

The Hunt for Trotskyist Contraband HISTORY BOOKS FOR SALE! The New Revision Under Way in U. S. S. R

By JOHN G. WRIGHT From the Kremlin down, the Stalinists in the Soviet Union are having the jitters from a recent epoch-making and horrible discovery made by none other than Stalin.

While Stalin and his suite were marching from one "irrevocable" triumph to the next, an unbelievable situation continued to develop in the rear: "On the Historical Front." While Stalin was busy making history in the very front lines, his flunkies in the rear were manufacturing it according to the day-to-day prescription.

Naturally, the Commission faces a colossal problem. In its work it runs up against tremendous difficulties. In the words of Pravda itself: "Strange as it may seem, this work has run up against difficulties in the sphere of the History of the U.S.S.R. It is well worth dwelling upon these difficulties because they concern not a small group of authors but the condition of our Historical Science."

"Liquidating" Pokrovsky On the 19th year of the October Revolution, on the very threshold of Communism, after all classes had been irrevocably eliminated, "our historical science" is in such an awful and ominous condition that Stalin must intervene and appoint no less than twelve specialists (including Radek and Bukharin) to relieve the situation.

The first inkling of the crisis "on the historical front" came to the uninitiated in the form of a worldwide attack launched by Stalin's pen-prostitutes (with Radek at the head) against the historian M. N. Pokrovsky.

This late and unlamented scholar was one of the recognized figureheads of the official school of Stalinist historians. In the textbooks he was invariably referred to as the "Great Historian", which translated into English means that his particular version of history was assumed by the bureaucracy to be entirely in its own interests.

"The harmful traditions of the school of M. N. Pokrovsky have not been liquidated in the sphere of the History of the U.S.S.R." (Jan. 27) In other words, we have here an official decree to "liquidate" immediately Pokrovsky (already a successful corpse)... and "his school".

The decree issued by the C.E.C. of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Peoples' Commissars makes no reference to Pokrovsky or any "school" but bluntly states the following: "A Commission composed of comrades Zhdanov (Chairman), Radek, Svanidze, Gorin, Lukin, Yakovlev, By trianski, Zatonaki, Painsulla Khodjalev, Bauman, Babinov and Bukharin is appointed to examine and improve and wherever necessary revise the already written textbooks on history."

"The Commission is empowered to organize groups to examine specific textbooks, and also to announce prize competitions to replace those textbooks which it will find necessary to revise fundamentally. First and foremost are to be examined the textbooks on the elementary course in the History of the U.S.S.R. and Modern History." (Our emphasis).

(Signed) J. Stalin V. Molotov We reprint this decree in full because it best characterizes the real appraisal of the condition of the Stalinist Science of History. Stalin (in the name of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union!) has repudiated lock, stock and barrel his own "science." To our knowledge, this is the first public admission of failure on such a wholesale scale by the Infalible and Beloved Scientist.

But the causes for this remarkable admission, for this sudden revaluation of historical values are very plain and rather simple. Indeed, they can be summed up in a single word: Trotskyism!

Yes, "Trotskyism", so often liquidated, exterminated and buried by Stalin and his henchmen is now a mass movement in the Soviet Union. During the recent "technical check-up", thousands of Trotskyists were "expelled" from the party. No sooner was this cleansing concluded than it was immediately necessary to institute another purge (this time, a mere exchange of "new party cards for the old and tattered ones"). A persistent drive on a vast scale is now going on to prepare and execute this new purge.

We shall content ourselves here by quoting an eloquent paragraph from an article by V. Shubrikov, secretary of the Qubibev District: "We must not forget revolutionary vigilance for a single moment. We have no right whatever to think all the alien and hostile class elements have already been exposed and driven out of the party. We have no right to allow our class vigilance to flag for a single moment. We have learned a great deal during the check-up of party credentials. But we must not forget that the class enemy, too, has learned something. For, we exposed not a few double-dealers, Zinovievist, Trotskyists, and all sorts of other anti-Soviet elements whose party papers were in perfect order. As is well known, a section of the Trotskyist, Zinovievist had a close conspirative organization, carrying on their undermining activities under the mask of 'honest' and 'devoted party members'." (Pravda, Feb. 3, 1936. Our emphasis).

