

# SOCIALIST REVIEW •

Vol. 7 - No. 2

Spring, 1940

15 cents

HERBERT ZAM: Editor

---

## The War

MARCEAU PIVERT: The Socialist Position on the War



## The Election Campaign

NORMAN THOMAS: The New Deal Faces Election

TRAVERS CLEMENT: The Socialist Party Faces Election

JUDAH DROB: The Election and the War



## Historical Documents

FEODOR RASKOLNIKOFF: An Open Letter to Stalin



## Books

FERDINAND LUNDBERG: Two Books of Significance

---

SOCIALIST REVIEW: Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.

Published Quarterly at 303 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., by the Socialist Party of the United States.

Subscription: One Dollar and Fifty Cents for 12 Issues. Fifteen Cents a single copy.

Reentered as second class matter January 21, 1938 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.



**MAY DAY GREETINGS**  
to the  
**SOCIALIST REVIEW**  
from its friends everywhere

---

**NEW YORK CITY**

Phil Heller	H. S.
Jack Blum	Fred Celli
Helen and Frank Trager	Co-operator
Al. Glazer	Co-operator again
Samson Horn	David Sinclair
Dave Tulchin	Reuben Newman
Lena Tulchen	Albert Lehrer
Irving Barshop	Ruth Feferholz
Max Kellner	Wm. Miren
Oscar Signer	Stanley Rappaport
L. Becker	Gloria Waldron
Abe Berkowitz	Mr. & Mrs. Kostinsky
David Berkingoff	Snow
Hatch Act Victim	Richard H. Rovere
Edith Parker	Ann Rosenzweig
Carl Fichandler	Sol Eisenberg
Mason Morrill	Morris Kornreich
Bob Tyler	Anna A. Kofsky
Florence Jaffe	Harry S. Davis
Tom Rossi	Jerome Finston
E. M.	L. Kelter
Herbert Zam	A. Bronfman
J. C.	V. Miller

---

**MAY DAY GREETINGS**

For an Effective Campaign

**SOCIALIST PARTY, LOCAL NEW YORK**

Greetings to

**SOCIALIST REVIEW**

**Teachers Branch — Local New York**

May Day Greetings

**8th Assembly District, Bronx**

Meets Every Wednesday, 8:30 P.M.

Room 20, 7 West Burnside Avenue, Bronx

---

**TOWARDS A WORKERS' WORLD**

Greetings from the

**Socialist Party 18th A. D., Kings**

Meets Every Thursday Evening

1428 St. Johns Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

---

**NEW JERSEY**

**M. Milgrim**

Member - Passaic Branch

**Claire E. Robinson**

---

**MAY DAY GREETINGS**

**Westfield, N. J., Branch of the Socialist Party**

---

**CALIFORNIA**

Edmund Kelly Janes

Jean and Jerry Knox

---

**COLORADO DELEGATES**

Edgar Sherman

Carle Whitehead

Harry Anderson

---

**CHICAGO, ILL.**

Gerry Allard

L. Symes

A. Camboni

Ina White

Gertrude R. Dubin

Mrs. Louise Mittlacher

Geo. Koop

---

**DETROIT, MICH.**

Evelyn Berglund

Emanuel Seidler

Blanche Green

C. Stern

D. Lipshitz

Rose Fine

Lawrence Piercey

H. R. McCrary

Jean Seidel

Louis Busker

F. King

Maurice Goldsmith

Branch Number One

Socialist Party

Local Wayne County

1110 W. Warren Street

Detroit, Mich.

---

**MAY DAY GREETINGS**

from

**Socialist Party of Massachusetts**

---

**S. P. Branch - Greater Pittsburgh Branch**

**Allegheny County, Penna.**

---

From a man against Foreign Wars.

S. M. Eyeman - Md.

Anonymous

Kate Barbash - Washington, D. C.

Blanche Roseberry - Pa.

Henry and Bessie Haskell - N. Y.

J. C. Pierce - N. Y.

Eleanor and Amicus Most - N. Y.

Charles H. Daniels - Mass.

Harry Rosen - Conn.

Caroline F. Urie - Conn.

A. L. Anderson - Conn.

M. N. Morrison - Conn.

Peter Wartianen, Jr. - Mass.

Joe Duchkowitch - Racine, Wis.

Emily P. Sterns - Va.

Samuel S. White - Mo.

H. J. Hahn

Joseph Jauch - Ohio

Wm. A. Ahern

Anonymous (Hatch Act)

Jerry Tucker, Md.

D. Felix — Penna.

Edmund B. Abbott, Md.

A. Handel

S. P. Two Members

Root, Pa.

Twin Cities, Minn.

Frank McCallister, Florida

Wm. Cote - Racine, Wis.

Al Jensen - Racine, Wis.

Jacob Cohn



# SOCIALIST REVIEW

Official theoretical organ of the Socialist Party of the United States.

HERBERT ZAM, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jack Altman, David Clendennin, Robert Delson, Harry W. Laidler, V. Miller, David Paul, Theodore Shapiro, S. Fanny Simon, Frank Trager.

VOLUME SEVEN

SPRING, 1940

NUMBER TWO

## The Socialist Position on the War

By Marceau Pivert

IN the eighth month of the second great imperialist war, the active phase of operations has begun. In spite of the predictions and the boasts of both camps, the matter is far from settled. After having divided Central Europe between themselves, Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia have just assured themselves control of all Northern Europe. Now the center of interest turns to the Mediterranean where probably the next development will arise. Then the colonial peoples, today enslaved and terrorized, will be involved. Then the Third Camp will come into play. . . .

We propose to be prepared for these events by defining now a general line which would guide the efforts of all workers toward their emancipation.

Let us examine the reasons invoked by the Socialists of the "union sacré": "Against Hitler, racial barbarism, fascist counter-revolution, it is necessary to aid in the victory of the allies without which the liberation of the German people is not possible." And others add, "The Allies are fighting for liberty, for law, for civilization, for the independence of small peoples."

It is not without bitterness that we find once again those illusions cultivated which in 1914 laid ten million dead on the fields of battle. Permit one of the twenty million wounded who escaped death in the first massacre to point out the lie of these affirmations. No, the Allies did not in 1918 win in order to bring about liberty, independence and democracy. They simply effected a new division of the world, creating thereby the germs of the present conflict. They simply shifted around the zones of influence and continued the old iniquities. Furthermore, they furnished the fascist dictatorships with the most efficient arms to ensure their control of Central Europe. At the same time, the colonial peoples to whom they had promised liberty found themselves on the morrow of the war more exploited than ever. We know the dark history of French imperialism in Indo-China, in Tunis, in

Algeria, in Morocco—a history which makes us blush to think that the country which proclaimed the Rights of Man could have been the author of such oppression.

In the natural development of events Hitler has used the very same methods of governing, but he has perfected them. German science has put itself at the service of the most diabolical of the powers. Today they are asking us to choose between two systems of oppression, one more virulent than the other. The question was recently posed to me in this way: "If you were in Germany, you would fall under the axe of the executioner; do you not rejoice that in France you are faced only with prison?" No one denies this real difference. But the problem is precisely to create a regime in which the free exchange of ideas and opinions will no longer be considered either a crime or treason. If the proletariat abandons its independent position and delivers itself into prison out of fear of the executioner's axe, it goes directly to the worst of solutions—that is to a general state of fascism.

Let us clarify this essential point: the treatment accorded the working class groups in each country in Europe is in direct relation to the level of security of its dominant class. When those in power feel in danger, they use the police and tighten the controls of their coercive state machine. I think one can say that there was less liberty in France in August, 1939 than in July, 1914. The degradation of the elementary rights of the individual, of associations, of the press and of Parliament was profoundly increased. On the contrary in England there still is even now greater liberty,\* but it is only because the margin of security of the oldest and most powerful of the imperialist countries still permits it to regard the exercise of these traditional liberties without fear. But war speeds up the evolution toward dictatorship. Democratic liberties which have been surprised by the

\* Since this was written, the situation in England has changed much for the worse, as is known.—Ed.



twilight are now in the night, and the movement marches from east to west. Already in France the death penalty has been prescribed for the crime of subversive propaganda (exactly as in Nazi Germany), and Great Britain begins to clamp down on the pacifists (see the London dispatch, N. Y. Times, of May 2nd). To sum up, whenever the workers of Italy, Germany, Austria, Spain, etc. clung to the illusion of bourgeois democracy and abandoned their own struggle they contributed to the advance of Fascism, without being able to give any vigor to political institutions (bourgeois parliamentarianism) which are condemned to disappear by their class content. Democracy can be defended only by the conquest of power by the proletariat.

Nevertheless, let us consider the hypothesis of an Allied victory as in 1918. Why should we expect on the basis of class collaboration a better outcome this time? Can we expect to destroy the formidable German industrial apparatus and if we do not destroy it how can we avoid new conflicts in a short period? Here is the harsh dilemma: a new and worse Versailles will give birth to a more violent Fascism, and a new Munich will open the way to an even more effective imperialist expansion. Within the present imperialist system there are only false and temporary solutions and in every case the working class suffers a reinforced exploitation, poverty, ruin, destruction: it is necessary to break through this vicious circle.

