

An Interview with Leon Trotsky

(We are glad to print the following interview given in Principio by Leon Trotsky to comrade B. J. Field in connection with an article published several months ago by a bourgeois apologist for the Stalinist regime. As the interview deals with questions of more than passing interest, it retains all its value as an exposition of the Bolshevik-Leninist standpoint on questions in dispute in the Communist movement.—Ed.)

LENIN AND SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY

In the question of the united front as well as in all the broad questions of revolutionary strategy and tactics, the Left Opposition regards itself as continuing the authentic Bolshevik line, as against the efforts of the Stalinist faction to revise it in an empirical and bureaucratic manner.

This sense of the continuity of the revolutionary tradition runs clearly through the answers which Trotsky gave to the writer's questions on the issues of principle which Mr. Fischer, following the Stalinists, takes for granted as having been decided against Trotsky's views.

Here are his answers:

Question: "Lenin and all his followers were convinced at that time (in 1917) that only a revolution abroad could save them from certain doom... They did not hope to survive unless revolutions in Europe and Asia weakened external hostility and gave Red Russia a breathing space for domestic entrenchment," says Mr. Fischer. Was Lenin speaking only in an immediate military and political sense of saving Russia from defeat and subjugation, or did he have in mind the whole perspective of Russia's developing on its own soil through the dictatorship of the proletariat to the ultimate Communist goal?"

Trotsky: "That affirmation of Mr. Fischer's, like a series of others, proves his lack of familiarity with the theory and the history of Bolshevism. In 1917 there was not a single Bolshevik who considered possible the realization of a socialist society in a single country, and least of all in Russia. In the appendix to my 'History of the Russian Revolution' I give a detailed and documented study of the ideas of the Bolshevik party on the October revolution. This study, I hope, will make it impossible in the future to ascribe to Lenin the theory of Socialism in a single country. Here I will limit myself to a single quotation, which in my opinion has a decisive character, Lenin died in January, 1924; three months later Stalin expounded in writing Lenin's conception of the proletarian revolution. I quote word for word: '...to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and to establish the power of the proletariat in one country, still does not signify the full victory of Socialism. The main task of Socialism—the organization of Socialist production—remains still in the future. It is possible to fulfill this task, it is possible to achieve the definite victory of Socialism in one country without the combined efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries. No, it is impossible. For the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the efforts of one country are sufficient—for this we have the testimony of the history of our revolution. For the definite victory of Socialism, for the organization of Socialist production, the efforts of one country, especially of a peasant country like Russia, are insufficient—for that are required the efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries...' Stalin closes the exposition of these ideas with the characteristic features of Lenin's conception of the proletarian revolution (Problems of Leninism, emphasis mine).

"Only in the Fall of 1924 did Stalin discover that it is especially Russia, as distinguished from other countries, which can by its own forces build up a socialist society. '...After having established its power and assumed the leadership of the peasantry,' he wrote in a new edition of the same work, 'the victorious proletariat can and must build up socialist society.' Can and must! The proclamation of this new conception is closed by the same words, 'Such are in general the characteristic features of Lenin's conception of the proletarian revolution' (Problems of Leninism, emphasis mine).

"Only in the Fall of 1924 did Stalin discover that it is especially Russia, as distinguished from other countries, which can by its own forces build up a socialist society. '...After having established its power and assumed the leadership of the peasantry,' he wrote in a new edition of the same work, 'the victorious proletariat can and must build up socialist society.' Can and must! The proclamation of this new conception is closed by the same words, 'Such are in general the characteristic features of Lenin's conception of the proletarian revolution' (Problems of Leninism, emphasis mine).

"Only in the Fall of 1924 did Stalin discover that it is especially Russia, as distinguished from other countries, which can by its own forces build up a socialist society. '...After having established its power and assumed the leadership of the peasantry,' he wrote in a new edition of the same work, 'the victorious proletariat can and must build up socialist society.' Can and must! The proclamation of this new conception is closed by the same words, 'Such are in general the characteristic features of Lenin's conception of the proletarian revolution' (Problems of Leninism, emphasis mine).

Question: "Is there reason to believe that the world revolution, or a series of social upheavals on the Eurasian continent, ceased to be an immediate possibility by 1921?"