These words hardly require any comment. Every syllable sounds the alarm. The entire Soviet press is now urging full blast all its local G.P.U. agents to be on guard not to relax their vigilance for an instant, and not fail "this time" to do a thorough and final job of "unmasking and expelling" the Trotskyists.

Contraband in Official Textbooks The bureaucracy is in a frenzy over the "great deal" that it has learned during the last check-up, and the "great deal" it obviously expects to learn from its present purge (February 1 to May 1)—evidently a great deal more than it had ever "learned." In their fury, the Stalinist usurpers are seeking to plug any possible channel through which revolutionary ideas might seep into the consciousness of the student youth and the new generations of workers.

Today, the Stalinists think that they have uncovered one of the important leaks through which "Trotskyism" finds its way to the masses. No more, no less. The fallifiers of history are certain that their own textbooks are not false enough. The trouble, you see, lies with the way history is being taught in the schools!

"Our historical science" is in a terrible condition, says Pravda. Why? Listen:

"... In the sphere of Russian history, there has not yet (!) been accomplished the work of scrapping non-Bolshevik traditions which... comrade Stalin (posed) in his work 'Some Questions Relating to the History of Bolshevism', which, as is well known, posed in its full scope before our historians the question of liquidating semi-Menshevik, semi-Contraband ideas, and Trotskyist contraband in our historical literature."

Radek Whines A task set by Stalin in January, 1932 remains "unfulfilled" by January, 1936. What was Stalin doing all this time? He was very busy. Small wonder, that Radek was instructed to write a tremendous article in the self-same issue of Pravda (Jan. 27). Our Mademoiselle Fifi in Journalism, too, whines: "Our historians have not yet assimilated the great historical legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin; this is very clearly proved by the very fact of the supremacy of the school of Pokrovsky in the sphere of Russian history, by the fact of the insurmountable influence of Luxemburgism and Trotskyism, in the treatment of modern history as a whole, at a time when the 'torment' course of history has placed the historians face to face with a whole series of questions of paramount importance." (Our emphasis).

Their own falsified history looms a source of danger in the storms they see ahead. The "enemy" lurks in most unexpected places. Even the Captain himself is no great comfort against the tempter. He adds his own thunderbolts to the already overcast skies, and only provide: the enemy with ammunition.

A "Faction of Communism" He is thundering today as he did in August 8, 1934 against the fact that the textbooks do not properly treat: "the struggle of tendencies in the ruling Communist Party in the U.S.S.R., and the struggle against Trotskyism as a manifestation of petty bourgeois counter-revolution." (Decree signed by Stalin, Zhdanov, and Kirov, August 8, 1934). But in January, 1932 he also thundered against the wrong line of his historians: "There are some Bolsheviks who are of the opinion that Trotskyism is a faction of Communism, and though it is erroneous and commits foolish and even anti-Soviet acts still it is a faction of Communism"; and he called upon all historians: to struggle against Trotskyism as the "advanced troop of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie" (On Some Questions Relating to the History of Bolshevism," see The Communist, p. 75, Jan. 1932). Yet Stalin himself insisted that Trotskyism was (once upon a time) a "faction of Communism". Back in the same year, 1932, after Stalin had already "posited in its full" cope before the historians the question of liquidating... Trotskyist contraband in our

historical literature," one of his zealous historians immediately tried to oblige him by broadcasting the historical fact that Trotskyism never had anything to do with Communism, being an unadulterated and permanent species of counter-revolution. What did Stalin do? Absorbed as he was constructing socialism in the Soviet Union, and helping Hitler come into power in Germany, he nevertheless took time off to reply to this historian, one Olekhovich. Chiding him, he wrote:

Stalin's Letter Dear Comrade Olekhovich, Your letter received. Excuse the delay as I am overloaded with work. I find myself utterly unable to agree with you, comrade Olekhovich. And here is the reason why:

It is not true that Trotskyism was never a faction of Communism... IT WOULD BE LUDICROUS TO DENY FACTS THAT ARE KNOWN TO EVERYBODY, as a faction in the C.P.S.U., recorded in the resolutions of conferences and congresses of the C.P.S.U. (Our emphasis). Ergo: It is impermissible to assert that Trotskyism (Trotskyites) WERE ALWAYS a faction of Menshevism, for such a supposition must logically lead to the notion that during the period from 1917 to 1927 our party was the party of a BLOC between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, and not a MONOLITHIC Bolshevik party, which is utterly incorrect and incompatible with the foundations of Bolshevism. (Emphasis in the original).

What other way out remains? Only one, namely: let us agree upon the fact that during a certain historical segment of time Trotskyism represented a faction of Communism—a faction vacillating between Bolshevism and Menshevism. (Signed) J. Stalin. (Dated) Jan. 15, 1932.

Today, any historian, any time, anywhere in the U.S.S.R., who would dare to repeat this species of Stalin's permanent vacillate on would find himself rotting in jail for life.

Only four years ago (see, Bolshevik, No. 16, Aug. 30, 1932, pages 46-48) the jovial Captain himself was of the opinion that it is absurd to deny "fact known to everybody," and was obviously convinced that the task of historical "science" consisted in fitting well-known (and unfortunately recorded) facts into a tissue of "interpretation" and falsifications. That, in his eyes, was the great merit of the "Pokrovsky school in history". Under the guise of erudition, facts, dates and documents, they falsified history to meet the needs of their master.

But our Captain, as usual, proved infallibly wrong. Today, he is a danger to himself. Today, his old falsification of history is no longer adequate—it is only 99.9 percent falsified: here and there a fact floats to the surface, and muddies the clear waters. A new school of historians is therefore necessary. Men unaccustomed to dealing with facts are needed. Men more cunning than the schemer in the fairy-tale who tried to steal Aladdin's magic lamp.

Daily Worker Distorts Lenin's Teachings WHAT PRICE ALLIANCES? Social Patriotism Scorns World Revolution

By DAN EASTMAN Almost daily in the last week or two in the Daily Worker, Theodore Repard has turned his weighty theoretical artillery on the Young Socialists. The noise is terrific. On Monday, February 24th, page 2 of the Daily Worker he delivers a 'salvo' under the title, "Young Socialist Leaders Are Beginning to Run Amuck on the Question of War."

It is time to sound the alarm, says Repard, (order: from Moscow—see the last issue of the New Militant), the Young Socialists are drawing close to "all that is vile which parades in the name of 'revolution'."

He begins with Gus Tyler, one of the YPSL leaders: "How does Tyler approach the war question? 'To begin with Tyler believes that the whole question is 'comparatively simple,' as he stated at the debate. We, of course, part company with him right here. For us the question of war raises some fairly complex questions, some of which cannot be settled by an epigram. We make no bones about it. Neither did Lenin."

This profound observation is the sum and substance of "Article I" of Repard's attack. He goes on to show that Lenin, in his instruction to the Hague Delegation on December 4th, 1922, urged the comrades not to be taken in by the "simple" declarations of the reformists that they would answer war with "strike or revolution." Then he attacks Tyler for taking the "simple" definition of the slogan, "Turn the imperialist war into civil war."

That is all. In other words, the whole of "Article I," is devoted to an attack on any "simple" attitude toward the war question. A rather "simple" trick in itself for concealing the fact that Repard has completely failed to answer "the fairly complex questions" put to him and the YCL by Tyler and the YPSL.