We reject the solution of the reformists and patriots which leads only to the ruin of the working class movement, the prolongation of capitalist agony and in the last analysis to the victory of fascism.

We wish to oppose to the fascist solutions something other than the reformist patchwork or plutocratic corruption. It is necessary to create a new Europe, to break down the feudal and provincial frontiers which still imprison it, to liberate these great territories for the free circulation of raw materials, manufactured goods, capital and men. It is necessary to cast off the burden of armaments which has ruined several generations to the benefit of the munition manufacturers alone. Finally it is necessary to devote all the resources of nature, of technology and of science to the constant raising of the political and cultural level of humanity.

This solution is possible. Maybe one could say that such a perspective, outlined at the very time when tons of explosives are transforming cities of Europe into rubbish heaps, when battleships costing several million dollars sink in a few minutes, when hundreds and thousands of airplanes wing the sky carrying destruction and terror, that such a perspective is a flight to Utopian shores.

It is not. The very enormity of the contradictions which appear on all sides furnish the elements of

their own solution; the contradiction between the possibility of a life of peace and abundance and the reality of war; between the possibility of liberty and the growth of dictatorship; between the high level of productive forces and the rapid economic exhaustion of the belligerent countries; the contradiction, finally, between the real feeling of these millions of men, facing one another in armed camps, marching to death, without hatred, and the unutterable sacrifices which are imposed upon them in both camps for a cause which is not their own.

If the English and French people appear to be solidly behind their governments, it is in large measure because they fear to suffer the treatment imposed by Hitler on the Czech, Austrian and Polish populations . . . and if the German people appear to follow their Fuehrer in all his undertakings, it is in part because there are Duff Coopers who openly advocate the destruction of their right to exist. All the bureaucratic and bourgeois imperialisms (including that of Stalin) temporarily have the power to decide the fate of their slaves only because they are divided and herded into hostile nationalities. But the idea which must save them is that of fraternization. Divided, they are weak and at the mercy of their masters. United, they will be invincible, and both dictatorship and plutocracy will collapse like a house of cards.

If we wish to emphasize the revolting absurdity of this second imperialist war, it would suffice to expose the international connections to which, in spite of their ideological differences, all governments are subject as proof of the fact that in our era distinctly national economies have lost their significance. Up to the very minute of the declaration of war, trains carrying iron ore owned by M. de Wendel replenished the German steel factories, and the coke of the Ruhr heated the blast furnaces of Briey. Certain German airplanes were mounted with American motors (Pratt and Whitney) or with French motors (Gnome and Rhone). Bauxite of Provence furnished most of the aluminum with which the air fleet of Goering was constructed. And if we studied carefully the world circulation of certain metals necessary to special steels—nickel, chromium, manganese, vanadium, etc. we would discover a most peculiar exchange of services among the great international firms. At this very moment the iron of Lorraine is being exchanged for the coke of the Ruhr via Belgium. American copper leaves Manzanillo for Vladivostock, and without doubt from there into the fuses of German bombs. There was American gasoline in the tanks of the Red Army at Petsamo; Canadian wheat has been sent to Russia, which means to Germany, etc. Thus, in spite of war and blockade, world economy imposes its laws. At the time of the Spanish war, the mercury of Almaden held by Franco was used to make the detonators of the Italian as well as



the Republican artillery. We could cite a host of other examples. Thus if the proletariat inherits certain internationalist sentiments which will manifest themselves when the crisis breaks, it is because the capitalist regime has created the basis for this sentiment, since, for a long time, captains of industry have given proof to the exploited that national divisions are relative and very often subordinated to class interests. Certainly they can still cultivate nationalist sentiments and exploit them for imperialist ends which the idea of national independence is supposed to camouflage. One can find the same phenomenon in the churches where the devotion of the faithful is exploited by clerical institutions in the service of the ruling class. The conclusion that we must draw from the real internationalism of economy is the certainty that Socialist organization which will eliminate tariff barriers, import and export quotas, industrial Malthusianism, the artificial raising of prices by monopolies, etc. will considerably decrease the general costs, the squandering and the discord to which capitalist economy gives birth.

It is necessary in fact for us to return to the true values. That is to say, using the expression of our friend, Jean Giono, "to the true riches", those which place man above social and economic forces and not below. We have shown above that it was visionary to count on the bourgeoisie for this mission, because the bourgeoisie is compelled today to use violence, lies and dictatorship in order to preserve its class privileges. During its rise, capitalism needed certain liberties for its conquest of the world. There has never been true democracy within the framework of capitalism, that is to say a society composed of individuals having equal opportunities at the beginning of the struggle for existence. Nevertheless, there was a certain elasticity, a certain freedom of action among human molecules which today social pressure no longer permits. The area of human liberty contracts from day to day. Only opinions coinciding with the interests of the ruling class are permitted. Only a press which sings the praises of the government is printed. Only those meetings which contribute to the propaganda of the powers that be are allowed. If you are poor and if you wish to be independent, you are crushed. If you have been exiled by a Fascist regime, you are herded like animals into a concentration camp. Never has the stuff of which human beings are made been more devitalized by the great machine which consumes all the hours of man's day and all the days of his life. Women are mobilized even though they are denied the right to vote (in France). Social authority controls everything: food, work, family and even sexual relations. Everything is regulated, stimulated, proscribed.

Antiquity provides us with many examples of slaves

who learned to think. Modern slaves have a clear consciousness of the mechanism which pushes them into the profit factory and from the profit factory onto the battlefield. Tracing back from effect to cause, they find the source of their ills in the economic system itself. And realize the necessity to wrest power from the dominant class in order to establish the conditions for true liberty. For the enlightened section of the international proletariat, liberty is realized after the capitalist regime, by means of a total break with its economic basis. It will be established only by a conscious and independent effort of the great masses, who must take their destiny in their own hands. There will not be Socialism, by which we mean liberty, without expropriation, conquest of power, and maximum democracy for the workers.

The question of understanding how the Russian Revolution of October, 1917, gave place to the Stalinist regime, today an accomplice of Nazism, is outside the limits of this article. But it is of considerable theoretical interest to show how, after having been able to overthrow the capitalist regime, Soviet Russia missed the road to Socialism, in part because it did not give the workers themselves those essential liberties without which Socialism is only a caricature.

The Socialist solution is not only possible; it is necessary. As long as the masses fail to understand this necessity, false and temporary solutions such as fascism and war will repeat themselves and history will continue to pose the problem as long as it has not been solved. It is therefore necessary to economize as much as possible on the gropings, the waste, and the catastrophes which result from an ignorance of fundamental laws. How is it that a productive apparatus so well equipped as that in the great capitalist countries can be compelled to function almost exclusively for war, that is for destruction? Let us choose an example among thousands.

In a refinery six workers earn about 10,000 francs each and they are employed to pack pieces of sugar into one pound packages. Their combined annual salary is 60,000 francs. A machine costing 75,000 francs amortizable in ten years, can perform the same work under the guidance of a single worker earning 10,000 francs. The work now costs only 10,000 francs plus 7,500 francs which equals 17,500 francs a year. That is to say there has been a saving of over two thirds to the factory. But on the other hand, there are five unemployed who will consume less at the very time that production will be able to increase. At the same time, the rate of profit will diminish with the increase in fixed capital and the industrialist will try to compensate for this loss by an increase in production. Soon the accumulation of stock will oblige him to look for foreign markets. Imperialism is born.

When the world was very large this conquest was



more or less specific, but today it is very small. In order to keep the markets or to acquire new ones, governments arm to the teeth and war breaks out. The great empires which have reserves are more patient than those nations which have arrived too late to share in the division of world markets or which lost them on a previous occasion. But they all share the same historic responsibility. As for the others, not being able to colonize and destroy colonial races, they colonize and destroy human groups like the Jews under racial pretext but with the same objective—theft and pillage. And finally they crush their own people by imposing upon them a system of methodical oppression.

Thus, that which is on trial is the economic system itself; the profiteering plutocracies which are ruling over hundreds of millions of colonials as well as the fascist dictatorships which have colonized their own people. The imperialist war which is an offspring of this regime with its train of ruin and suffering must create the objective conditions of the revolutionary transformation of a Europe which is exhausting itself and degrading itself at an unexpected rate (in two months of war France used up the equivalent of its normal annual revenue). We do not yet know where or

when or how the first rupture will occur which will permit the political socialist factor to become the decisive element in the conclusion of this war. But we can affirm two things: first, the contagion will be much greater than in 1917 because the degree of decomposition is much more advanced, and second, we can picture to ourselves the ideal which will animate the working and peasant masses, today silent, when they will march in combat for their own cause and not for their masters.

Their starting point will be this premise: today the productive forces are sufficient so that there need no longer be a single home without bread, a single person without shelter, a single child without school, a single old man without refuge, a single invalid without a hospital. If we know how to organize there will be not merely bread, but milk and butter for everyone, and we do not need cannon to live. Our objective is no longer to kill each other, man against man, brother against brother, race against race, but to unite to conquer the forces of nature and to destroy all iniquities. It is this ideal which must bring victory, when it will be borne by the armed fist of the revolutionary workers.

May 4, 1940.

