in the imperialist camp. Under Lenin and Trotsky's leadership, under the banner and program of socialism, the Soviet Union beat back the interventionist attacks and saved the Soviet Union in a civil war of three years' duration. The world was thus presented with the first irrefutable proof of the historical justification and necessity of the proletarian revolution.

This revolution was guided so consistently and firmly, erected on such solid foundations, tapped such vast reservoirs of power, that it was enabled not only to withstand the ravages of six years of imperialist warfare and civil war, but also to lift the country from the depths of the post-war crisis despite military and economic blockade by the capitalist world. No other rising regime in history ever faced such obstacles, such difficulties, such adverse conditions. After Lenin's death, the October revolution was profoundly weakened by the rise and ascendancy of a privileged, ruthless and malignant bureaucracy. The revolution lived on.

But it began to degenerate. Beneath all contempt are those renegade communists who refused to recognize the first stages of this degeneration, and who then seized upon its later stages as a pretext to desert the revolution. The surprising thing is not that the revolution degenerated but that it survived at all.

The Left Opposition, led by Leon Trotsky, carried on a struggle whose vital influence on the fate of the Soviet Union is now being completely revealed. When the Soviet Union hovered on the verge of internal collapse and counter-revolution as a result of the ruinous economic and international policies of the Stalin-Bukharin bloc (1925-1929), it was the program of the Left Opposition which saved the young workers' state. Stalin and the bureaucracy were compelled to adopt, even if in a terribly distorted form, Trotsky's program of industrialization and planned economy. The successes of that program—just as the military achievements of today—surprised not only the imperialist world but the Stalinist bureaucracy.

These economic successes were achieved at the cost of

frightful sacrifices by the toiling masses. Most of these could have been avoided had a genuine proletarian leadership remained at the head of the regime instead of the reactionary bureaucracy. Nevertheless these successes, achieved *despite* and *against* Stalin's regime, constituted on the economic plane another irrefutable justification of the October revolution. They demonstrated in action the vast possibilities and the great future that socialism has in store for mankind.

Today these same economic successes, gained by the Soviet masses on the foundations established by October, are manifesting themselves on the battlefield. Thus, under the most adverse conditions, debilitated by Stalinism, completely exposed to the full striking power of German militarism under conditions most advantageous to the latter, the strangled revolution is showing to the whole world that it still lives on.

Bolshevism (revolutionary socialism), Bolshevik theory and Bolshevik practice were put to the crucial test first, not in a number of advanced countries with advanced economy, but in one of the most backward countries of the world. All the adversaries of Bolshevism, all the apologists for capitalism conveniently forget this in their fraudulent "analyses" of the conquests of October.

We repeat, no conditions could be more unfavorable than these: 1) a decimated working class; 2) a ravaged and backward country; 3) the stabilization of the mortal and active enemy, the world bourgeoisie, after the post-war crisis (thanks to the treachery of the Second International and the weakness and immaturity of the then newly-founded Third International) which meant: 4) the *complete isolation* of the young workers' republic.

When and where was any rising social system submitted to such a merciless environment? The rising capitalist class began under far more favorable conditions; it was able from the beginning to draw on the resources of the world.

But that is not all. In addition to all this, the new social order was compelled after 1924 to demonstrate its vitality under the supervision of a bureaucracy which adopted false and ruinous policies, which ruthlessly disregarded everything save its own privileges and power, and which suppressed and destroyed every creative, independent and critical voice.

Today the Soviet Union is confronted with the gravest crisis since its foundation. It is compelled to struggle through this crisis just as it passed through all the previous stages in its history, that is, under the most adverse conditions.

What Stalin Destroyed

The Soviet Union is now waging war without the aid of the institutions created by Lenin and the Russian revolution. Stalin and the bureaucracy have destroyed those institutions:

THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY. Lenin attached tremendous significance to the so-called Old Guard of Bolshevism. He regarded these men—the living embodiment of the experience of three revolutions (1905, February 1917, October 1917), of the struggle against World War I, of the Civil War, the post-war period of reconstruction (War Communism, the NEP, etc.)—as the only guarantee of correct policies. "If we do not close our eyes to reality, then it must be recognized," he wrote in a letter addressed to Molotov and intended for the Central Committee in March 1922, "that at the present time the proletarian policy of our party is determined not so much by its social composition as by the enormous and unlimited authority of that thin layer which may be called the Old Guard. Even a minor internal struggle within this layer would suffice if not to undermine, then, in any case, to weaken its authority to such an extent that the decisions would thereafter no longer depend upon it."

Stalin destroyed that entire generation of the Old Guard. All of Lenin's closest collaborators—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov, Serebryakov, I. N. Smirnov, Piatakov, Preobrazhensky, and countless others—were murdered during the infamous Moscow Frameups (1935-1938). Thousands of others were destroyed, driven to suicide, imprisoned or jailed in bloody purges. This fate was suffered also by the generation which had raised Stalin to power and carried on its shoulders the brunt of the industrialization.