What Lenin Said Repard failed to give the full quotation from Lenin's instructions to the Hague delegation. After urging them not to be taken in by the reformists "simple" declarations, Lenin said: "First, therefore, clarification of the question of 'national defense.' Second, clarification of the question of 'defeatism.' Third, clarification of the only possible way to struggle against war—by means of the creation and maintenance of an illegal organization for continuous war against the war... all this must be primary."

It seems that Repard "makes no bones" about bare faced treachery. He gives the first part of the quotation, omits the second, and then spend the rest of the article attacking Tyler for doing what Lenin urged in the second part of the quotation. It was exactly the question of national defense, defeatism, and war on war that Tyler put to Green again and again in his debate. And it was exactly these questions that Green "simply" failed to answer.

"When Tyler says that we must threaten revolution it follows that we must be in a position to threaten revolution otherwise we will be playing with words." From this Repard concludes that, as Tyler is not in a position to threaten revolution, his attitude leads to "passivity" and "playing with words." But it is not Tyler who is playing with words.

Lenin "threatened revolution" in Russia for more than twenty years but was in a "position to threaten revolution" twice; once in 1905 and once in 1917. Was Lenin merely "playing with words" the rest of the time? Repard neglects to answer the question: about national defense, defeatism, and war on war. But they have been answered for him. The Stalinists are in favor of national defense of countries allied with the Soviet Union, they are opposed to revolutionary defeatism in such countries, they abandon the war on war.

In France, for instance, they are in favor of national defense according to the terms of the Stalin-Laval pact which specifically approves the activities of the French Imperialist Government in building up its national defense machine "to the level of security." They are opposed to revolutionary defeatism, for in a war with France allied with the Soviet Union revolutionary defeatism would be "treachery", according to one of the leaders of the YCL, Chemedanov. What is left of the war against war in France? Nothing.

Repard says that he "parts company" with Tyler on the "simplicity" of the war problem. He says it is "fairly complex". But there is nothing complex about the Stalinist position—it is "simple" treachery according to the very tests that Lenin urged the Hague delegation in the quotation which Repard so dishonestly neglects to complete. So much for "article I."

Article II appears on Page 5 of the Daily Worker for Wednesday, February 26th. "Certain of the Socialist Youth leader like Tyler are drawing dangerously close to all

that is vile that parades in the name of 'revolution.'" Perhaps Repard forgot that he said the same thing in the same words in the last article. This "all that is vile that parades in the name of revolution" seems to haunt Repard. Maybe he picked up the phrase from Gottwald that Czech leader, who after voting for the war budget in the Czechoslovakian parliament, went home to write an attack on Otto Bauer for flirting with the idea that Stalin and the Soviet Union were anything but "one indivisible whole," "indissolubly bound together."

"We tell our Socialist Comrades frankly that the next step after Tyler's present position is to call for open struggle against the Soviet Union," says the Stalinist sage. "How does Tyler approach the war question? Whether the Soviet Union is a beacon or a burden. 'No wonder he replied when asked this question by Green that he could no more answer this question than one whether the A. F. of L. or craft unions, or the Social Democratic union of Germany before Hitler were beacons or burdens.'"

Indignation is no Reply Imagine comparing the Soviet Union to craft unions, to the A. F. of L., to the German trade unions, says Repard in a fit of indignation—and let it go at that. He fails to answer the question: Is the Soviet Union a working class organization, or is it the Stalinist bureaucracy, beyond all take and above criticism?

When progressive trade unionists attack William Green all his little hired lackeys begin to howl that they are attacking the trade union. How does this differ from Repard who, when Tyler attacks the policies of the bureaucracy of the Soviet Union, begins to howl that he is attacking the Soviet Union itself? It differs: not at all except that Green's lackeys have not yet sunk so low on the intellectual scale as to claim that the A. F. of L. is "one indivisible whole," "indissolubly bound together." No amount of righteous indignation from Repard can conceal his lackey adoration of the Stalinist bureaucracy to which he is "indissolubly bound", like a "slave to his master."