---

## The New Deal Faces Election

By Norman Thomas

THIS article must begin by a word of explanation. The Editor has asked me to do a hurry-up job of discussing eight years of the New Deal. I simply haven't time to do a properly documented article of the weight which the SOCIALIST REVIEW ought to require. I am, therefore, writing on a more general subject more immediately on my mind at present. Perhaps even this survey of the American political scene at the beginning of the 1940 campaign might be different if I had time to consider it more at length, and to look up certain references. Some of its conclusions, in any case, will be subject to modification by the development of events, but it is, I think, sufficiently accurate and well thought out to serve as a background for Socialist action.

The American people are generally aware that they suffer from unnecessary poverty and insecurity. The attempt of Dorothy Thompson and Arthur Krock to prove that unemployment was largely an illusion didn't get very far. We shall not have to argue very long to establish the statement that for some ten years we have had an average standing army of ten million unemployed, with no sign that it will be substantially

lessened; that two-thirds of our families have less than \$1,500 a year in family income; and that more than 20 per cent of our people are entirely outside the going economic order. That is to say, they could be drowned in the Atlantic or the Pacific without making much difference except as they would reduce the demand for subsistence goods. Neither shall we have to argue very earnestly to persuade the American people that the Brookings Institute was conservative in its well known estimate that back in 1929 we had enough capacity to produce so that we could have raised every family income in America to a \$2,000 level without reducing any at the top! There were, in that year 16,400,000 families with less than \$2,000 a year.

Confronted with this situation, the dominant American mood is far from revolutionary. If the FORTUNE survey is correct—and I am inclined to think it is—your typical American is extraordinarily modest in his economic expectations; 49.9 per cent would be satisfied with an income less than \$2,500 a year. Likewise your typical American pictures himself as middleclass; he would like to be "on his own," that is, if possible, in business for himself; he still thinks that he would



prefer success to security; he still believes that his opportunities to succeed are better than his father's. He also believes that he is better prepared than was his father, and that his sons' opportunities will be still greater. All of which shows how amazingly Americans have been conditioned to conventional middleclass reactions. Probably these convictions have gained strength, first from a general comparison of America's good fortune with Europe's crisis; and second, from a sense of the failure of Socialism, or what is called Socialism under any of its various forms, to achieve great things for the masses in Germany or in Russia.

In any case and for whatever reason, the dominant American reaction to an admittedly unsatisfactory economic condition is conservative or even reactionary. This is true, irrespective of the lines of division between the Democratic and Republican Parties. Thus, in spite of the continuing personal popularity of Mr. Roosevelt, FORTUNE'S survey indicates that 60 per cent of the general public favor modification or nullification of the New Deal. According to FORTUNE 42.3 per cent of the poor (but not of the Negroes) concur in this conclusion. People of every class overwhelmingly believe that somehow or other the budget should be balanced. Only 27.3 per cent believe that the next Administration should work toward government ownership of the public utilities.

Of course these figures should not carry quite the weight that at first sight they suggest. For instance, a great number of these who want to balance the budget also want continuance and increase of benefits to themselves. The movement for pensions for World War veterans and their families is gaining in momentum; the Townsend Plan and similar proposals are far from dead; business, by no means, wants to give up its tariff benefits; most emphatically the unemployed do not want to abandon their meagre relief, any more than the farmers want to stop some form or other of aid to themselves. The voters consciously or unconsciously hope that the subsidies they get will be greater than the subsidies which they help to pay. The pulling and hauling between a theoretical desire to balance the budget and the desire for greater subsidies is likely to come close to wrecking the next Administration, whether it is Republican or Democratic. Certainly there is no philosophical approach to the question in evidence which has any consistency or constructive promise.

That fact becomes clearer when we examine the attitude of the major political parties in some of the groups. Let us begin by looking at the Democrats. The first fact which meets the eye is that the Democratic Party is not a New Deal Party. This will be true even if Roosevelt is renominated. The Party has

been profoundly influenced by the New Deal, but for that matter so have the Republicans and the whole country. The Democratic Party has not been captured by the New Deal forces; it is still a weird federation of Southern Bourbons with urban bosses and political machines in the great industrial cities and self styled progressives. Never forget that Messrs. Hague, of Jersey City, and Kelly and Nash of Chicago are among the most enthusiastic advocates of a third term for Roosevelt. Why? Certainly not because they love Roosevelt, but because they love the political success to which the magic of Roosevelt's name has contributed. Roosevelt may be re-elected President of the United States with a Democratic Congress almost as reactionary in tendency as a Republican Congress would be.

Part of the explanation for this situation is the fact that the New Deal itself, which always had to compromise for political reasons with non New Deal elements of the Democratic Party, has now come to a standstill so far as any program for the future is concerned. Roosevelt, or any New Dealer who may be nominated for President will go into this campaign fighting on a record of things already accomplished rather than on a program of things to be done.

That record, let it be admitted, is in many respects very good; so good, that no Republican will dare to advocate outright repeal of any of the major New Deal laws. Clearly the New Deal has not conquered poverty or removed unemployment; it has, however, greatly increased elementary social security, and it has shown a concern for the under dog and for the conservation both of natural resources and human values unprecedented in American political history. It has greatly encouraged the organization of labor and has, to a certain extent, protected labor from the worst consequences of its own divisions and its own mistakes. In no true sense has the New Deal been Socialist, but unquestionably it has put into operation many of the more important Socialist immediate demands. Socialists may criticize its legislation in detail, but they ought to understand why it has been popular with the workers of America. In general, it has done much of what we ourselves have suggested.

Thoughtful critics can, indeed, find plenty to criticize specifically in particular laws. They can point to the inconsistency between the New Deal of the N. R. A. period, and the New Deal of trust busting fame. But when all is said and done, the major criticisms of the New Deal's positive performance, so far as that performance goes, are two: First, its foreign policy has been completely inconsistent, and points dangerously toward war; and second, its gold purchase policy not only subsidizes foreign nations, including Japan, in the conduct of their wars, but lays the basis of a



menacing inflation in the United States. The first of these errors is peculiarly Mr. Roosevelt's own; the second is fully shared by Republicans. The very people who criticize the silver purchase have been, as a rule, blind to the more serious effect of the gold purchase policy of the United States. Fortunately it has been a subject admirably dealt with in that important book *The Golden Avalanche* by Messrs. Graham and Whittlesey.

The chief criticism of the New Deal is concerned not with its sins of commission, but of omission. It has come to a halt without solving any fundamental problems. True, enough, some Left Wing New Dealers would challenge this statement. They say that the New Deal has come merely to a temporary resting place while it gathers again its forces, and they would point to the Temporary National Economic Committee, or the work of the New Dealers on that committee, as evidence of further policy in the making.

Time alone will show what that policy is, or whether Mr. Roosevelt will accept it. It is generally understood that the committee will make no report prior to the election. I have heard the argument advanced that what the Left Wing New Dealers want is a broad general government control of investments with a frontal attack on private monopoly. This can be stretched into a position somewhat like that taken by Maynard Krueger in his well received keynote speech at our own convention. It is, however, a weakness, not a strength, that these Left Wing New Dealers do not see, or will not admit that their own most constructive tendencies, logically carried out, will take them over to a Socialist point of view. Their plans require something fairly to be called a revolution in terms of the purpose and direction of our economy. It may be political expedience to disguise that fact for the present, but in the end it is an expedience which is likely to become self defeating.

We are, however, so uncertain what will come out of this TNEC that at present speculation is idle. Mr. Roosevelt's own immediate trust for any sort of economic solution of the problem of unemployment has now been for many months in the field of armament economics, and in the hoped-for profits of a hurry in war trade. It is a trust that has been badly disappointed since the subsidence of a mild war boom at the end of 1939. In domestic affairs, he is likely to go before the public to boast of what has been done. And what has been done, excellent as it is in many respects in comparison with the Old Deal, could as well be a prologue to the totalitarian or fascist state as to a true co-operative commonwealth.

All this adds up to the flat statement that the New Deal has nothing definite to offer the American people to meet its enormous economic problem, and that the

Democratic Party, as such, has even less. Moreover, it will be the Democratic Party rather than the New Deal which will be fighting this election even if Mr. Roosevelt should decide to run.

To discuss the Republican Party will require less time. It has no leader and no program to capture the popular imagination. If it achieves victory it will be merely as the expression of the vague reaction to which I have referred. It is a sobering thing that at such a critical time in history a Party should offer so serious a challenge for power with so little to offer. Tom Dewey, who is now out in front of the race for the Republican Presidential nomination, has nothing to offer but a successful record as a public prosecutor, a good voice and lots of energy. His program consists of criticism of the Administration couched in terms of a lawyer indicting a criminal. He does not even command one's confidence in his sincerity. He had no opinion to offer during the long discussion of the revision of the Neutrality Law. His first specific reference to foreign policies in New York was a general indorsement of the Administration for taking "the American way". He specifically declared that "today we find the Administration broadly following the policy both in Europe and the Far East laid down by 12 years of Republican Administration. These are the policies stated by three great Secretaries of State, Henry L. Stimson, Frank B. Kellogg and Charles F. Hughes." It was only after he had been criticized in his own party and had exchanged the atmosphere of New York for the atmosphere of the Middle West, that Dewey began his present policy of denouncing the Administration for its tendency to lead the country into war. He has never documented his charges, nor told the country what he would do. There is much reason to think that he,—yes, and several of his rivals for the nomination if in office, would be as quick to try to put the country into war as Roosevelt himself. Their rationalizations of a war policy that might be more in terms of American interest and less in terms of some idealistic ideology, but it would be the same war and the same destruction of democracy.