Answer: "What shall we call an 'immediate possibility'? In 1923 the situation in Germany was profoundly revolutionary, but what was lacking for a victorious revolution was a correct strategy. At that time, I wrote a study about this question, 'The Lessons of October,' which served as a pretext for my elimination from the government. In 1925-27 the revolution in China was destroyed by the false revolutionary strategy of the Stalinist faction. To this last question I consecrate my book, 'Problems of the Chinese Revolution' (issued by the Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1932). It is quite clear that the German and Chinese revolutions in case of victory would have changed the face of

Answer Given to Views Of Louis Fischer

Europe and Asia, and perhaps of the whole world. Once again, he who ignores the problems of revolutionary strategy would do better not to talk about revolutions at all."

Question: "Is it true that 'a revolution germinates only in national soil, that it does not result from imported money or pamphlets or agitators, and that the capitalists will do more than the Communists to undermine capitalism?' Is it true that by its very existence a truly Soviet, near-Socialist system... must further the cause of revolution in other countries; and that 'a strong Socialist Soviet Union is the most effective stimulus to world revolution'?"

Answer: "The statements quoted in this question contradict each other. That the existence of the Soviet Union has an international revolutionary significance is a commonplace equally recognized by friends and foes. In spite of the existence of the Soviet Union, however, the proletarian revolution during the past years has not recorded a victory in any other country. In Russia itself the proletariat conquered in spite of the fact that there was no Soviet State in existence at the time elsewhere. For the victory are necessary, not only certain objective conditions, internal as well as external, but also certain subjective factors—the Party, the leadership, the strategy, our differences with Stalin are entirely of a strategic character. Suffice it to say that if we had carried through, in 1917, the policy of Stalin, the Soviet State would not be in existence today. It is therefore not true that the mere existence of the Soviet Union is capable of assuring the victory of the revolution in other countries. But it is also false that the revolution ripens and comes to development only in the national soil. Otherwise what purpose is served by the Communist International?"

Question: "Granting that a capitalist economy, the more highly it is developed, becomes the more dependent on other countries, is it less true of the Soviet Union, because it is developing toward a Socialist economy?"

Answer: "National self-sufficiency or 'autarchy' is the ideal of Hitler, not of Marx and Lenin. Socialist economy cannot reject the huge advantages of the world division of labor: on the contrary, it will carry it to the highest development. But in practice, it is not a question of the future socialist society, with an established internal equilibrium, but of the extent technically and culturally backward country which in the interests of industrialization and collectivization is forced to export as much as possible in order to import as much as possible."

Question: "Is it true that the theory of the permanent revolution, which is the platform on which you have fought Stalin since 1924, was born in a time of Bolshevik mental depression caused by a series of failures both at home and abroad, or does this theory represent a consistent line found in all your political writings and actions after 1905—Mr. Fischer makes both statements?"

Answer: "The theory of the permanent revolution, in contradiction to the theory of socialism in one country, was recognized by the entire Bolshevik party during the period from 1917 to 1923. Only the defeat of the proletariat in Germany in 1923 gave the decisive push to the creation of Stalin's theory of national socialism: the downward curve of the revolution gave rise to Stalinism, not to the theory of the permanent revolution, which was first formulated by me in 1905. This theory is not bound to a definite calendar of revolutionary events; it only reveals the world-wide interdependence of the revolutionary process."

Question: "The statement is made that 'Trotsky would not have neglected Soviet home industry any more than Stalin would ignore the usefulness of the Third International.' Do you agree with the conclusion that 'there are no whites and blacks in this picture. It is a matter of proportion and shade'?"

Answer: "Such an affirmation is possible only because of lack of familiarity with the history of the struggle between the Stalinist faction and the Left Opposition. The initiative of the Five Year Plan and of the accelerated collectivization belongs entirely to the Left Opposition, in uninterrupted and sharp struggles with the Stalinists. Not having the possibility of occupying myself here with long his-

Reforestation Swindle

(Continued from Page 1)

able minimum and paid in credit tickets. There are today hundreds of large families close to starvation on this budget. The reforestation camps are being recruited from among those now receiving relief.

