It is beginning to definitely cast off its post-war cloak of "isolation" & to take its place among those nations which came out of the Versailles Conference triumphantly. It is throwing its weight behind the sated victors to prevent the redivision of the spoils, as determinately championed by those nations which were fleeced, Germany predominantly.

For this will, of course, be the essential cause of the world war, the contradictions of decaying international capitalism take their specific forms in the inability of national capitalisms to contain themselves (particularly those which lack colonies as a result of their defeat in the World War) & their attempts to expand at the expense of rival imperialisms. The wars will no doubt be fought under the slogans of "Revenge Versailles" on the one hand & "Defend Democracy against Fascism" on the other.

Pre-war periods can be recognized not only by the objective political & economic situation, but also in individual countries to prepare the masses for the war. Not only do the official government agencies attempt to implant the ideology of nationalist hysteria, without which a war must fail, but within the working classes within the radical movement itself, reflection of the capitalist crisis may be seen; and those reformist and vacillating parties which are not fully equipped with the revolutionary Marxist understanding of history, succumb, willingly or unwillingly, to the wiles of imperialist war.

(Continued on Page 16)
Now Is The Time

The fate of a revolutionist has often been compared to that of a swimmer struggling against a strong current. Alone, "isolated", scorned by those who have made successful careers as "labor leaders", he still faithfully retains both the context and fervor of his revolutionary ideology and attempts to explain them to the workers.

Particularly in a period such as the present, when the working class movement has been exhausted by a series of terrible defeats and betrayals, is it necessary to differentiate between the genuine and the false, between the reformists of all shades and the revolutionary party.

We see the traditional Social-Democracy which fights for "socialism in our spare time", the policies of which laid the groundwork for the victory of fascism in Europe.

With them stand the newer, more blatant reformists, the Stalinists, who while maintaining the phraseology of the old Communists have adopted as their own the reformism of the Second International.

And, then the intellectual pygmies who "believe in the revolution" but "God forbid, aren't sectarian like the Trotskyists." They are often capable of achieving correct positions on individual questions, but, like all centrists, are incapable of drawing full conclusions therefrom. "And besides, the Trotskyists are so small...."

Yes, we are small, just as Lenin's party was small... That is the fate of any revolutionary party in the years of quiet and seeming despair which precede revolutionary action. But if it is to be in the forefront then, it must have remained loyal to Marxist principles in the past.

The place of youth interested in a better life is with us, we who are building a revolutionary party— the party of the Fourth International. This is the historic task of our age. If a powerful revolutionary party is not forged, the victory of Fascism is assured. If that party is built, the road lies clear for the victory of the working class—the lever which will lift all humanity to new heights and a classless society without the oppression of man by man.

Spain and China...

The centers of world politics remain Spain & China. If in our paper there is no article about either it is not because we do not recognize their significance. It is rather because of the impossibility to give any comprehensive analysis of these questions in the limited space at our disposal. Nor do we think it necessary to write a blurb about the necessity to aid Spain & China. Suffice it to say that now when events appear to be darkest the position of the revolutionary Bolshevik-Leninists is being completely reaffirmed. In this of decadent capitalism it is impossible to stop or destroy Fascism by supporting its root cause—capitalist democracy. Even from a narrow empirical viewpoint, the Spanish Loyalist government and Chang Kai Chek have proven their inability to militarily defeat Fascism. The task facing revolutionary elements now is to rally the most effective possible aid for the Bolshevik-Leninists in both countries revolutionists continue to give material support to both, but must mercilessly criticize their ineffectiveness.
The "Campus" Beats the War Drums

The fact that "The Campus", the only undergraduate newspaper at City College is controlled by the Young Communist League, might in ordinary times be merely unfortunate but nothing more. For in a limited sphere "The Campus" despite this control, can and does play a progressive role. Thus in the fight to oust Robinson, in the fight against NYA cuts, against academic retrenchment etc., "The Campus" has and in the near future probably will continue to play a leading role. And in ordinary times this would stamp the Campus as a progressive paper. However, these are not "ordinary" times.

The overwhelming, the inescapable problem today is war. Today, twenty years after Versailles, the leading imperialist bandits of the world, Germany; Japan, Italy, England, France and the United States are plotting another world slaughter for the redivision of the world market. The slogans to be used, the pretexts sized upon, the question of who will be the "aggressor" etc., is for us as for all Marxists unimportant. What is important for us, as it was important to Lenin in 1914, is the fact that the coming blood bath will be imperialistic on all sides and must be halted by the revolutionary action of the working classes of the world. That is the ABC of Marxism; and because the YCL is attempting to bludgeon the issue with Utopian nonsense and pie-in-the-sky phrasology such as "peace", "democracy", "a war against Fascism", "collective security", etc., this is a condemnation of the YCL and not of the Marxist interpretation.

That is why it is important not only to us but to the whole student body, when "The Campus" acting as the lackey of the YCL, attacks all those who have the courage to proclaim Roosevelt's "collective security" pacifism as exactly what it is -- a blind to the American people to the imperialist war machine. That is why it is necessary for all students interested in stopping Roosevelt's drive toward war, to strip the "Campus" of its liberal mask and recognize it for what it is.