If it were not for the war, I should think the Republican chance for victory a little better than the Democratic. In office a Republican administration would not even try to repeal outright any important New Deal legislation. It would tamper with some of that legislation, probably for the worse. It might try to economize at the expense of relief, but political fear of the masses who still have a vote will keep it from advancing far in abolishing the program of bread and circuses by which our modern rulers keep the people quiet. Indeed the flirtation of certain Republicans with Townsend planners and the American Legion, might actually result in an increase in the budget they



promise to balance. The psychological contribution of such an Administration to that spirit of confidence by which we are told that private business may yet lead us out of the wilderness would be small. After the first flush of enthusiasm, private business would find that Republican President Dewey or Republican President X, had little to offer it by way of a shot in the arm. The underlying economic conditions which Republicans refuse to face will make for a continuance of unemployment.

What is the matter with our economics is something that goes far deeper than the mistakes of political government. The system of private capitalism is dying everywhere in the world, and under every form of government there is an increase—a necessary increase of state intervention, sometimes in forms that are wise, and sometimes in forms that are foolish, but always in ways not to be stopped by sighing for the capitalism of the 19th Century. Its era of expansion is over; the rate of increase of population is dying; monopolies are entrenched; vested interest in keeping the profits of old enterprises rather than in undertaking new enterprises are enormously strong.

It is when the masses will have found out that the Republicans have no magic to balance budgets, to restore confidence, and to create employment, that we must look for a real upswing of American fascism, a fascism which will not bear the label but which will have all the characteristic earmarks of that movement. It may begin with a demagogue and some patent medicine proposal to cure a real ill. Never forget that the Ham and Eggers in California, who faced a real evil and doubtless thought they were good believers in democracy, supported a proposal for a quasi dictatorship in California to carry out their economic panacea. The day may come when some strong man will unite the various conflicting quasi fascist movements and make a genuine fascist appeal. The situation which gave rise to fascism in Europe will be with us if we cannot cure unemployment; still more will it be with us if we cannot escape war.

Space fails me to argue the war question here. Our Socialist campaign will not be based on keeping America out of war as the major issue. The major issue is the conquest of poverty and the preservation and increase of democracy. That requires that we keep out of war. It is fantastic wishful thinking to talk of Socialism and still to accept the necessity of our military intervention in war. The logic of war is fascist totalitarianism, military collectivism, but not the cooperative commonwealth.

We are not better than our brothers in Europe but much more fortunate in that we are able, in America, to save Socialism. We are not caught in the tragic web of fate which European history, including it must

be added, certain failures of Socialism itself, has woven for the European Socialists. Most of them see no escape from the war. We have such an escape. There is no service we can render to Europe in war comparable to the loss to ourselves by participation in war. By staying out of war we can do for Europe and for mankind far more than by our involvement in a mad imperialist struggle.

It is quite clear that Mr. Roosevelt does not see this. Subconsciously, at least he may desire an escape from America's unsolved problems and his own relative failure as our saviour, to a campaign to save the world. His present denials of any intentions to put America into war are somewhat less than convincing. They do not conform to his record. Doubtless Mr. Roosevelt would prefer not to put the country into war if, in his judgment, he could make America's influence felt on what he regards as the "right" side, without war. Doubtless, moreover, he will not fly in the face of strong American determination to keep out of war, but in no sense can he be counted on as a leader in the hard task of achieving the maximum possible isolation from war with the maximum co-operation for peace. That is one of the reasons for our campaign.

I have spoken of the major parties. There is small likelihood of the rise of any efficient or significant farmer, labor or even third party movement in 1940. It will be too late to create such a party after a Democratic Convention which may prove unsatisfactory to John L. Lewis and others. At best, Mr. Lewis could only get his party on the ballot in a few states to wreck vengeance on certain people. Alas, the divisions of labor organizations, and the suspicions that rank and file workers have of their own leaders, are also likely to frustrate a real farmer labor party. One of the most ominous signs of the times is FORTUNE'S report that 62.9 per cent of factory labor believes that the government should regulate labor unions. That is the price union laborism is paying for its civil war, lack of sufficient internal democracy, and its toleration of racketeering. It is a bitter fight that militates against any nationwide farmer labor movement this year.

What may be called the left wing forces outside the Socialist Party will not count for much. The Communists still have an organization and a financial strength not to be despised. They will play with John L. Lewis as long as they can, but will probably run their own ticket. Lately they have spent so much time on politics that they have forgotten to educate people in the fundamental economics of Socialism, and for that they will pay a price. (So will all of us!) They will talk vociferously for peace unless, by chance, America should be on the verge of a war with Japan which might help Stalin, in which case they would



shift again. Their only real desire is to follow a line to help Stalin. Increasingly the public can and must be made aware of that fact.

In their revolt against this Communist line, many former Left Wingers, including such diverse individuals as John Chamberlain and Max Eastman, have renounced Socialism itself in favor of a kind of vague, new, "scientific" or experimental approach to a better economic order. They have seen so clearly the failure of certain Socialist experiments that they have forgotten the richness of the Socialist heritage and have been somewhat blinded to the essential nature of the failures of capitalism and nationalism, to which Socialism has long offered an answer.

It is precisely this dangerous situation which has made it so absolutely imperative for Socialists to wage an aggressive campaign. If we don't, no one else will. The great name, the great traditions, the great ideals, of Socialism, will be mocked and derided by our critics, and betrayed by the Communists. The work of education for a cooperative commonwealth, for a democratic Socialism will not be undertaken. We have a great opportunity; we have an obvious failure of the old system at which to point. We have a position on war that must appeal to the masses, and we have a definite, constructive Socialist approach to the problem of increasing production and better sharing what is produced. Our platform and our resolutions point the way to the achievement of plenty, peace and freedom.

---

## The Socialist Party Faces Election

By Travers Clement

THOSE who are urging America's entry into the war, either gradually through increased economic participation or immediately by putting our armed forces at the services of the Allies, and particularly those in this group who look upon themselves as Socialists, are insistent upon the fact that this is 1940—not 1917.

No one can deny that the world of 1940 is a very different place from the world of 1917. The first World War and the forces it set in motion attended to that. Vast as the changes during the last twenty-odd years have been, they are probably minor compared with those that are to come within the next decade. This will be true, no matter who wins the present war, no matter whether we are drawn in or stay out, for though it is possible for America to isolate itself from the war, it will not be possible for it to isolate itself completely from the *economic* consequences of the war.

It should be reasonably clear by this time that the type of democracy we have known in the past—limited political democracy—is fast fading out of the picture, in the Allied as well as in the fascist countries. We are witnessing the birth of a new socio-economic order as distinct from old-line capitalism, now in its death-throes, as this capitalism was from feudalism. The best names we have for it so far are state collectivism or state capitalism. This is the form of society which is emerging in Russia, Germany, Italy and which is now taking form in England and France as they struggle to gear themselves for totalitarian war.

The burning question still to be settled is the political character of the new collectivized state. There appear to

be only two possibilities. We can have a Socialist collectivism, which means the extension of democracy into the economic structure, or a fascist or military collectivism which means the crushing of both political and economic democracy—and culturally at least, a new Dark Age.

Thus far, the tide has been running in favor of fascist collectivism. This is true, not only in the acknowledged fascist countries—Germany, Italy and Spain—but in Stalin's Russia.

England and France, providing the issue is not settled for them by a swift German victory, have yet to decide this issue. This means that the French and English workers will have to decide it—and upon their decision will hang the destruction or reinvigoration of the labor movement in the smaller or less industrialized nations. If the war is drawn out, they will have to take power—which is not the same thing as entering into coalition, national unity cabinets merely to maintain the status quo. Otherwise, they will probably get a fascist collectivism whether the Allies win or lose. The possible variations would seem to be few. It is conceivable, of course, that while the Allies may emerge victorious, it will be at the price of such exhaustion and with a victory which carries with it so little prestige to the ruling classes, that the workers will be able to take power at the end of the war. It is less conceivable, but also possible that a German victory which is not swift and immediate would place Hitler in the same position as the English and French ruling classes at the end of a long exhausting struggle and that even with such victory, he would face a German Revolution. But the exhaustion attendant upon such victories—on either side—would be shared by the English, French



and German working classes. Another variant, if the Allies win at the end of a long struggle is that a revolution would take place in Germany which they would not have sufficient strength to suppress. In this case, the German workers would probably face the danger of Russian intervention which would mean totalitarian collectivism—Stalin brand.

The most favorable climate for a Socialist collectivism is the United States—if the progressive forces prove sufficiently strong to keep America out of war. In view of the political backwardness of the American working class, this may seem a far-fetched assertion. But economic forces do not always wait upon the psychological preparation of the masses. In the presence of military collectivism in Europe, the development of economic collectivism in the United States will be enormously accelerated. If we are not at war, we have a fighting chance to prevent the development—along with it a totalitarian political super-structure, an opportunity immeasurably greater than that of any other nation to guide this development into democratic collectivist channels.