Homeless Still Homeless

What becomes, then, of the homeless and the wandering? There was a great agitation before the elections about them. The Scripps-Howard syndicate, for example, estimated that 500,000 of them roam the country. The January census of the Committee on Care of the Transient and Homeless showed 1,225,000 homeless and transient people in the United States, of whom 200,000 are youths, boys and girls, unable to go to school, unable to get a job, a burden to their poverty-stricken family, join the ranks of migrant youth in a futile search for work in other cities. A restless tide is moving across the United States, hitch-hiking, walking, riding the freights, begging, stealing, living as they can. They are treated as traditional hoboes—a night in jail, a meal of beans and coffee and twenty-four hours to get out of town. They are eluded by railway detectives and hounded with petty criminals in jail. The good citizens demand government action to relieve the municipalities. Something had to be done for the American "beg prizoni". So, the Democrats fervidly promised, if elected, to take care of them also. At the same time, liberal and progressive groups clamor for the reforestation of land denuded by the lumber and paper interests in the heyday or rugged individualism. An ideal chance to kill two birds with one stone, and do it cheap! Conservation and Unemployment Relief. However, they are in this dilemma: Either they use conservation funds for municipal relief, in which case they do not reach the wanderer; or, if they recruit the latter, then conservation funds cannot be allocated to city relief. America's homeless youth is lost in the shuffle of the "New Deal!"

What about the dignity and honor of honest toil, ask the army men? The men get \$5.00 a month for doing the work of regular foresters. It is exploitation in the crudest sense. It is humiliating to the person and degrading to the class. Out West they call this racket "gyp labor." And it is well named. Investigators of the Public Welfare use economic pressure on families to get their "quota" of boys into camp. One realizes the bitter irony of this situation: Workers "volunteer" for their six months' enlistment.

With the brazen self-interest of the business men they have converted a twenty million dollar reforestation fund into a new scheme for pauperizing workers and creating the basis for national conscript labor. "Citizens Conservation Corps" means human cannon fodder trained with funds intended for unemployment relief. The Democratic party in power, like its Republican predecessor, to rise out

of the crisis by still further exploiting and degrading the working class. Against this the American worker can and will organize a struggle.

1. Full time wages for forestry workers!
2. No victimization of those who refuse conservation enlistment!
3. Abolish the relief "deduction" system!
4. Organize within the camps for better conditions!
5. Payment of City Relief in cash!
6. Unemployment Insurance.

—CARL COWI.

of the crisis by still further exploiting and degrading the working class. Against this the American worker can and will organize a struggle.

1. Full time wages for forestry workers!
2. No victimization of those who refuse conservation enlistment!
3. Abolish the relief "deduction" system!
4. Organize within the camps for better conditions!
5. Payment of City Relief in cash!
6. Unemployment Insurance.

—CARL COWI.

of the crisis by still further exploiting and degrading the working class. Against this the American worker can and will organize a struggle.

1. Full time wages for forestry workers!
2. No victimization of those who refuse conservation enlistment!
3. Abolish the relief "deduction" system!
4. Organize within the camps for better conditions!
5. Payment of City Relief in cash!
6. Unemployment Insurance.

—CARL COWI.

of the crisis by still further exploiting and degrading the working class. Against this the American worker can and will organize a struggle.

1. Full time wages for forestry workers!
2. No victimization of those who refuse conservation enlistment!
3. Abolish the relief "deduction" system!
4. Organize within the camps for better conditions!
5. Payment of City Relief in cash!
6. Unemployment Insurance.

—CARL COWI.

The Chicago May Day Conference

(Continued from Page 1)

Chicago.—The Communist party in Chicago concluded another vest-pocket united front for May Day. The united front from below, then the middle and every once in a while from behind, has driven the party with its back to the wall.

John Williamson made the keynote address. He pointed out that the call was sent to the Socialist party and A. F. of L. organizations calling upon them to unite for one May Day demonstration. In his speech he at last realized that Germany is the most important country in the international situation. After speaking for some time on the party's call for a united front with all organizations, he started to call the S. P. and A. F. of L. social-Fascists, etc. Such ignorance! According to your (Williamson's) own definition of social-Fascism, it is the greatest danger. Now, if that is no, why do you call for a united front with them—with their organizations?

The Y. P. S. L. sent a letter stating that it was willing to cooperate, but that it could not send any delegates until the County Committee of the S. P. approved of their action. The Socialist party stalled for time by telephoning and delaying meeting after meeting, called to establish joint proposal for action.