Stalin climaxed these crimes by the murder of Leon Trotsky last August.

Since February of this year, the Russian Communist Party has been demoted from its supposedly predominant position. The war discloses its non-existence. Not simply its local and regional units, but even the once all-powerful Politbureau, of which Stalin is General Secretary, has been completely shunted aside. No statement on the war has been issued in the name of that party which under Lenin held congress after congress under conditions of complete democracy in the very midst of the civil war.

THE YOUTH. The youth constitutes a driving force in every significant struggle. The original party of Bolshevism in Czarist illegality was composed predominantly of young workers. The role of the youth in October and in the Civil War hardly requires comment. The young soldiers of the Soviet Union are now bearing the brunt of the Nazi onslaught. All the more important, therefore, is the Communist Youth. But the *Komsomols*—the Russian YCL—were erased as a political organization in 1936. Even the Dean of Canterbury admits the real reason: Stalin removed "political power from the *Komsomols*, i.e. from the Young Communist League—when they were challenging the party itself as an organ of political power." ("The Soviet Power," page 305.)

Stalin's persecution of the youth matches in savagery the persecution of the Old Guard. In May 1940, over 70 per cent of the youth leaders of the many times "reorganized" *Komsomol* were again purged. Not even a skeletal structure of *Komsomols* now remains in the agricultural areas. There is only the top apparatus welded to the petty bourgeoisie and the embryonic agricultural bourgeoisie of the "millionaire kolkhozi."

THE SOVIETS. The October revolution revealed the Soviets—the Councils of Workers, Soldiers, Agricultural Laborers and Farmers—as the most natural, most efficient and most democratic form of government in the transition period between capitalism and socialism. Lenin hailed the Soviets as a million times more democratic than any bourgeois parliamentary republic. And *this was true of the Soviets under Lenin and Trotsky*. They played a central role in the Civil War, which could never have been won without them. They welded the alliance between the workers and the toiling peasantry against all the exploiters. The Soviets assisted and facilitated the work of the Revolutionary Military Council. The mobilization of draftees in the Civil War was carried out by them. The Soviets conducted a struggle against deserters; they collected foodstuffs, raw materials, supplies, etc.; they dealt with the violators of the revolutionary law and order, aided in crushing counter-revolutionary uprisings.

The very necessity today of explaining the crucial meaning and importance of Soviets in the life of a workers' state is in itself an indication of Stalin's terrible work of destruction. The Soviets have long been abolished and are no longer alive, even in name. Stalin's "constitution," which eliminated the Soviets, has itself been jettisoned. The Kremlin pays no attention to it. The "Supreme Council," supposedly the highest power of the land, was not summoned during the war

emergency. Even its Presidium has played no part in recent times.

THE TRADE UNIONS. Lenin and the Bolsheviks regarded the trade unions as a school of Communism, and as one of the institutions through which the workers ruled in factories and in the Soviets. Democracy in the trade unions was for Lenin an indispensable condition for the preservation and advancement of the workers' state. The Tenth Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions took place in 1932. And since that time there has been no congress. The only body that has met since is the handpicked and repeatedly purged Executive Committee. The trade union bureaucracy, reconstituted after the blood bath of 1935-1938, was purged again during 1940, and all authority in the industrial enterprises was concentrated in the hands of the directors. The trade unions were not even summoned to increase production in the war emergency. They issued no manifesto. The increases were demanded by ukase from the top. The work day has been prolonged to 11 hours.

The trade unions have been rendered as silent as the destroyed party, the suppressed *Komsomols*, the "Supreme Council of the Soviets," not to mention the Third International together with its "helmsman," Dimitrov.

It would carry us too far afield to enumerate all of Stalin's crimes and abominations against the Soviet people. No "Fifth Column" could have caused greater havoc, could have done more to undermine and endanger the defensive position of the USSR than did Stalin's regime.

Three years before the battle was joined, Stalin dealt the Red Army a far greater blow than any yet delivered by Hitler's *Panzer* divisions. To grasp what Stalin did, one need only imagine the effect were the German High Command to announce that it had captured or killed 90 per cent of the Soviet General Staff.

Stalin destroyed the General Staff he had himself appointed in 1935. He executed the flower of the Airforce and Naval command. He then proceeded to purge not less than 30,000 officers. Yet scoundrels are not lacking to acclaim that these were measures for "strengthening the USSR." This process of beheading the Red Army is still continuing. And scoundrels continue to acclaim. Instead of freeing from the jails and concentration camps the thousands of devoted, experienced Red officers who organized, led, and mechanized the Red Army, Stalin keeps them imprisoned. Now, when the need for such men is most acute, he keeps them in prison and places the military struggle in charge of those whom he himself considers as incompetent.