The victory of Socialist collectivism in one highly developed, industrialized nation—the only type of country in which it is economically possible—might well be enough to reverse the whole world trend toward totalitarianism. It is inconceivable, for instance, that the advanced working class of Germany, as well as the politically developed working class of England

and France, would tolerate for very long a regime which meant the loss of both political and industrial democracy if they had before their eyes, as a working example, a form of society which provided both economic security and complete democracy.

With these thoughts in mind and against the background of this war and the economic consequences that are sure to follow, the 1940 Socialist campaign in this country takes on a new international as well as a national significance. We are not campaigning primarily for office or for votes. In the words of Norman Thomas in his acceptance speech at the Socialist National Convention: "If we can make our fellow-citizens stop and listen to our program for keeping America out of war and abolishing poverty, if we can make our words stick like a burr in their minds and consciousness in this hour of darkness, doubt and confusion, we shall not have failed." We shall, in addition, have lighted a beacon which may serve to give new hope and direction to the workers of the world.

As America begins to feel the economic consequences of this war, as all the normal processes of capitalist decay are accelerated, these words of Norman Thomas may come to have as much significance in the minds of millions of the American people generally as they have to us Socialists. There lies our opportunity and our hope. There the significance of this campaign and of the Convention which planned and launched it.

---

## The Election and the War

By Judah Drob

**T**He war and the campaign provide unusual opportunities for the Socialist movement. More people than ever in ordinary times will listen to us and approve of what we have to say about the breakdown of the system and the necessity for keeping this country out of war.

These opportunities are not dissimilar from those offered to us several times in the past—notably in 1919 and in 1932. But this year, much more than any other in our recent history is a critical year, and so the chance to reach the ears of large numbers of people must be converted into solid organizational gains for the Socialist Party and the Young Peoples Socialist League.

To gain a hearing is not enough. To convince people is not enough. To pile up a fairly large vote is not enough. For in the period ahead we will need more than amorphous support. We will need organized strength.

The talk about a national government, a coalition

cabinet, a Roosevelt-Willkie ticket in the 1940 elections, is a dangerous prelude to the familiar European sacred union in which all the forces of the government are massed against the people who stand out against the government policy (which may be war, or just preparation for war).

The huge armaments program is a prelude to the lowering of living and wage standards which has been initiated by the attack of army and navy officers on the Walsh-Healy act.

The whole situation is meant to involve us in war, and to run the country on the totalitarian model of warring European nations.

Under such circumstances we need organization. We need the kind of Socialist movement that is large enough to reach the masses of workers, farmers, and middle class; strong enough to be able to take the initiative in action; well enough knit to act as a disciplined and cohesive unit no matter how difficult the circumstances.



Such an organization can be built in the course of this campaign. But it requires certain special precautions to be able to do so.

We must resist the impulse to sweep on without consolidating our gains. Too many times have we made a speech in a locality, signed up the entire audience, and sped on to the next place without a glimmer of an idea of what will happen to our "new branch".

Too many times have we been content to enlist the support of leaders, and forgotten that the might of our movement depends upon its numbers.

Too many times have we been content to secure vast amounts of publicity without the slightest chance to follow up and organize the people who were reached.

Our work this year must combine the sweeping scope of a promotion drive with the painstaking laborious work of building organization.

This involves efforts to convince those who follow us for the period of the campaign that there is need for permanent Socialist organization and that they belong in it.

It means that new Party and Y.P.S.L. organizations will have to be nursed along carefully, visited often, given every possible aid in their program and activity. Their members will have to be brought up on the notion that being a Socialist means being able to work regularly and steadily.

The kind of campaign that we want means being part of the mass organizations of labor and of other

progressive forces. It means learning how to win influence and sympathy among people whose experiences have predisposed them to understand Socialism.

In short, the organizational side of this campaign requires that we linger a little longer, spend a little more time on individuals and groups, that we provide the means for continual supervision of the work of our local sections.

If we do this faithfully we will emerge from the campaign well able to face the difficult times ahead.

For there is no use fooling ourselves. The tide is running toward war and totalitarianism, not against. Only the most determined work on our part, and on the part of a mass of workers and farmers who do not yet see all the implications of their present plight, can stem the tide.

We shall have to be able to influence unions to strike—for political as well as economic ends. We shall have to be able to put large numbers of people in motion. We shall have to be able to defend ourselves and to participate in the defense of labor and progressive organization.

We shall have to be able to respond to new crises, and to recurring crises without ever reaching the end of our rope or our hope.

The strength to do these jobs, to accomplish our aims and to frustrate our enemies, will have to be built largely during the time between now and November.

Dare we fail?

---

## An Open Letter to Stalin

By F. Raskolnikoff

*Translated by JULIUS EPSTEIN*

(As a result of a fortunate accident, the author of these lines is in a position to publish for the first time the following "Open Letter to Stalin", a document of historical significance.

Feodor Raskolnikoff is neither a runaway renegade nor a deposed official. Raskolnikoff is an old Bolshevik who served the Party for more than thirty years, a great revolutionist decorated by Lenin and Stalin with the highest honors the regime had. No Party Communist could imagine for himself a more brilliant life than Raskolnikoff's.

Raskolnikoff was born January 28, 1892 in Petrograd and received the education of a cadet in the Czarist naval academy. He almost immediately joined the revolutionary circles in the Navy and Army. Years before the victorious Bolshevik revolution, he belonged to Lenin's Party. In 1917 he played an important role: in October he was one of the leaders in the capture of the Winter Palace. He became commander of the Volga Fleet. In 1921 he was already a member of the diplomatic corps of the young Soviet Union and became Ambassador to Afghanistan. From 1923 to 1930 he was in the educational ministry in Moscow. In 1930

he returned to the diplomatic service and was ambassador to Esthonia, Denmark and finally to Bulgaria.

Raskolnikoff has a place in the history of the Soviet Union not only as a revolutionist and diplomat, but also as an author. His books and theatrical works were among the best sellers and most played.

Raskolnikoff was twice decorated with the Order of the Red Flag.

If this man, voluntarily and without the slightest personal conflict with Stalin, breaks with him and his regime and gives up his post as ambassador in Sofia to become a beggar in exile in Paris, it has extraordinary significance. After a long period of silence in exile, he finally decided to end his silence. He wrote the following "Open Letter to Stalin" which will have a lasting place in revolutionary literature. This letter has become Raskolnikoff's testament and farewell. A short time after writing this document, as a result of brooding over the Stalin-Hitler pact, he became insane and died in poverty in an asylum in Southern France.

It remains for a later epoch to give the Raskolnikoff tragedy its proper place. Only then will it be possible



properly to evaluate the Open Letter.

Without identifying ourselves in all details with the contents of the Open Letter, we recognize its extraordinary significance. Nobody will dare suspect Raskolnikoff of dishonorable motives. Even if this should be the case from the Communist side, it would have no significance, since the Party followers, who have swallowed all of Stalin's crimes without bellyaches, who often burn what they yesterday slept with and today sleep with what they will burn tomorrow, have lost all right to a hearing on moral judgment. Once and for all!

Raskolnikoff's Open Letter will contribute toward opening the eyes of that world which has too long been asleep.

Not what the author of this letter says—it contains hardly anything new—gives the message importance. That he it is that says it—Feodor Feodorovitch Raskolnikoff—lends the word importance and an echo in the entire world.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.)

*I shall tell truths about you  
more terrible than any lies.*

**S**TALIN, you have stated that I am "outside the law". By so doing you have placed me on your own level and on the same level with all Soviet citizens who, under your rule, live "outside the law".

For my part, I retaliate. I return you the ticket to your kingdom of "socialism" and break with your regime.

Your "socialism", which places its creators behind prison bars, is as remote from real socialism as your personal and arbitrary dictatorship is from the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Nor does it help your case for the world to remember that the respected and decorated revolutionary, N. A. Morosov, member of the Party of the People's Will, spent twenty years of his life in the crypt of the Schlissenburg prison for this "socialism".

In 1921 the growing dissatisfaction of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia forced Lenin's drastic change of policy and the inauguration of the N.E.P. In answer to the pressure of the Soviet people you "granted" them a democratic constitution. The entire country greeted it with real enthusiasm. If those democratic principles, embodying the hopes and expectations of the people, had been translated into action the constitution of 1936 would have initiated a new stage in Soviet democracy.

But in your mind political action and deceit are synonymous. You cultivate politics without ethics, power without honesty, "socialism" without regard for human beings.

What did you do to the constitution, Stalin?

Fearing freedom of the polls because it was a "leap into the unknown" which might endanger your personal rule, you tread upon the constitution as if it were a scrap of paper; single candidacy turned the elections into a pitiful farce and the sessions of the Supreme Soviet were filled with ovations in its own honor. Between sessions you quietly destroy non-conforming deputies, scoffing at their legal inviolability and making

clear that you, and not the Supreme Soviet are the boss of the Soviet land.

You have done everything to discredit Soviet democracy just as you have discredited socialism.