Yes, we know that the S. P. leaders are afraid of a united front for they have much to lose. We must force them into action! Out with it! Admit that the tactics of united front from below were wrong and that you have made a turn (the E. C. I. Manifesto). Otherwise the S. P. workers are confused as to whether you want to unite without their organizations or a genuine united front. Amid such confusion their leaders can continue to mislead them, as one delegate said, 'On Monday you call the socialist workers social-Fascists, and on Tuesday you expect them to unite with you.'

Delegates of the Communist League of America (Opposition) and Communist Party (Opposition) were nominated for the committee of Action. Gebert tried in the same old way to suggest that only mass organizations be represented.

—IRVING BERN.

torical researches, I will limit myself to a single illustration. The Dnieprostroy is considered with right as the highest achievement of Soviet industrialization. Yet Stalin and his followers, (Voroshilov, Molotov, and others) a few months before the beginning of the work were decided opponents of the Dnieprostroy plan. I quote from the stenographic report the words spoken by Stalin in April, 1927, in the Plenum of the Central Committee of the party, against myself as chairman of the Dnieprostroy commission. There is talk... of our constructing Dnieprostroy through our own means. The means needed are great, several hundred millions. Let us not get into the position of the peasant who, after accumulating a nest-egg, instead of repairing his plough and renewing his equipment, buys a gramophone and goes bankrupt.' (Laughter) 'Can we ignore the decisions of the Party Congress that our industrial plans must be adapted to our resources? Yet comrade Trotsky openly ignores that decision of the Congress.' (Stenographic notes of the Plenum, page 110.)

"Simultaneously the Left Opposition in the course of several years carried on a struggle against the Stalinists in favor of collectivization. Only when the kulak refused to deliver grain to the State did Stalin, under the pressure of the Left Opposition, accomplish a sharp turn. Being the empiricist that he is, he moved to the opposite extreme, and set as a task for two or three years the collectivization of all the peasantry, the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, and the compression of the Five Year Plan into four years. The Left Opposition declared that the new tempo of industrialization were above our forces, and that the liquidation of the kulaks as a class in the course of three years was a fantastic task. If one wishes to say so, we find ourselves this time 'less radical' than the Stalinists. Revolutionary realism tries to draw the maximum advantage from every situation—that is what makes it revolutionary—but at the same time it does not permit us to set ourselves fantastic aims—that is what makes it realistic."

Question: "If we accept the views that the policy of Stalin has a purely empirical character, is determined by the circumstances of the moment and is incapable of seeing far ahead, how can we explain the victory of Stalin's faction over the Left Opposition?"

Answer: "Above, I emphasized the significance of revolutionary strategy. Here I must come back to the decisive importance of objective conditions. Without a correct strategy the victory is impossible. But even the most correct strategy cannot give the correct under unfavorable objective conditions. The revolution has its own laws: in the period of its culmination it pushes the most highly developed, determined and far-seeing stratum of the revolutionary class to the most advanced positions. Yet the proletariat has not only a vanguard, but also a rearguard, and besides the proletariat there are the peasantry and the bureaucracy. No one revolution up to now has brought all that was expected of it by the masses. Hence the inevitability of a certain disillusionment, of a lowering of the activity of the vanguard, and consequently, of the growing importance of the rearguard. Stalin's faction has raised itself on the wave of reaction against the October revolution. Look back at history—those who guided the revolution in the time of its culmination never kept their leading positions long after the turning point. In France, the leader of Jacobinism perished on the guillotine; with us, the change of leadership was achieved by means of arrest and banishment. The technique of the process is gentler, but its essence is the same."

Question: "How do you reconcile your criticism of the Soviet Union in the capitalist press with your revolutionary sympathies? Is it true that you are 'turning the thinking youth away from Russia,' offering enemies of the Soviet regime the best possible arguments and material, and giving 'ex-radicals and near-Communists an excuse for maligning Moscow and abstaining from participation in revolutionary action'?"