Repard then turns his "entitling" intellect to the problem of alliances: "Almost word for word this argument is repeated in Tyler's pamphlet. On page 12 we find that the Communist International... seeks alliances with the capitalist class of other nations." On page 17 we find that "alliances do not prevent or minimize wars; alliances give rise to counter alliances and finally to world war between bigger and better alliances."

"What does this position amount to? Namely that the Soviet Union will be responsible for the next war." Repard here accuses Tyler of saying that war is caused by alliances. This he does by means of a quotation torn out of context. Tyler correctly presented the Marxist position on war in his pamphlet,

then he went on to analyze one of its aspects. Repard seizes on this last incidental analysis and makes it appear to be the main content of Tyler's pamphlet.

Nonsense on War If alliances were the cause of war, the Soviet Union would be directly responsible for war, and so would every other nation that entered an alliance—and the struggle against war would be reduced to a struggle against alliances. But this is nonsense, and Tyler never said it.

War is caused by the economic conflicts which are incessant under capitalism. The only struggle against war is the struggle against capitalism. Whether or not the Soviet Union enters an alliance will not stop war.

What Tyler was trying to explain in his pamphlet was that alliances cannot stop war—all they can do is alter the line-up. Repard accuses Tyler of saying that alliances are responsible for war—and then instead of correcting this false impression goes on to attack Tyler as if alliances could stop war. What is there left of the fundamental Marxist conception of war? Nothing. War is reduced to the unfortunate chance of an alliance—and the struggle against war to the struggle for allies for the Soviet Union.

Alliances and the USSR "The Soviet Union is a Socialist power which could never be a partner to an imperialist alliance," says Repard. It is not in the fact that the Soviet Union takes advantage of imperialist alliances that the treachery lies—but in the fact that the Stalinist clique sacrifices the working class struggle against capitalism and its war machines at the price for the alliance. It is not that the Soviet Union has formed an alliance with France—it is that Stalin has recognized the French Imperialist army as the price for the alliance that makes it treachery.

Neither Lenin nor Trotsky nor Marx nor Engels could oppose the Soviet Union taking advantage of imperialist alliances. Yet Repard says: that the statement that the USSR is partner to an imperialist alliance is "the most infamous of all slanders." This he qualifies by accusing Tyler of saying that the Soviet Union is an imperialist partner of an imperialist alliance. But neither Tyler nor the "Trotskyists" have advanced the theory that the Soviet Union itself was an imperialist power. That is also nonsense used by Repard to distract attention from the issue at stake... which is, not the alliance but the price of the alliance.

That price is the betrayal of the working class. PAUL LUTTINGER, M.D. DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D. 5 Washington Square North 1-2 and 6-8 Except Sundays and Holidays.

How the Social Insurance Laws Operate in Capitalist England

EDINBURGH, Scotland— In pre-war day Germany was the scene of experiments in social insurance. Today, Britain is the country where capitalism spends millions of Pounds in the relief of sick, aged, unemployed and disabled workers. A the U. S. A. seems about to embark upon a similar course, it may interest American workers to know just how British capitalism operates social insurance and what effects it has upon the working class.

1. Health Insurance and Old Age Pensions State insurance against sickness or disablement was introduced in the year 1911 and is based upon contributions paid by wage workers and employers and a grant from State fund. The scheme embraces all manual workers (with few exceptions) who earn less than 250 pounds per year. The employer pays 10s per week and the worker 10d per week but the female workers pay 1s. Should the worker fall sick and be unable to work, he is entitled to receive free medical treatment and medicine and 15s per week for 26 weeks with reduced benefit thereafter. The wife of an insured worker receives 2 pounds upon the birth of a child while the act allows: additional benefits out of any surplus funds for dental treatment, eye treatment or extra cash benefit. Doctors receive payment of a certain sum per year for every person registered on their panel and chemists receive money for medicine so dispensed, so that the Act has been a gold mine for the medical profession.