At the very beginning of the conflict, he removed the three generals in charge of the Leningrad, Moscow and Kiev districts. If they were unfit after the struggle began, why were they appointed in the first place? Obviously, not for military but political reasons. A removal of commanders in the midst of conflict can serve to weaken and not strengthen the morale of troops. Should the German High Command be reshuffled, the Kremlin would be the loudest in pointing out the significance of such a move.

Those removed were replaced by Timoshenko, Voroshilov and Budenny. For Timoshenko, who was Minister of War and Commander-in-Chief of all the Red Armies, this appointment is a demotion. This step cleared the road for Stalin's assumption of supreme command a few days later. Budenny and Voroshilov have been out of active military service for the past year. Budenny remainst the illiterate cavalry commander he was in the Civil War without any ability as a strategist. Voroshilov's incapacity was acknowledged by his removal as Commander-in-Chief after the Finnish events in 1940. Stalin now places them in charge of the other two

strategic sectors as a political measure: to guarantee Stalin's personal control over the army. In war, as in peace, he carries on his politics in the Red Army.

To wage the war successfully, it is necessary to summon forth the maximum energies of the people, but Stalin has no confidence in the masses. Instead of relaxing his personal dictatorship and giving the masses room in which to develop their resources and abilities, he concentrates still more authority in his own hands. One of his first moves was to form a "Defense Council," i.e., a War Cabinet of five men; the four in addition to himself, Berya (the demoted and then hastily reappointed head of the GPU), Molotov (the demoted Premier), Voroshilov (the demoted Commander-in-Chief), and one Malenkov, are all discredited nonentities. The members of this "Council" were chosen not for their outstanding abilities as organizers and leaders, but for the opposite reason. None could become Stalin's rival. They remain what they always were: puppets without any popular backing who have no choice but to go along with Stalin.

Stalin's ability as a military leader and strategist is a fiction. With the mass of the Red Army, the greater portion of whom, both men and officers, received their training under Tukhachevsky, Yakir, Uborevich and other heroes of the Civil War, the real organizers and mechanizers of the Army—Stalin's status is, to put it mildly, not that of a military genius. The ranks must be profoundly disturbed by Stalin's moves. They must ask themselves what happened to the "glorious" generals raised to power only a year ago, in May 1940? why this constant shift of their commanders? where the officers are who led and trained them? why are they not released from the prisons?

Stalin knows that these and a thousand similar questions are being asked in the Red Army. The restoration of the political commissars in the army, after their complete disgrace and removal last year, Stalin's assumption of the high command, his shifts of commanders, etc.—these are preventive measures. They represent Stalin's desperate attempts to lace the Red Army into his totalitarian straightjacket and insure his control.

The Morale of the Rank-and-File

The problem of maintaining morale is the most vital of all military problems. This was positively demonstrated by the triumph of Trotsky's Red Army against superior forces in 1918-1921. This was negatively demonstrated in the debacle of the French army last year. The Civil War in Spain shows us how initially high morale can be destroyed from within. Everyone testifies to the extraordinarily high morale of the Spanish workers in the first period of the fight against Franco, but the reactionary policies of the Popular Front regime—supported and abetted by the Kremlin—sapped that morale to nothingness.

The Red Army is made up of workers and peasants. The overwhelming majority of the soldiers now engaged in action are proletarian. The peasants, however, constitute the bulk of the reserve. The support of the proletariat is the strongest pillar of the Soviet army and of the Soviet Union. The outbreak of the war brought a resurgence of proletarian consciousness and militancy on a broad basis, but this awakening class spirit carried within itself a threat to Stalin's personal power. That is why Stalin has acted, as always, to stifle proletarian enthusiasm.

By restoring all the reactionary practices of the Czarist army, from the creation of ranks to the military salute, Stalin opened an unbridgeable gulf between the officers corps and the rank-and-file. In place of conscious proletarian discipline,

he has instituted a totalitarian police discipline inside the army, giving the officers absolute power over the lives and liberties of the men. Everything was done to enhance the prestige of the officers corps at the expense of the morale of the men. By eliminating the Communist Party nuclei in the army units, Stalin has further concentrated the power of the officers corps over the rank and file.

Stalin intends to continue his blood purge under wartime conditions above all in the Army. With this difference, of course, that the military tribunals and secret courts martial will supersede "public" trials and "public" methods. Beyond a shadow of doubt this is one of the chief functions of the "political commissars," i.e. special GPU agents. The butchery of the GPU in Spain is to be repeated on a vaster scale in the USSR.