Answer: "The Soviet State does not need either illusions or camouflage. It can claim only that world authority which is confirmed by the facts. The clearer and deeper the public opinion of the world in the first instance the opinion of the working masses, will understand the contradictions and the difficulties of the socialist development of an isolated country, the higher will it appreciate the results achieved. The less it identifies the fundamental methods of Socialism with the zigzags and errors of the Soviet bureaucracy, the less will be the danger that, by the inevitable revelation of these errors and of their consequences, the authority, not only of the present ruling group, but of the workers' State itself, may decline. The Soviet Union needs thinking and critical friends, such as are capable not only of singing hymns in the hours of successes, but of not shrinking in the hour of defeat and danger. Journalists of the type of Fischer accomplish the Soviet Union by defending the Soviet Union from calumnies, malicious inventions and prejudices. But these gentlemen overstep the limits of their mission when they attempt to give us lessons of devotion to the Soviet State. If we fear to speak of dangers, we shall never conquer them. If we close our eyes to the dark sides of the workers' State which we have helped to create, we shall never reach socialism."

Austria is Next in Order

(Continued from Page 1)

most ill-fated, degrading and ruinous for the proletariat is to bank upon the co-operation of the imperialist governments of the countries surrounding Austria.

Even if we were to allow that because of the traditional flabbiness of all Austrian parties as well as because of the influence of external and temporary causes (the pressure of France and of the Hitlerites; the apprehension of the Hitlerites to push matters to the end, just now—allowing, in the culmination even in this case would turn out to be postponed by means of some kind of a moth-eaten Austrian Bonapartist compromise—and a postponement of this kind could have an extremely unreliable and a very temporary character. The process thus checked would burst out in the course of the next few months or even weeks with a redoubled force and at a tenfold tempo. To build its policies upon checks, masquerades, the plastering up of cracks, and petty political moratoriums would mean for the proletariat to extend more time for the still weak Austrian Fascism in which to achieve its murderous mission.

THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

Otto Bauer confines himself to rapid moralizations on the subject of the "superiorities" of bourgeois democracy over Fascist dictatorship. As if the struggle is taking place between two schools of state laws! Engels aptly remarked, that every state is reducible to armed detachments of men with the material appendages in the nature of jails, etc. At present this "essence" of the state has been completely revealed in Austria. The political struggle which has developed in the course of a number of years upon the bases of democracy has been pushed flush up against the clashes between armed detachments. It is necessary to call this fact by its name, clearly and precisely, and to draw from it all the necessary practical conclusions.

Instead of this, the Austrian social democracy demands an admission on our part that the struggle is being carried on "for democracy." As if the question lies in this at present! It goes without saying that we are not ready to make any concessions whatsoever to the Austro-Marxists as regards the theoretical and historical

Bonapartism and Fascism In the Austrian Crisis

appraisal of democracy. And in fact, if democracy was indeed raised above the social regime that engendered it; if it was indeed capable of reconstructing bourgeois society into socialist society, then it should have revealed all its qualities first of all in Austria, where the constitution was created by the social democracy, where the proletariat comprises the decisive force in the nation, and the social democracy represents the decisive force in the proletariat. And concurrently, what Austria is living through demonstrates in action that democracy is flesh of the flesh of capitalism, and decomposes with it. The Austrian crisis is the expression of the decay of democracy. The gentlemen of democracy need expect no other appraisal on our part.

However, we understand only too well, on the other hand, that theoretical diagnosis alone is altogether insufficient for the purpose of supplanting democracy with the Soviet regime. The matter touches the living consciousness of a class. If in the course of a joint struggle against Fascists the majority of the proletariat understands the need for Soviet dictatorship, there will be no stopping the Communists. But if, despite all the lessons it received, the majority of the workers, even after the smashing of the forces of counter-revolution, decides to repeat once more the experiment of formal democracy, then the Communists will be compelled to take to the same ground, in the guise of an opposition.

Today, at any rate, the overwhelming majority of Austrian workers follows the social democrats. This means that they cannot even be talk of revolutionary dictatorship as an actual task. What is on the agenda today is not the antithesis of bourgeois and Soviet democracy but the antithesis of bourgeois democracy and Fascism. We accuse the Austro-Marxists not of fighting for democracy but of not fighting for it.

Capitalism resorts to Fascism not out of caprice but because it is driven into an impasse. If social democracy is capable only of criticizing, grumbling, curbing, threatening, and biding time but is incapable of taking into its hands

the fate of society, when the matter touches the life and death of the nation and of its culture, then this party, which represents one-half of the nation becomes itself the instrument of social decomposition and compels the exploiting classes to seek salvation from Fascism.