Instead of following in the direction of the change indicated by the constitution, you continue to suppress the growing discontent with force and terrorism. Having gradually replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat by your own dictatorship, you have inaugurated a new stage which will go down in the history of our revolution as the "Era of Terror."

No one in the Soviet Union feels himself secure. No one who goes to sleep knows whether he will escape a midnight arrest. No one is spared. The person who is right and the one who is wrong, the hero of October and the enemy of the revolution, the old Communist and the non-party member, the kolhoz peasant and the plenipotentiary representative, the people's commissar and the worker, the intellectuals and even the marshal of the Soviet Union—they are all equally subject to the blows of your whip, they all ride a diabolic, bloody merry-go-round.

As tremendous clods of earth fall thunderingly into the crater of an erupting volcano, so whole layers of Soviet society collapse and fall into the abyss.

You started the bloody retribution with the former Trotskyites, Zinovievists and the Bucharinists; you turned to the annihilation of the old Bolsheviks, destroyed the party and non-party contingents that grew up during the civil war and bore on their shoulders the organization of the first five-year plans; and you have exterminated the Komsomolists.

You hide behind the slogan of fighting the "Trotsky-Bucharinist spies". But the power in your hands does not date from only yesterday. No one could "elbow one's way" to any responsible position without your appointment.

Who placed the so-called "enemies of the people" in the most responsible state, party, army and diplomatic positions?

Joseph Stalin.

Who embedded the so-called "wreckers" into every pore of the Soviet party machine?

Joseph Stalin.

Reread the old protocols of the Polit-Bureau:—they are filled with the appointments and transfers of these same "Trotskyist-Bucharinist spies", "wreckers" and "diversionists" and under the orders is the signature: J. Stalin. You pretend to be a trusting duffer led by the nose for years by monsters in disguise.

"Find scape-goats", you whisper to your Attendants. You offer the ensnared victims in sacrifice and you charge them with your own sins.

You have welded the country with terror. Even the most daring would not attempt to speak openly



before you.

The wave of self-criticism, "disregarding personalities", stops respectfully and abruptly at the foot of your throne.

You are infallible as the pope! You never make mistakes!

But the Soviet people know that you are responsible for everything, you the forger of the "universal happiness!"

With the help of dirty lies you have staged trials in which the accusations are even more ridiculous than those made in medieval witch-trials which you have read in your textbooks.

You yourself know that Piatakov did not fly to Oslo, that Maxim Gorky died a natural death and that Trotzky did not derail a train. You know that these are lies and still you spur your agents on.

Slander and more slander. But there is always someone who is left over, who doesn't fit. As you know, I have never been a Trozkyite. On the contrary, I fought all opposition both in print and in public speeches. And even now I am not in agreement with the political position of Trotzky, with his program and tactics. But while I differ with Trotzky in principle, I consider him an honest revolutionary. I do not believe and shall never believe "his agreement" with Hitler and Hess.

You cook up some spicy dishes, but they are not digestable for a normal stomach.

You solemnly swore on Lenin's tomb to carry out his political legacy and to safeguard the unity of the party as you would the apple of your own eye.

Liar, you have broken even this trust of Lenin.

You have maligned, dishonored and shot Lenin's old companions: Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bucharin, Rikov and others whose innocence you were well aware of. Before they died you forced them to confess to crimes which they never committed and to cover themselves with mud from head to foot.

And where are the heroes of the October revolution? Where is Budnov? Where is Krylenko? Where is Antonov-Ovsenko? Where is Dibenko?

You have arrested them, Stalin.

Where is the old guard?

Its members are no longer alive. You have executed them, Stalin. You have depraved and dirtied the souls of your friends. You have forced those who follow you, troubled and disgusted, to wade through pools of the blood of their friends and comrades of yesterday.

In the false history of the party, written under your direction, you have stolen from the dead. You have credited yourself with all the achievements and merits of those killed and dishonored by you.

You have destroyed Lenin's party and you have built a new party, the "Lenin-Stalin party" around the skeleton of the old one. It serves as a convenient front

for your one-man regime. You did not build that party on the basis of common program and common tactics, as every party is built, but on your unprincipled self-love and egoism.

Knowledge of the program of the new party is not mandatory to its members; but the love of Stalin is mandatory and daily evoked by the press. The understanding of the party program has been replaced by a declaration of love for Stalin.

You are a renegade who has broken with his past, who has betrayed Lenin's cause!

You have solemnly proclaimed the slogan of promoting new cadres. But how many members of these young promoted cadres are already rotting in your cells? How many of them have you executed?

With the cruelty of a sadist you have destroyed the staffs necessary for the well-being of the country; from the point of view of your personal dictatorship they are dangerous to you.

On the eve of war you destroyed the Red Army, the love and pride of the country, the bulwark of its power.

You beheaded the Red Army and Navy. You killed the brilliant leader Tuchatschewsky and his most talented commanders, matured by the experience of the World and Civil wars.

You have annihilated the heroes of the Civil War who rebuilt the Red Army according to the last word in military technique and made it invincible.

At the very moment of the greatest war danger you continued to annihilate the leaders of the army, the members of the general staff and the petty officers.

Where is Marshal Bluecher? Where is Marshal Egorov?

You have arrested them, Stalin. In order to pacify those who were disturbed by this you deceived the country and stated that the Red Army, actually weakened by arrests and executions, had become even stronger.

Knowing that the law of military science demands undivided authority from the chief commander down to the platoon commander, you have revived the post of political commissar which originated at the dawn of the Red Army and when the specialists of military tactics required party supervision.

Distrusting the red commanders, you introduce dual power into the army and destroy military discipline.

Under pressure of the Soviet people, you hypocritically revive the cult of Russian historical heroes, Alexander Nevsky and Dimitri Donskoy, Suvrov and Kutusov, hoping that in the coming war they will serve you more than the executed marshals and generals.

Taking advantage of that fact that you do not trust anyone, the real agent of the Gestapo and of the Japanese Intelligence Service fish successfully in the muddy waters which you trouble. They provide you



with an abundance of false documents which defame the most talented and honest people.

You have handed over the Red Army and the entire country to be rent to pieces by the all-powerful rule of Narkomvnudel. In the rotten atmosphere of suspicion, mutual distrust and general perequisition which you create the precious "trapped" documents are accepted, or at least it is pretended that they are accepted, as if they were irrefutable evidence.

The "inner line" (Intelligence Service) of Rovy (counter-revolutionary White Russian organization in France) has, through Captain Foss, given false documents compromising honest embassy workers to Yezhov's agents and has achieved the complete destruction of our official representatives in Bulgaria, from the chauffeur M. E. Kasakov to the military attache, Col, Suhorikov.

You are destroying the important October conquests one by one. Under pretense of fighting the "fluctuation of labor" you have abolished freedom of work, enslaved the Soviet workers and attached them to factories and plants. You have destroyed the economic organism of the country, disorganized production and transportation, weakened the authority of the director, the engineer and the craftsman. You have accompanied these perpetual and abrupt replacements and appointments with the arrest and prosecution of engineers, directors and workers, charging them with being "hidden, as yet unexposed wreckers."

Having rendered normal production impossible, you force workers to labor under the whip and scourge of brutal anti-proletarian decrees, in the alleged attempt to stamp out "truancy and tardiness."

Your inhuman repressions make the life of the Soviet worker unbearable; he is dismissed for the slightest offense or he may lose his job through a "Wolf's passport" and he is subsequently dispossessed.

With self-sacrificing heroism the workers bore the burden of strenuous work, insufficient food, scant pay, crowded living quarters and lack of necessary commodities. They believed that you were leading them toward socialism, but you betrayed their trust. They hoped that with the victory of socialism in our country—with the triumph of the faith of "humanity's great minds in the universal brotherhood of man"—they would be able to live happily and comfortably.

You have taken away even this hope. You have declared socialism complete as it now exists in Russia.

And the perplexed workers ask each other in whispers: "If this is socialism, then what did we fight for, comrades?"

You pervert Lenin's theory of the withering away of the state just as you pervert the entire theory of Marxism-Leninism. You promise through the mouths of your illiterate, home-grown "theoreticians" who have filled the vacant places of Bucharin, Kamenev and

Lunacharsky, that you will maintain the rule of the GPU even under communism.

You have deprived the Kolhoz peasants of any stimulus to work. Under the pretext of fighting the "Waste of Kolhoz lands" you ruin cultivated areas in order to force the peasants to work on Kolhoz fields.

Organizer of famine, the brutality of the illegal methods characteristic of your tactics has discredited Lenin's idea of collectivism in the eyes of the peasants.

Hypocritically proclaiming the intellectual to be the "salt of the earth", you have deprived the writer, scientist and painter of the very minimum of inner freedom.

You have forced art into a vise which stifles it until it withers and dies out. The fury of your terrorized censor and understandable timidity of the editors who must answer for everything with their heads have stupified and paralyzed Russian literature. The author is not published, the dramatist is not produced, the critic is not allowed to express his personal opinion unless it bears the stamp of government approval.

You are stifling Soviet art by demanding that it kowtow like a courtier; but it prefers to remain silent rather than sing "hosannas" to you. You are propagating a pseudo-art which sings your notorious "geniality" with a monotony that set's one's teeth on edge.