Conditions behind the lines serve still further to infuriate the soldiers. The Moscow papers report the flight of the bureaucrats from exposed points to safe refuge. The exodus of the families of bureaucrats towards the Urals while the inhabitants of Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev are exposed to air bombardments cannot fail to have its effect. In the industrial enterprises the workers are being driven beyond human endurance. The full weight of the Stalinist regime presses down upon the proletariat, piling burden upon burden upon them without giving them a single concession which would make their situation more tolerable.

Where every channel of self-expression is choked, where the GPU rules, the workers' morale cannot remain at the heights.

The situation is even worse with regard to the peasants. The Soviet regime has always rested upon an alliance between the proletariat and the peasant masses. The stability of the regime greatly depends upon the support accorded it by the peasants. This is also true of the stability of the army, and especially of its predominantly peasant reserves.

The collectives conceal the profound class differentiation among the various sections of the rural population. Hidden within the collectives are not only agricultural laborers and poor peasants but also petty-bourgeois elements controlling the collectives and even budding bourgeois in the person of "millionaire kolkhozniks". The agricultural aristocracy now controls the countryside.

No organized counter-weight to these reactionary bourgeois tendencies exists in the rural area. The committees of poor peasants, which existed during the Civil War, do not exist now. The party has become completely demobilized.

While Stalin shackles the progressive forces, all the reactionary elements in Soviet society are coming to the fore. The Russian Orthodox Church holds masses for victory in Moscow, its Archbishops bless the war, and these events are proudly featured in the Stalinist press the world over.

The Kremlin fosters nationalism; Stalin even attempts to revive a feudal spirit. Holy Russia has replaced in his propaganda the internationalist outlook which led to the creation of the Union of Soviet Republics.

Stalin's foreign policy is unambiguously reactionary. Just as in the first period of the war Stalin staked all upon his alliance with Hitler, so now he stakes the salvation of his regime upon the aid of the bourgeois imperialist "democracies." Now, as before, Stalin entirely disregards the independent role and needs of the world working class. Internationalism, the guiding line of Bolshevik policy, is as alien to Stalin as it is to any petty-bourgeois bureaucrat in the democratic capitalist countries.

In accordance with his policy of dependence upon imperialist democracy, the Moscow radio has dropped the slogan

"Workers of the World Unite" for the slogan of Democracy against Fascism.

Stalin's subservience to the Anglo-American imperialists has its most disastrous consequence among the German masses. Stalin aids Churchill and Roosevelt and Hitler by depicting the Soviet-German conflict not as a class war between two antagonistic social systems, but as an integral part of the holy crusade of the "democracies" against the German people. In this way, he helps rivet the German masses to Hitler's war machine instead of driving a revolutionary wedge between the Nazis and the German workers.

What the Nazis Failed to Understand

Fully apprised of the terrible wounds that had been dealt to the Red Army by the Kremlin, the German High Command confidently expected to shatter its ranks. It failed to understand that the regime of the Kremlin is not identical with the Soviet Union.

It is not Stalin's Red Army that has successfully resisted the first two Nazi offensives. It is the Red Army of the October revolution. It is Trotsky's Red Army, which was built in the fire of the Civil War, built not from the wreckage of the old Czarist armies but completely anew—unlike any other army in history.

The name of Leon Trotsky is inseparably bound up with the formation, the life and victories of the Red Army. The Kremlin's falsifications, lies, calumnies and crimes have as their aim to expunge from the memory of mankind Trotsky's role in the building of the Red Army in the epic period of the Civil War. But no power on earth, least of all that of Stalin, will succeed in obscuring the fact that Leon Trotsky, in addition to all his other incalculable gifts and achievements, established himself as one of the greatest military leaders and strategists of all time.

Every great military leader reveals his stature above all as organizer. Lenin's verdict was that "in the organization of the Red Army were most brilliantly realized the consistency and firmness of proletarian leadership in an alliance of workers with the toiling peasantry against all exploiters."

In Lenin's opinion this was the basic reason for the ability of the Red Army to defeat its formidable and far more powerful enemies.

The ideas, traditions and lessons of this army, born in the crucible of the revolution, were continued after Lenin's death. Trotsky remained as Commissar of War until 1925. His successor, Frunze, one of the outstanding and most capable military leaders, carried on his policy and methods. When Frunze died under the most mysterious circumstances, Voroshilov was appointed in his place, but only as a figurehead. The real work of directing, mechanizing and modernizing the Red Army, drafting the plans of defense, constructing the defense lines both in Siberia and on the European frontier, was in the hands of those who had constituted Trotsky's General Staff. That is to say, for 13 years after Trotsky's removal the Red Army continued on the foundations he had laid down. The successes of industrialization still further strengthened the Red Army's fighting power.

Stalin's personal and destructive intervention in the Red Army begins only in 1937-1938. In the three years since then Stalin could not undo the achievements of two decades. It is these surviving forces that are making themselves felt today in battle.