Applying the ancient juxtaposition of *Ermattungsstrategie* and *Niederwerfungsstrategie*, the strategy of exhaustion, and the strategy of assault, one is compelled to say that the strategy of exhaustion, which was applicable after a fashion in certain situations, is impossible of application today when there remains nothing for capitalism except strategy of assault, its reformist strategy is exhausting at present not the class enemy but its own camp. The policies of Otto Bauer and Co. lead fatally to the victory of the Fascists, imposing least sacrifices and difficulties upon them, and the greatest sacrifices and misfortunes upon the proletariat.

THE AUSTRO-MARXISTS ARE CHLOROFORMING THE PROLETARIAT

Despite the experience of Italy and Germany, the leaders of Austrian social-democracy do not understand the situation. In order to live and breathe, these people must fool themselves. This they cannot do otherwise than by fooling the proletariat.

Bauer places the blame for the defeat in Germany upon the Communists. We are not the ones to defend German Stalinists! But their chief crime consists in their having given the social democrats the possibility of preserving their influence upon the basic part of the German proletariat and of loading upon it the tactic of delaying and fatal capitulation, despite all the crimes and betrayals committed by the social democracy. In essence Bauer's policies are no different from the policies of Wels-Stampfer. But there is a distinction: Bauer will be unable to shift the responsibility upon the Austrian Stalinists who have managed to doom themselves to complete impotence. The Austrian social democracy is not only the leading party of the proletariat but it is the strongest, as regards the population, social democratic party in the world. The political responsibility lies upon the Austrian social democracy, solely and entirely. All the more fatal will prove to be the consequences of its present policies.

The Austro-Marxists say—If we are deprived of liberty, then we shall fight to "the end." By such subterfuges they want to "gain" time for their vacillations, when in reality they are losing the most precious time for the preparation of defense. After the enemy deprives them of liberty, it will be a hundred times more difficult to fight, for the liquidation of rights will be accompanied by military and police destruction of the proletarian press and the proletarian apparatus. The enemy prepares and acts while the social democracy bides its time and whines. The Vorwärts also repeated times innumerable: "Woe to Fascism, if it ventures against us!" The events have demonstrated the value of such rhetoric. The party which proved incapable of giving battle when it held in its hands almost impregnable positions and powerful resources will crumble into dust when it is completely expelled from the legal arena.

(To Be Continued)

The Scottsboro Case

(Continued from Page 1)

that a different verdict would have been obtained had not the Communist Party entered the case—

"It feels that the only remaining hope for the boys is to remove from the already overwhelming prejudices which militate against them the additional burden of Communism." "It called for the organization of a 'new defense committee.'"

The capitalist press and the N. A. A. C. P. and all the other agencies of capitalism are working overtime to counteract the spontaneous mass protest that is arising against this monstrous verdict. They are hammering on all keys the theme of justice. That is their function in capitalist society.

But it is no part of the I. L. D.'s role or policy to conduct a course which lends support to such illusions. Yet this is what it has done. We want our criticism to be clearly understood. The fight of the I. L. D. from the first day of its courageous entry into this case has been an inspiring struggle against some of the most reactionary practices of a predatory capitalist South. It has held aloft the banner of mass struggle on behalf of nine innocent Negro class brothers in the face of a reign of terror. It lit the spark which kindled a blaze of protest on four continents. It took a long step forward on the road to the unity of the white and black workers by showing the black workers that white workers were leading the struggle in which they were vitally involved.

But some time last summer the I. L. D. allowed the mass movement to lag. Following the decision of the United States Supreme Court it did nothing to organize the workers into a gigantic protest movement behind its legal defense. It did not call the united front conferences to set the workers in motion.

Instead it made the mistake of riding the wave of protest. And it retained as its chief defense lawyer, a notorious gangster lawyer, a Democrat, a patriot. Moreover, it allowed him to attack the Communist party in the capitalist press without reply. It allowed him to repeat his attacks on the mass movement which had saved the boys from the electric chair with out making any public reply.

