

A Letter to the Appeal From Joseph Zack

Dear Sir:

In an edition of your publication (Trotskyite), of October 6, 1939, you are quite free in the epithets you use of condemning Ben Gitlow and myself for appearing before the Dies Committee. You raise the issue there of the possible suppression of the Communist Party resulting from the activities of the Dies Committee, condemning those who appear before the Dies Committee as aiding in that suppression.

May I ask you whether you yourself would refuse to appear there if subpoenaed and run the risk of going to jail for contempt? May I also ask you whether you, when appearing, would lie in favor of the Communist Party, and if you did lie, what good would that do to you, in face of the fact that the Dies Committee could prove out of your own printed articles the names of all the various unions and other organizations that the Communist Party controls. Would you undertake to deny that the Stalin G.P.U. (Russian Secret Service), in fact, controls the activities of the Communist Party here, when, in fact, the Dies Committee could quote your own printed words to that effect.

You will probably say that you would make speeches against the Dies Committee at the same time as you affirm the facts, in which case, let me assure you that the speeches you would make would appear nowhere except in your own little paper, whereas, the facts you would affirm would be flashed across all the newspapers of the country, in a manner that you would not like, but over which you, the same as myself, would have absolutely no control. When I was first interviewed by the counsel of the Dies Committee two months ago, I said to him that if subpoenaed I could of course not refuse to appear and when appearing I would not lie in favor of the Communist Party. Would you do otherwise?

It is not my fault if the mere statement of known facts about that party discredits them in the extreme. As to what the Dies Committee does or intends to do with my testimony, or how the newspapers report any testimony, this of course is beyond my control.

In reference to the issue of the possible suppression of the Communist Party, I am of course in favor of fighting to the limit any movement that, if it would come to power, would suppress everyone else. I don't have to tell you that the Communist Party utilizes the available democracy in this country for no other purpose than to suppress it completely and entirely for their own benefit, the same as the Bund would do if they had a chance, the same as they have done in those countries where they have acquired power. I would prefer however, that they be "suppressed" by public ostracism rather than by any administrative measures, for it is obvious that the public and the workers in particular will come to the same conclusion as the resolution adopted by the American Labor Party, namely that they are "anti-democratic, anti-humanitarian, anti-labor and the servants of Stalin's dictatorship, brutal betrayers of the labor movement."

You know as well as I do that even the most reactionary democrat in this country is far more democratic than Stalin's mercenaries, who parade their alleged radicalism as a mere trap to the workers. The democracy in this country with all its faults and essentially capitalistic character does not depend on Mr. Dies or any other individuals. It is inherent in the system but the system of one party domination of government ownership by the bureaucracy of all economic and political institutions has been revealed as the instrumentality to expropriate not only the capitalists, but to expropriate also the workers of all their rights. The workers cannot be expropriated of property which they do not own, but when they are expropriated of their rights, then a country becomes a huge concentration camp, regimented by a bureaucracy, organized into a totalitarian party. Under such a set-up, one or more individuals can engineer a despotism over all. This kind of slavery for which you too stand, explains better than anything your stand on this question and the nonsense of your polemic.

I, and others, however, who see in Socialism a system which gives more rights to the mass-

tribution towards the advancement adopted and signed, the Treaty is part of the signatory powers that for the solution of international conflict an instrument of national policy in other.' . . .

"The right of all states to wage by the Treaty, nor does the Treaty offensive war. Each nation is . . . the right of self defense and the same. . . . The Treaty does not require, to fight for Belgium, Czechia, or Yugoslavia, her allies. . . .

"The Treaty enunciates a great principle, but it is useless to speculate what the result will be, but there seems to be no right direction. For this reason, the Kellogg Treaty stands out as the most notable.

"The Kellogg Treaty is also a basis for the conclusion of treaties with Russia and her other neighbors, particularly Germany.

"On the basis of a detailed analysis of Germany's economic life, the American Payments Commission concludes that 'Fundamental restoration, and Germany has been concerned on a relatively high level of economic activity.'

"Among the so-called Successes of the Treaty, the greatest economic progress has shown the greatest economic progress.

The "Practical Business Method"

It is only fair to say that the National Industrial Conference Board arrived at the conclusions in a remarkably scientific manner. For the 1939 misjudgements, there was the National Industrial Conference Board. As President Alexander of the Board said in the volume: "In the preparation of the National Industrial Conference Board and judgement of the business executives and of recognized authorities, the publications of the Board thus finalise scientific investigation and broad business.

In other words, the National Industrial Conference Board is a solid, responsible scholarly institution, along lines approved of by the brains of the country. Its fantasies are day-dreams but the hallucinations

INCIDENT

And then there is the story of the man who went to a socialist meeting to boo the speakers and was just in time to see the meeting broken up by the cops. "But I'm an anti-socialist!" he protested, "I don't give a damn what kind of socialist you are," roared the copper, as he gave the man's skull another caress with his nightstick.

es over all things, economic and political, shall and will remain intransigent opponents of the kind of slavery totalitarian parties and their splinter offshoots stand for. Therefore, far be it from me henceforth to sympathize with any of them, even if they get paid back in their own coin.

Very truly yours

JOSEPH ZACK

(See editorial page 4 for our answer.)