The resistance to the Nazi armies has been achieved, like the previous success in industrialization, by a tremendous exertion on the part of the masses, at a terrible cost. On the part of the Kremlin there has been as usual only the maximum

of interference, inefficiency, false and ruinous policies, ruthless oppression, lack of foresight, lack of leadership. Inside the USSR the war can only provide an impulse to rid the people and the Army from the dead hand of totalitarian control.

The working class of Russia proved itself powerful beyond anyone's expectations. But its powers are not inexhaustible. It cannot alone withstand the assault of imperialism. Today more than ever before it needs the help of the world working class.

Bourgeois commentators are accustomed to separate political policy from military affairs and to oppose them to each other. They treat them as two independent departments of social activity without essential connections with each other. During wartime, they say, politics takes a subordinate place. Military considerations become predominant.

This view is not only contrary to fact but fatal as a guide to revolutionary policy. War does not demote politics to a secondary status in national or international life. It raises political questions to a new and higher level of importance. The military struggle is the main defensive arm of the regime, the people, or the social system engaged in combat. But the military forces involved are directed and controlled by political agencies. The policy of these agencies, therefore, becomes decisive in determining the methods of waging war and in deciding its outcome. War, as Trotsky said, is the most concentrated form of politics.

The present war is the second struggle of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack and internal counter-revolution. These two struggles have been and are being conducted under entirely different leaderships by entirely different methods and around diametrically different programs.

Since the Civil War of 1918-1921, the Soviet Union and the Red Army have become far stronger, materially speaking, but they have become far weaker from a social and political standpoint. The totalitarian regime of Stalin, which completely controls all organs of power and dictates the policies and means of struggle, is the greatest internal obstacle to the efforts of the Russian workers and peasants to defend their regime successfully against the imperialist robbers.

"War," said Clausewitz, "is the continuation of politics by other means." This maxim applies with full force to the Stalinist regime. Stalin, the uncrowned Czar in the Kremlin, expresses now the same conservative nationalistic outlook that has characterized all his political actions, beginning with the theory of socialism in one country, culminating in the 1935-1938 mass purges and the series of defeats and retreats on the international arena which paved the way for Hitler's ascendancy in Germany and Europe and his assault upon the USSR.

The key measures which would strengthen the defensive power of the USSR, but which might threaten Stalin's power, he rejects out of hand—indeed, never seriously considers. For these measures—release of all pro-Soviet political prisoners, revival of the Soviets, trade union democracy, etc.—are a threat to the bureaucracy. Stalin knows that to restore the workers and peasants to their rightful place in Soviet society entails the downfall of his regime.

The apologists for Stalin counterpose his "realism" to the "revolutionary romanticism" and "adventurism" of the Trotskyists.

It is now, however, clear to the whole world that the course pursued by Stalin in the past fifteen years in the name of realism and under the charter of Socialism in One Country has led the Soviet Union to the brink of the abyss. In actuality, Stalinist "realism" is nothing but bureaucratic blindness based upon national conservatism. The Stalinist regime took

as the guiding line of its policy the preservation and promotion of the privileges of a small bureaucratic caste, no matter what the cost to the international socialist revolution, proletarian democracy and the real needs of the Soviet people.

The distinguishing characteristic of Stalinism in all spheres of thought and action is its narrow horizon, so typical of the petty-bourgeoisie. Despite his bragging pretensions, Stalin has been content with little things. It did not matter to him what catastrophes were visited upon the rest of the world proletariat because of his ruinous politics, so long as his own rule was not directly and immediately imperiled. The salvation of his personal power—that is Stalin's supreme law.

The war imposes great tasks upon the Soviet people. It imposes tremendous obligations upon the proletarian revolutionists. To comprehend these tasks and to solve them it is necessary to have the broadest perspectives; to act in the most daring and resolute manner. The present conflict involves the peoples of the entire world. The people of the first workers' state are part of the vanguard of the world revolution. Only with this perspective can the Soviet Union be properly defended and the world revolution revived.

Why A Political Revolution Is Necessary

The advocacy by Trotskyists of the political overthrow of the Stalinist regime must be viewed within the framework of this perspective of international revolution. It formulates the deepest need of the Soviet peoples. It sets forth the goal of their instinctive striving—to find a way out of the blind alley into which Stalinism has flung them. In stressing the inevitability of the overturn of Stalinist totalitarianism, we provide these masses in advance with the fundamental answer to their most urgent problems.

It must be remembered that revolutions are not made by propaganda, agitation or slogans. They are brought about by the action of vast masses, impelled by burning necessity, to satisfy their needs against those who stand in their way. A political overturn effected by the Soviet masses, which would restore Soviet democracy and get rid of Stalin's iniquitous regime, would provide the most potent defense of the USSR, would lead to the extension of October throughout Europe and Asia, and erase fascism from the earth.