Worse than this, it allowed Liebowitz to dictate the line of the defense. It permitted him to confine the defense to legal lines essentially. It permitted him to order a National Students' League delegation out of town. It permitted him to say in the capitalist press that he would not tolerate any demonstrations by radical and Communist organizations.

The capitalists took pains to give the impression of a fair trial. It chose an "objective" jurist to try the case. Horton was careful to avoid any appearance of hostility to the defense. He unquestionably favored the prosecution in his denials of motions for mistrials motivated on the outrageous speeches of the prosecution. But he made

it possible for the entire capitalist press to land him to the skies. And Liebowitz—at the conclusion of the trial—Liebowitz, according to the New York Times: "I walked to the bench and grasped Judge Horton's hand. The judge shook it warmly. Mr. Liebowitz, who had undertaken the defense of the penniless Negro without a fee, was trembling. He said: 'I am taking back to New York with me a picture of one of the finest jurists I have ever met.'" Mr. Liebowitz, the I. L. D. chief defense lawyer has done his bit to nurture the illusions of the masses in the class institutions of capitalism.

The I. L. D. has not yet uttered a word of criticism of this gross perversion of its principles. On the contrary it is playing up its white elephant. It permits Liebowitz to be hailed as a hero.

But if the I. L. D. is silent about its hero it went out of its way to attack the Left Opposition. On April 7, Patterson, National Secretary of the I. L. D., fired a broadside against the Militant in the Daily Worker. The Militant of March 25 warned the party and the I. L. D. that it was making a mistake in allowing Liebowitz to dictate the line in the Scottsboro Case. It said: "He (Liebowitz) is getting a free hand to attack the defense from a platform given him by the I. L. D. He attacks the mass struggle which has saved the Scottsboro boys four times—When one considers these facts in relation to the equally regrettable fact that the mass movement has died down in recent weeks almost to the vanishing point, it begins to look as though the I. L. D. were teetering on the brink of a rotten and dangerous piece of opportunism."

The verdict, the events leading up to it, and particularly the role of Liebowitz and the criminal silence of the I. L. D. about him confirm the analysis of the Militant up to the hilt. Patterson rushes to Liebowitz's defense. "The Militant"—hurts a bouquet of slander and invective at the I. L. D. because of its utilization of the services of S. Liebowitz, prominent attorney in the Scottsboro Case." So! And: "Mr. Liebowitz is carrying out the line of the I. L. D. in the court room in this particular case." Mr. Liebowitz closed his appeal to the jury by intoning the Lord's Prayer! "He was not asked to nor could he be engaged in the political defense of the accused, but his legal defense is political!" There is more of the same. And now, Patterson, and, with him, the whole I. L. D., is silent.

But if Patterson is silent one of his masters has a word to say. In the Daily Worker of April 12, there appears a note from Foster to Stachel. Foster says: "That statement of Liebowitz was tragic, endorsing the chief lyncher, Horton and condemning the southern masses indiscriminately as morons, lantern-jawed, etc., etc. These statements will be used against us in the gigantic struggle ahead, both in the courts and among the masses. Surely our party statements

will disassociate us from that trash and put all these matters in their true light." Against whom is this directed? Surely not against us. We warned against it in time.

Whether the party and the I. L. D. will disassociate themselves from this trash remains to be seen. We hope they will. And the sooner the better. Much time has been lost and much damage done. The first step to repair it is to repudiate Liebowitz's statements and tell him to confine himself to the purely legal aspects of the case.

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO THE MILITANT

central and most immediate task is to organize the protest movement of the workers. If that is not done the protest movement will find other leaders and be directed into reformist channels. There are signs of this already. Upon receiving news of the verdict the Amsterdam News, a petty bourgeois Negro newspaper in Harlem, began a petition campaign against the death sentence. Plans are already under way to organize a march from all parts of the country on Washington to protest the verdict.

The party says that the struggle must rise to a higher stage. But it has not given the signal to organize it. This it must do without delay. The masses are burning with a sense of outrage. They are eager to fight. They seek leadership. Only the Communist party can give correct leadership and direction to the struggle and save the movement from being diverted into channels harmless to the capitalists. "That is its duty in the situation.

Call the united front conferences! Organize the protest movement of the workers! Let their indignation mount to the skies! United, they can smash the Scottsboro frame-up! The Scottsboro boys shall not die!

—T. STAMM.