Untalented parrots eulogize you as a half-god, "born of the sun and the moon" and you, like some Oriental potentate, delight in the incense of this coarse flattery.

You mercilessly annihilate young writers who do not flatter your personality.

Where is Boris Pilnyak? Where is Serge Tretyakov? Where is Alexander Arosev? Where is Galina Serebryakova, whose only crime lay in being the wife of Sokolnikov?

You have arrested them, Stalin!

Following Hitler's example, you have revived the medieval custom of book-burning. I have seen with my own eyes the long lists distributed to Soviet libraries, enumerating the works to be destroyed immediately and without any question whatsoever. When I was ambassador in Bulgaria I found that the 1937 list of books to be burned included my own volume of historical recollections: *Kronstadt and Petrograd in 1917*. The names of many authors were followed by the note: "all books, pamphlets and portraits to be destroyed."

You have deprived Soviet scientists, especially those in the field of social sciences, of the very minimum of scientific method and thought, without which creative research becomes impossible.

Arrogant boors, involved in intrigues, squabbles and badgering, interfere with the work of scientists in universities, laboratories and institutions.



You loudly declared that Ipatkev and Tchitchibabin, outstanding Russian scientists of world-renown, were political "fugitives". You naively believed you could dishonor them but you merely disgraced yourself. The whole country and the world now know that fact, so shameful to your regime, that the best scientists are fleeing from your paradise, leaving the card entitling one to dinner in the Sovnarkom restaurant.

You annihilate talented Russian scientists.

Where is Tupolev, the best constructor of Soviet airplanes?

You haven't spared even him. You have arrested Tupolev, Stalin!

There is no province, there is no corner where one may quietly pursue one's chosen occupation. The director, the marvelous stage-manager, the outstanding promoter of art, Vsevolod Meyerhold, did not mix in politics. But you arrested even Meyerhold, Stalin!

You know that our scarcity of qualified personnel makes every intelligent and experienced diplomat invaluable. Still you lured almost all Soviet ambassadors to Moscow and exterminated them one by one. You have annihilated the most talented and promising young diplomats in their prime—the golden fund of the nation.

In this tense moment of war danger when the sword of Fascism is drawn against the Soviet Union when the struggles for Danzig and the war in China are the basis for future aggression against the U.S.S.R., when the main object of Japanese aggression is our fatherland, when the only means of avoiding war is by forming an open alliance of the Soviet Union with the international block of democratic countries and the quick consummation of political military agreements with England and France, you have signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler.

In all your considerations of internal as well as foreign policies, you are motivated not by love of the fatherland but by the living fear of losing personal power.

Your unprincipled dictatorship is a stumbling block in the path of our country.

"The father of peoples", you have betrayed the vanquished Spanish revolutionaries and left them to their fate. You are letting other countries worry about them. The generous desire to save human lives plays no part in your principles. Too bad for the vanquished! You don't need them any more!

You have been indifferent to the fate of Jewish workers, intelligentsia and artisans fleeing fascist barbarism. You close the doors of your country which could easily shelter thousands of immigrants on its broad expanses.

Like all Soviet patriots, I worked, closing my eyes  
(Concluded on page 16)

## BOOKS

"Retreat to Reform" by Ferdinand Lundberg.

THE political attitude of the American literary intelligentsia that centers around New York City has undergone a tremendous change in the past five years. At the depth of the depression, between 1932 and 1935, it was the fashion of this group to look with conscientious contempt upon reform and liberalism, and to enshrine the Russian revolution of 1917 and its children. Lenin was its hero. But a number of events, among them the recent Russian treason trials and "purges" and the alarming spread of fascism by essentially Bolshevistic methods, and even by formal collaboration between Bolshevism and Fascism, have caused a re-thinking of positions among the more responsible literary intellectuals, who are dismayed that Bolshevism in the outcome is not very different from Fascism. Superficial differences apart, the two are identical expressions of thoroughgoing moral and intellectual reaction.

John Chamberlain, one of the percipient editors of *Fortune*, indirectly gives us in his second book\* the general rationalization for the reversal of political attitude along the "literary front," just as his first book, "Farewell to Reform," summed up the 1932 literary mood with reference to the American scene. The exploits of commissars and storm-troopers have caused Mr. Chamberlain, like many others, to look with more toleration upon democratic machine politicians, capitalists, and the parliamentary industrial system called capitalism. Mr. Chamberlain no longer believes that all society may be reconstructed by the abolition of private property, nor by any other single magic stroke. He is ready to admit that the malady of social disequilibrium in the age of machine technology is extremely complex, fraught with perils if roughly approached, and susceptible only to localized treatment.

Mr. Chamberlain is sure, indeed, like many of his thoughtful contemporaries, that the wholesale razing of valid social institutions and groupings by a revolutionary hurricane would only facilitate political upstarts (such as Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini or Lenin) in their shackling of humanity to a totalitarian politico-economic system that promises, at best, to yield economic security—the sort of egalitarian economic security enjoyed in a penitentiary by felons, who are well housed, adequately clothed, decently fed, and in general scientifically supervised. They lack only one thing—freedom. And freedom is the one thing that Mr. Chamberlain sees as indispensable to any good life. The problem, as he sees it, is not merely to bring about significant material improvement in the general condition of man, but improvement in a context of political and moral freedom that gives *lebensraum* to individual and group creative impulses.

The gist of Mr. Chamberlain's message is that freedom is found only in diversity and plurality—cultural, economic, social and political; and that only slavery can eventuate from uniformity, conformity, and orthodoxy of any kind, radical or conservative. The message is not new, it must be conceded, but it is stated by Mr. Chamberlain with such easy grace that it will probably have new force in contemporary reflection among the highly literate audience to which Mr. Chamberlain especially appeals.

\*The American Stakes, by John Chamberlain (Carrick & Evans, Inc., \$2.75, 320 pp.)



Remnants of Marxist doctrine, unfortunately, weaken Mr. Chamberlain's statement of the case for reform. He finds it necessary, for example, to regard the State as a "racket," originating in seizure by a predacious warrior group. The researches of modern anthropology cry out against this lopsided notion, and the current structure and functioning of the State refute it completely. Since the State to Mr. Chamberlain is a "racket," he addresses himself to the task of arguing that it should be made a "limited racket"—limited so that its potentialities for infringing upon creative social freedom may be circumscribed by institutional checks and balances.

It is true that there is a racket aspect to the State, and that this is an important aspect. The State has been used for racketeering purposes, its police power has been abused. But this gives no excuse for *defining* the State as a racket, limited or unlimited, any more than the existence of prostitution provides adequate grounds for defining sex as a racket. The State is a socially created instrument; the instrument may be abused for the private purposes of a class, or may be employed for the welfare of all, or a part, of Society. Mr. Chamberlain neglects to observe that whenever the State is employed as a racket the passive and indispensable collaborators with the racketeers are the politically inactive and unconscious citizens, the virtuous respectables who never do wrong and—never prevent wrongdoing.

It is a sad fact, as J. G. Frazer records, that "the dull, the weak, the ignorant, and the superstitious" constitute "the vast majority of mankind." Our indurated vein of ignorance and stupidity is the fulcrum for the lever of special interest that uses the State as a racket. Education may in time destroy the ignorance, and Mr. Chamberlain is optimistic about the possibilities in a better use of educational methods and resources. But most Americans, despite all the public education of the past 100 years, believe implicitly in the immaculate conception, the resurrection, and the second coming, the life ever-lasting after death, the divine inspiration of the Constitution and the Founding Fathers, the "natural" inferiority of the Negro (and foreigners, excluding a few special pets like Christ, Napoleon, Newton and Beethoven), etc. With such a popular state of mind, which extends even into high places, it is not difficult to understand how aggressive personalities can at times, almost without challenge, prostitute the State.

Mr. Chamberlain, like most who have been under the Marxist spell, sees in the State mainly its police power and its aspect of "sovereignty." The latter notion is not recognized as a groundless concept of idealist political philosophers, and it is not adequately appreciated that the police power of the State, be the State totalitarian or democratic, is greatly overshadowed in modern practice by its social welfare power. Mr. Chamberlain pleads with political theorists to reassure the public that the State belongs to everybody. And, true enough, it does—to everybody with the wit to utilize it. But to argue at the same time that the State is a racket, however limited, seems very much like arguing that everybody, if he is to use his own State, should become a political racketeer. This is the general position to which Mr. Chamberlain is unwittingly driven, and he frankly approves of political pressure groups that will be reconciled to each other by skillful professional politicians acting as brokers. Creative intelligence seems pretty well ruled out of that picture which, sad to say, is just about what we have before us today and was what we had in the period leading up to the Civil War. Mr. Chamberlain fails to consider what

happens when the political brokers run out of tricks, as they must when confronted with sharp either-or problems. And the systematic cultivation by politicians of pressure groups, as at present, must some time eventuate in a sharp either-or situation.

The serious student would be ill-advised to devote much attention to "Capitalism the Creator," by Carl Snyder,\* who is the retired statistician of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. As a technician adept in setting up index numbers he has achieved an international reputation.