Stalin's regime weakens the Soviet Union in the fight against the imperialists. The sharp caste distinction and inequalities introduced by the Kremlin produce discontent and strengthen centrifugal tendencies within the Army. Instead of reinforcing its morale, the nationalist demagoguery of the Kremlin serves to shatter the class cohesiveness of the Army. Such slurring over of the class struggle disarms the proletariat and the poor peasantry in the face of their class adversaries, and acts as a cover for the most reactionary sections and counter-revolutionary tendencies among the population.

A great danger looms from within the peasantry. They have neither forgotten nor forgiven the crimes of forced collectivization, the famines of 1931-1932, the Draconic decrees of 1940-1941 when the Kremlin reverted to forced grain collections. These repressive measures have served to estrange the peasants not only from the Stalin regime, but also from the working class.

We defend the Soviet Union even under Stalin. But that must not mean that we blind ourselves to the mortal danger which confronts the Soviet Union if Stalin remains in control.

All the efforts of the Trotskyists are directed toward defeating Hitler's onslaught against the Soviet Union. It is necessary to free the Soviet Union from the dead hand of Stalinism in order to assure the victory of the first workers' state.

Zinoviev And Kamenev

By LEON TROTSKY

This article, now published for the first time in English, was part of a Journal kept by Trotsky during his imprisonment in Norway and his deportation to Mexico, in the period of the Moscow Trials. Other sections of the Journal were published in the June, 1941 issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. This sketch of Zinoviev and Kamenev forms part of a longer refutation of their "confessions."

At this point I hear a question: "But can you say with complete certainty the self-same thing about Zinoviev and Kamenev that you say about yourself? Both of them made no few turns, and squandered no few principles in the last period of their lives. Why can't we grant in that case that, despairing of the consequences of their own capitulations, they really did for a moment fling themselves to the side of terror? Later, in due course of their final capitulation, they consented to meet the GPU half-way and to entangle you in their ill-starred designs, as a service to themselves and to the regime with which they once again sought to make peace." This hypothesis has entered the minds of some of my friends. I have weighed it from all sides, without the slightest preconceptions or considerations of personal interest. And each time I came to the conclusion that it was utterly unfounded.

Zinoviev and Kamenev are two profoundly different types. Zinoviev is an agitator. Kamenev—a propagandist. Zinoviev was guided in the main by a subtle political instinct. Kamenev was given to reasoning and analyzing. Zinoviev was always inclined to fly off at a tangent. Kamenev, on the contrary, erred on the side of excessive caution. Zinoviev was entirely absorbed by politics, cultivating no other interests and appetites. In Kamenev there sat a sybarite and an aesthete. Zinoviev was vindictive. Kamenev was good nature personified. I do not know what their mutual relations were in emigration. In 1917 they were brought close together for a time by their opposition to the October revolution. In the first few years after the victory, Kamenev's attitude toward Zinoviev was rather ironical. They were subsequently drawn together by their opposition to me, and later, to Stalin. Throughout the last thirteen years of their lives, they marched side by side and their names were always mentioned together.

With all their individual differences, outside of their common schooling gained by them in emigration under Lenin's guidance, they were endowed with almost an identical range of intellect and will. Kamenev's analytical capacity served to complement Zinoviev's instinct; and they would jointly explore for a common decision. The more cautious Kamenev would sometimes allow Zinoviev to carry him along farther than he had wanted to go himself, but in the long run they found themselves side by side along the same line of retreat. In the stature of their personalities they were peers, and they supplemented each other by their dissimilarities. Both of them were deeply and unreservedly devoted to the cause of socialism. Such is the explanation for their tragic union.

They Lacked Sufficient Character

There is no reason to impel me to take upon myself any

political or moral responsibility for Zinoviev and Kamenev. Discounting a brief interval—from 1926 to 1927—they were always my bitter adversaries. Personally, I did no place much trust in them. Each of them, to be sure, was Stalin's intellectual superior. But they lacked sufficient character. Lenin had precisely this trait in mind when he wrote in his "Testament" that it was "no accident" that Zinoviev and Kamenev were opponents of the insurrection in the autumn of 1917. They failed to withstand the onset of bourgeois public opinion. When deep-going social shifts in the Soviet Union began to crystalize, combined with the formation of a privileged bureaucracy, it was "no accident" that Zinoviev and Kamenev allowed themselves to be carried away into the camp of Thermidor (1922-1926).

They far excelled their then allies, including Stalin, in the theoretic understanding of the processes taking place. Herein lies the explanation for their attempt to break with the bureaucracy and to oppose it. In July 1926 at the Plenum of the Central Committee, Zinoviev declared that "on the question of apparatus-bureaucratic repression Trotsky was correct as against us." Zinoviev, at that time, acknowledged that his mistake in waging a struggle against me was even "more dangerous" than his mistake in 1917! However, the pressure of the privileged stratum reached illimitable proportions. It was "no accident" that Zinoviev and Kamenev capitulated to Stalin at the end of 1927 and carried with them those who were younger and less authoritative. Thereafter they expended no little effort in blackening the Opposition.