The scheme is administered by Approved Societies such as: Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, or Assurance Societies who are in turn supervised by District Insurance Committees set up by the state. Like all state schemes it has suffered from a series of weaknesses such as irritating red tape procedure, faulty medical treatment, adulterated medicine and inadequate cash benefits.

A recent innovation has been the payment of 10 per week Old Age Pensions to all insured contributors upon reaching the age of 65. But the aged person then loses the right of any cash benefit when sick or unemployed when idle, so that the veterans of industry declare that they have been "swindled, and so it seems. If a person is idle for more than two years and fail to pay arrears in contributions then he loses cash benefit when sick and if he is idle too long, he fall out of the scheme altogether and loses everything. Old Age Pensions are paid to persons who are not contributor to the scheme only when they reach the age of 70 and only after being able to prove that their income is not more than 26 pounds per year. As not even the mighty minds of the National Government have been able to reveal how an aged person can exist upon 10s per week in capitalist Britain it can easily be understood that there is great poverty in the world of aged persons in Britain.

2. Workmen's Compensation and Assurance Alongside of the Health Insurance Act runs the Workmen's Compensation Act, which legalizes the payment by an employer of compensation to an employee who meets with an accident or becomes infected with an industrial disease while at work. The victim of an accident is entitled to a lump sum of money or a weekly payment of half wage: up to a maximum of 30s per week for 26 weeks when he must then be tested by a court to see if he is still unfit for work. Before he receives any money, however, the worker must prove that the accident was not due to neglect or carelessness on

his part and must produce witness-ness to prove that the accident or disease was really the outcome of work. At this point it becomes necessary for the worker to obtain legal advice, and in steps our old friend the lawyer, and by the time the case is settled the worker is often dead or "tarring or has accepted an offer from the agents of his employer, which usually is an extremely modest sum. Woe betide the worker who has to claim Workmen's Compensation. He may even win his case and then lose his job.

Yet another link in the chain of social insurance is the now legalized business of Assurance Companies who trade in death and endowment policies, whereby a worker can insure his relatives at so much per week and in the event of their attaining a certain age he will receive probably 25 pounds or upon their death 12 pound. In this way the poor pay for death and keep capitalism alive.

3. Unemployment Insurance Probably no legislation has played so prominent a part in post-war British politics as the Unemployment Insurance Acts. Introduced, previous to the war, to embrace a limited number of building trades worker, the scheme was broadened to embrace all manual workers who earn less than 250 pounds per year with the exception of certain corporation, government, railway, agricultural and domestic workers. Like the Health Insurance scheme, the Unemployment scheme has never paid its way while it has brought governments down and has been the means of propping up others. In order to obtain benefit, a worker must report at the local employment exchange where he registers his claim for benefit. If he can prove that he has paid 30 contributions to the Unemployment. (Continued on Page 4)

Two Pamphlets

"THE ROAD FOR REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS"

War and the Workers is written by John West. He needs no introduction to you. The Road for Revolutionary Socialists is written by Fred Zeller. He is the acknowledged leader of the French Socialist youth.

Fred Zeller was expelled from the Socialist youth organization by the agents of Leon Blum and his Old Guard some time ago, together with twelve other youth comrades. The young Socialists, however, remained supporters of the revolutionary position presented by Fred Zeller and his co-workers. They remained supporters in the continuation of the struggle for this position. How this struggle has been carried on and how comrade Zeller and his co-workers came to a revolutionary position, and came to be supporters of the Fourth International, is described in this little pamphlet. The introduction is by Leon Trotsky.



"WAR AND THE WORKERS"

The pamphlet, War and the Workers, presents a searching analysis of the nature and causes of modern war. It deals with the problem of sanctions, neutrality, and the rôle of the League of Nations. It presents a scathing indictment of the various forms of pacifism and social-patriotism and outlines a concrete program of struggle against imperialist war. The price of this pamphlet is 10c per copy; in lots of ten or more, 7c per copy. The price of the Zeller pamphlet is 5c per copy; in lots of ten or more, 3c per copy. Here is an opportunity. Take advantage of it.