With this narrow qualification, and without any apparent hitherto undisclosed resources of learning, Mr. Snyder has taken a canvas fully as broad as any faced by Spengler, Pareto or Marx, and has daubed it thoroughly with all the clichés of economic Rotarianism.

In the first place Mr. Snyder never defines capitalism. At times he discusses it as an ancient system of trade and exchange. Then he treats it as though it is identical with machine technology, and asserts that the latter was fathered by trade and exchange. In saying this he betrays a lack of knowledge about the history of science.

Throughout the volume Mr. Snyder rides various hobbies. He is firmly convinced, for example, that labor has no part whatever in the creation of economic values. "Capital creates itself," he says, but gives us no clew as to what first created capital. In fashioning his unique theory of value, which leaves out entirely such a thing as social process, Mr. Snyder includes in his category of "capital" all management and technical skill, inventors and scientists. All material progress, he believes, has been brought about by unfettered "free enterprise"; Mr. Snyder pays no attention to the little matter of government subsidy and government protection of "free-enterprise"—to land grants, financial aid, tariffs, construction of such things as roads that have indirectly subsidized the automobile industry, to government contracts, etc.

Mr. Snyder's book is very confused and thoroughly crude in its formulations. The writing throughout is clumsy, and at times fails to make grammatical sense. Illogicalities fight with each other from page to page, as when Mr. Snyder in one place denounces all interference with "free enterprise," whatever that may be, and in another advances central control of credit as the sovereign remedy for economic ills.

A laudable plea is made by Mr. Snyder for scientific methods in economics, but his discussion of scientific method leaves it clear that Mr. Snyder knows next to nothing about it, has referred to none of the standard authorities. The comments on his statistical charts are almost uniformly beside the point or naive. The book boils down to a hodgepodge that is badly in need of re-writing by the publisher's editorial staff, for whatever value there may be in its thesis. Any thesis, however unhistorical or illogical in its parts, deserves at least a clear statement.

Although the book is buttressed by a multitude of footnotes, the footnotes refer mostly to magazine articles written by Mr. Snyder or to whole monographs for which no page references are given!

*(The views expressed by the reviewer are not necessarily those of the Review—Ed.)*

---

\*Capitalism the Creator, by Carl Snyder (The Macmillan Company, \$3.75, 473 pp.)



## NOTE ON THE WAR

As this is being written, the first phase of the Second World War is ending. France, militarily defeated, politically disintegrated and demoralized, has accepted the German armistice terms, under which it will become a base for a German blitzkrieg against Britain. This outcome, disillusioning to liberals and believers in bourgeois democracy, can be understood only if analyzed cold-bloodedly and objectively. Bourgeois democracy, especially in the advanced imperialist countries, is already so decadent that it is even incapable of defending itself, of using its resources and economy to perpetuate itself. And if such is the case, how can one expect this same decadent system to defend and extend the liberties, well-being and happiness of the masses of the world?

The above cannot, however, cause us to forget the evil role of Stalin in bringing about this situation. He it was who gave Hitler the signal and more recently also gave Mussolini the signal. Had Hitler been compelled to maintain a force on the Eastern front, even without Russia's entry into the war, he could never have achieved such rapid success. Had Mussolini not received assurances that Russian pressure would keep Turkey and Yugoslavia on the sidelines, he might still be hesitating as to his course of action. If now, swollen with success, Hitler and Mussolini turn against Stalin, it will be poetic justice.

In the meanwhile, Roosevelt, with full speed, is converting his pre-war economy of two years ago into a full war economy, including a war coalition cabinet and class peace. The country is worked into a hysteria by phantastic tales of invasion, and this hysteria is already turning into an anti-labor and anti-civil liberties and democracy movement under the guise of combatting fifth column activities. If we are not yet in the war physically, we are in it morally and psychologically. If this were not a campaign year, we would probably be in the war with a dictatorship firmly in the saddle.

It is very disheartening to note, in this situation, that labor has not learned its lesson, and that some labor leaders are falling over themselves in their efforts to get on the war wagon, and incidentally on some important government board. Indeed, in some labor circles, the hysteria is even greater than among the bourgeoisie. The groups still maintaining a firm anti-war position are woefully weak, divided, and inadequate, making their task all the more difficult. One thing is certain, however; this is no time to prate about being "with the masses". One either resists the current of hysteria, and thus risks isolation, or one jumps into the current and adds to its strength.

Nothing that has happened so far in the Second World War has changed our firm belief that there is

## RASKOLNIKOFF

(Continued from page 14)

to many things. I have kept silent too long. It was difficult for me to break the last links, not with you and your doomed regime but with the rest of the old Lenin party to which I belonged for nearly thirty years and which you destroyed in three years. It was agonizingly painful for me to give up my fatherland.

The longer it continues the more the interests of your personal dictatorship lead to an irreconcilable conflict with the interests of the workers, the peasants, the intelligentsia—with the interests of the development of the entire country over which you rule like a tyrant who greedily seized power.

Your social basis narrows every day. In your frantic search for support, you hypocritically squander compliments among "non-party communists"; you create new privileged groups one after another; you shower them with favors; you feed them with alms; but you cannot guarantee these "caliphs-for-an-hour" their privileges or even their right to live.

Sooner or later the Soviet people will place you on the defendants' block, and will charge you with being a traitor to socialism and the revolution, the chief wrecker, the real enemy, the organizer of famine and perjury.

August 17, 1939.

no way out for labor under capitalism. Even bourgeois economists agree that after the war, whatever the results, regimentation (fascism) is inevitable. The swift Hitlerian victories will only strengthen these opinions among large sections of the capitalist class as showing the superiority of organized versus unorganized capitalism. Democracy having shown itself a hampering luxury in war preparations, will be everywhere discarded. The entire world will become a vast war machine, all modern industry will become the incubator for means of destruction, the human race will become the cannon fodder at the front (and also away from the front) and the servile tender of the war machine. This is the world of tomorrow under capitalism. Only Socialism can prevent its inevitable appearance. The achievement of Socialism may be extremely difficult, but it is not more difficult than the toleration of the sort of world which is rapidly developing.

### A Personal Note.

This is the last issue of the Socialist Review under its present editor. The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party is considering the question of future personnel and policy for the Review, and it is to be hoped that a way will be found of maintaining an organ of Socialist theory in the United States.

I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest thanks to all those who have made the maintenance of the Review possible these last two difficult years. —H. Z.

SOCIALIST REVIEW



## LAST CHANCE

TO OBTAIN

BOUND VOLUMES

of

1. SOCIALIST REVIEW \$2.00
2. AMERICAN SOCIALIST QUARTERLY \$1.00
3. AMERICAN SOCIALIST MONTHLY \$1.00

Order at Once from

**SOCIALIST REVIEW**

303 Fourth Avenue

New York, N. Y.

## NATIONAL SECRETARY REPORT TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

The Secretary report giving the hurdles that the Socialist Party has already been over and the ones to be faced in 1940.

**25¢ Each**

## 1940 PLATFORM AND PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY

An 8-page leaflet containing 1940 Socialist Platform . . . The Socialist Position on War. Biographical sketches of our candidates.

25 for 15c	50 for 25c
100 for 45c	1000 for \$4.00

Order From

**SOCIALIST PARTY NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS**

549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

L. W. Johnson

Literature Agent

Or

**SOCIALIST CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE**

268 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

SUBSCRIBE TO

# THE SOCIALIST CALL

Official Organ of the Socialist Party

*"America's Outstanding Anti-War Fighter"*

ANNOUNCING . . .

A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON

**"What Socialism Means to Me"**

In the Weekly Publication of the  
Socialist Party, U.S.A.

**A Newspaper for the Masses**

549 WEST RANDOLPH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscriptions: \$1 a year; 50c for six months;

free copy on request.

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

— USE THIS BLANK —

SOCIALIST CALL

549 Randolph St.  
Chicago, Ill.

I wish to subscribe to the SOCIALIST CALL for one year  
at the special rate of \$1.00.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY.....



# OFF TO A FLYING START

The 1940 Socialist Campaign is off to a flying start.

State by state, we're overcoming the obstacles of difficult and undemocratic election laws.

Some of the basic literature of the campaign is beginning to roll from the presses.

Campaign buttons are out, our publicity staff is hard at work, organizers are in the field, radio time is being arranged for, our candidates' speaking tours from coast to coast are shaping up.

Our Independent Committees are growing. Thomas and Krueger Clubs are springing up in all parts of the country. New people are joining the party; old friends coming back into harness.

And what is making all this possible is that our financial machinery is beginning to click. The \$100,000 campaign fund is a long way from being realized, but we are beginning to go places. A few states are well on their way to fulfilling their convention pledges.

But let's not get any false sense of security. We need more fuel. We need campaign donations big and small. Keep the checks, the bills, the silver flowing in. We have a long pull ahead of us. We need help NOW—even more than later when many of those now sitting on sidelines are going to begin to get excited about this campaign and join in.

Let us hear from you today. Every dollar and dime helps the campaign, The Call, the party and Socialism. Get generous early!

TRAVERS CLEMENT, Director,  
Socialist Campaign Committee,  
268 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

I want to see a 1940 Socialist Campaign that IS a campaign. Enclosed is  
\$.....to help out.

Name .....

Address .....