But in 1930-1932 when the country's entire organism was convulsed by the frightful consequences of the forced and unbridled collectivization, Zinoviev and Kamenev, like so many other capitulators anxiously lifted their heads and began discussing in whispers among themselves the dangers of the new state policy. They were caught reading a critical document which emanated from the ranks of the Right Opposition. For this terrible crime they were expelled from the party—no other charge was brought against them!—and, to top it off, were exiled. In 1933, Zinoviev and Kamenev not only recanted once again but prostrated themselves before Stalin. No slander was too vile for them to cast against the Opposition and especially at me personally. Their self-disarmament rendered them completely helpless before the bureaucracy that could henceforth demand of them any confession whatever. Their subsequent fate was a result of these progressive capitulations and self-abasements.

They Succumbed to Unprecedented Pressure

Yes, they lacked sufficient character. These words, however, should not be taken in their most simplified sense. The resistivity of matter is measured by the force required to destroy it. I have had the occasion to hear tranquil petty bourgeois tell me in the days between the beginnings of the trial and my internment: "It's impossible to understand Zinoviev... He is so lacking in character!" And I would reply: "Have

you yourselves experienced the full weight of the pressure to which he has been subjected for a number of years?" Unintelligent in the extreme are the comparisons, so widespread in intellectual circles, of the conduct in court of Danton, Robespierre and others. These were the instances of revolutionary tribunes who found the knife of justice suspended over them, directly in the midst of the arena of struggle; at a time when they were in the full flower of their strength, with their nervous system almost untouched and, at the same time, when they despaired of all hope of salvation.

Even more inappropriate are comparisons with Dimitrov's conduct in the Leipzig trial. To be sure, alongside of Torgler, Dimitrov made a favorable showing by his resoluteness and courage. But revolutionists in various lands and especially in Czarist Russia have shown no less firmness under incomparably more difficult conditions. Dimitrov was facing the most vicious class enemy. There was no evidence against him, nor could there have been. The State apparatus of the Nazis was still in its formative stages, and not adapted to totalitarian frameups. Dimitrov had the support of the gigantic apparatus of the Soviet state and the Comintern. From all the corners of the earth the sympathies of the popular masses went out to him. His friends were present at the trial. To become a "hero" one need only have had ordinary human courage.

But was this the situation of Zinoviev and Kamenev when they faced the GPU and the court? For ten years they had been enveloped by clouds of slander paid for in heavy gold. For ten years they had swayed between life and death, first in a political sense, then in a moral sense, and lastly in a physical sense. Can one find in all past history examples of such systematic, refined and flendish destruction of spines, nerves and all the fibers of the soul? Zinoviev or Kamenev would have had more than ample character for a tranquil period. But the epoch of grandiose social and political convulsions demanded an extraordinary firmness of these men, whose abilities secured them a leading place in the revolution. The disproportion between their abilities and their wills led to tragic results.

The history of my relations with Zinoviev and Kamenev can be traced without difficulty in documents, articles and books. *The Bulletin of the Russian Opposition* (1929-1937) alone sufficiently defines that abyss which decisively separated us from the day of their capitulation. Between us and them there were no ties whatever, no relations, no correspondence, nor even any attempts in this direction—there were none nor could there have been. In my letters and articles, I invariably advised the Oppositionists, in the interests of political and moral self-preservation, to break ruthlessly with the capitulators. Consequently, whatever I am able to say concerning the views and plans of Zinoviev-Kamenev for the last eight years of their lives can in no case be construed as a deposition of a witness. But I have in my possession a sufficient number of documents and facts which are easily verifiable; I am so well acquainted with the participants, their characters, their relations, and the entire background as to be able to state with absolute assurance that the accusation of terrorism against Zinoviev and Kamenev is from beginning to end a contemptible, police-manufactured frameup, without an iota of truth in it.

The Moscow Trial Records Reveal the Lie

The mere reading of the report of the court-proceedings confronts every reflecting person with the following enigma: But who are these extraordinary accused? Are they old and experienced politicians, struggling in the name of a definite

program and capable of combining the means with the end or are they victims of inquisition, whose conduct is determined not by their own reason or will but by the interests of the inquisitors? Are we dealing with normal people whose psychology is an inner unity reflected in words and actions, or with clinical cases who choose the least rational course, and who motivate their choice by the most insensate arguments?

These questions relate above all to Zinoviev and Kamenev. Just what were their motives—and these motives must have been exceptionally forceful—that guided them in their purported terror? At the first trial in January 1935, Zinoviev and Kamenev, while denying their participation in the assassination of Kirov, did acknowledge, by way of compensation, their "moral responsibility" for the terrorist tendencies, and in doing so they cited as the incentive for their oppositional activity their urge... "to restore capitalism." If we had nothing else to go by except this inhuman political "confession," it would be sufficient to expose the lie of Stalinist justice. And indeed who is capable of believing that Kamenev and Zinoviev were so fanatically set upon that capitalism which they themselves had overthrown that they were ready to sacrifice their own as well as other heads to attain this goal? The confession of the accused in January 1935 revealed Stalin's own order so crudely that it jarred even upon the sensibilities of the least exacting "friends."

In the trial of the sixteen (August 1936) the "restoration of capitalism" is completely discarded. The impelling motive to terror is the naked "lust for power." The indictment rejects one version in favor of another as if it were a question of the alternative solutions of a chess problem, wherein the interchange of solutions is effected in silence and without any commentaries. Following the state prosecutor, the accused now repeat that they had no program, but that in its place they were seized by an irresistible desire to capture the commanding heights of the state, regardless of the price. But we should like to ask: Just how could the assassination of the "leaders" have delivered power into the hands of people who had managed through a series of recantations to undermine confidence in themselves, to degrade themselves, to trample themselves into mud and thereby forever to deprive themselves of a possibility of playing any leading political role in the future?

If the goal of Zinoviev and Kamenev is incredible, their means are still more irrational. In the most carefully thought-out depositions of Kamenev it is underscored with especial insistence that the Opposition had completely isolated itself from the masses, had lost its principles, and was thereby deprived of any hope of gaining influence in the future; and it was precisely *for this reason* that the Opposition came to the idea of terror. It is not hard to understand how advantageous such a self-characterization is to Stalin: it is his order that is being fulfilled—that is absolutely self-evident. But while the depositions of Kamenev are suited for the purpose of debasing the Opposition, they are utterly unsuited for the justification of terror. It is precisely in conditions of political isolation that terrorist struggle signifies swift self-destruction for a revolutionary faction. We Russians are only too well aware of this from the example of *Narodnaya Volya* (1879-1883), as well as from the example of the Social-Revolutionists in the period of reaction (1907-1909). Zinoviev and Kamenev were not only brought up on these lessons, but they themselves commented innumerable times upon them in the party press. Could they, old Bolsheviks, have forgotten and rejected the A.B.C. truths of the Russian revolutionary movement only because they wanted power so very much? To believe this, is utterly impossible.

Support the Defendants in the Federal Prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party

Members of the Socialist Workers Party and the leaders of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Union, Local 544-CIO—a total of twenty-nine defendants—have just been indicted in Minnesota on charges of “conspiracy to overthrow the Government.” Not since the infamous Palmer cases following the last war has the Federal Government conducted such a persecution against members of a working class party for their opinions or trade unionists because of their activities in the labor movement.

**THE DEFENDANTS URGENTLY NEED FUNDS TO DEFRAY THE
HEAVY COSTS OF FIGHTING THIS CASE. DO YOUR SHARE!**

THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

“The American Civil Liberties Union went on record in opposition to the Smith Act when it was introduced in Congress and after its passage in 1940 the Union announced its intention to test the constitutionality when and if the occasion arose. Such an occasion, we believe, is at hand now, in these first cases under the law. We hold that these provisions of this statute are a violation of constitutional guarantees and a potential instrument of oppression against unpopular minorities and organized labor.”

THE NATION

“For the first time in peace since the Alien and Sedition Laws of John Adams a mere expression of opinion is made a federal crime... If the leaders of Local 544 can be convicted for their opinions, so can others.”

THE C.I.O.

“The indictments against many of the active members and officers of Local 544, C.I.O., are carefully timed with the aim of seeking to disrupt the campaign of the C.I.O. to win the right of democratic industry-wide elections to determine the union bargaining agent... It is deplorable that the functions of the U. S. Department of Justice have been perverted in this reprehensible manner... The National C.I.O. will not be deterred by the indictments but will continue to carry forward with all the resources at its command the campaign to organize the Motor Transport and Allied Workers in Minneapolis and the nation.”

THE NEW REPUBLIC

“This is one of the most serious issues involving civil liberties to arise in the United States in many years... That the Minneapolis case is tremendously important goes without saying. For a country preparing to fight for the principles of democracy, now to violate those principles... would be unforgivable; it would be worth ten divisions to Hitler.”

SEND IN YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE

*Organized on Behalf of the Defendants in the Federal Prosecution
of the Socialist Workers Party*

GEORGE E. NOVACK, Secretary-Treasurer
Room 809, 160 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

I enclose \$..... for your Defense Fund.

Name

Address

.....

Fill Out

This Coupon

As Your Protest

Against

The Indictments