There is no better place to observe the rightward accumulations of the YCL within the last year than in the editorial and news columns of the "Campus". Take the Oxford Pledge for instance.

Just eight months ago, when of course "the objective situation was entirely different" -- that one is a corker -- the editorial column of the "Campus" featured this shocking Trotskyite statement in defense of the Pledge, "The Oxford Pledge is presented to demonstrate the fallibility of government -- a crime committed in most election years by responsible voters. Perhaps, most important, the pledge is intended as a warning to the war makers that the sanction for a war must come from the people, if it is to come at all. For if the numbers that subscribe to the pledge bear enough influence Congress will not venture into a conflict without serious qualms. The Oxford Pledge, as such, can be a serious deterrent to war."

Then, again, on April 20 in an editorial entitled "Oxford Pledge for Peace" we have, "The U.S. government as it is constituted at present will not undertake any war unless it is to advance its own imperialist interests or to protect them. Such a war is not a war we can support... Only were there a serious realignment in the American social and economic base of government could there be a war that the progressive element in our intellectual world could support... The Oxford Pledge is the slogan of those warriors against war..."
The ASU AT THE CROSSROADS...

The truism that the student movement can play no independent role in society, but must rather reflect the currents of political life is again, in the case of the American Student Union, being demonstrated to the hilt. Born in the period when the Young Communist League had suddenly become enamoured of "united fronts" and when the Socialists were oscillating leftwards, the ASU was, in the main, a coalition of Communists and Socialists, with pacifists and liberals (really "independent radicals") participating.

Now the honeymoon is over. Each has come to his true destination—the Stalinists to the swamp of reformism and the socialists to the banner of revolutionary Marxism, and these tremendously important currents are being reflected inside the ASU. The discussion preceding the Christmas ASU convention must be of the sharpest nature.

Let us make no bones about it! For us, the ASU faces its final choice. Either it will reaffirm its original minimum position on war (which is of course the testing ground of any organization)—that of clear unconditional support of the Oxford pledge, the opposition to all imperialist alliances—or it will become but another of the innumerable Stalinist peripheral groups which, under the guise of "left" slogans, are preparing the people for the next war. Let us clearly understand that collective security is not and "incorrect" way of fighting war; nor is it an "inadequate" or a "poor" way. Collective security means nothing more or less than the preparation for war. COLLECTIVE SECURITY MEANS WAR! AND ANY ORGANIZATION WHICH WOULD PRETEND TONIGHT WAR MUST CATEGORICALLY REJECT IT!

In an article of this length, we cannot enter into detail upon all the questions facing the ASU. But we shall attempt to clarify some points about which the "Campus" and others have confusion.

Are we attempting to put forth a "revolutionary program" for the ASU? It is indeed a pathetic example of the degeneration of the Stalinists when they cannot (or will not) differentiate between the full anti-war program of a revolutionary organization and a minimum program which it puts forth for another organization—i.e. the ASU. We are not pacifists; we are revolutionists. The Oxford pledge is however the full program of the pacifists, and not of the revolutionists. Our full program is the revolutionary struggle for state power and the tactic of revolutionary defeatism in case of war. Thus it is clear that when we propose the Oxford pledge as the program of the ASU (or more correctly its retention in the ASU program) we are not proposing a revolutionary program but a minimum basis acceptable to all genuine anti-war forces, revolutionists, pacifists.

We, of course, believe that in time of crisis all such pacifist elements will polarize in two directions: one capitulating to the government war machine, the other joining in the revolutionary struggle against the war. But we can, meanwhile, join together in the limited right for certain immediate objectives, without surrendering the right to express our full program at all times.

We are accused of not being interested in the struggle for immediate student demands. What nonsense. Although in a pre-war period such as this, every question pales to relative insignificance before the war question, the immediate student demands assume a certain importance.

The question is really: how shall we fight for these demands. Shall it be by militant struggle in which ONLY has such a glorious (continued on page)
The two lines are distinct. The Young Communist League proposes to gain the student body by watering down the ASU program to the level of the backward majority. We propose to struggle for the adherence of the majority of the students by educating them to the level of the militant vanguard—no watering down of program, no avoidance of militant manifestation in order not to "antagonize" liberals. These liberals can be won to the ASU not by catering to their prejudices, but by involving them in action for specific actions.

And, incidentally, is it not this YCL which is backward, rather than the students? Didn't the majority of the students present at the November 11 anti-war meeting take the Oxford pledge, despite the YCL opposition?

This question of militancy and the charge of sabotage hurled against us can best be answered by referring to our local YCL chapter. Here through mechanical domination of a YCL paper membership majority, we were kept off the executive committee of the chapter. Let us examine the record of this YCL dominated committee. On the most important question facing the student body, that is, the cut in YSA appropriations, it did exactly nothing. It was only two months afterwards, when the affair had become a dead issue, that a meeting was called in the Great Hall and that meeting was a dismal failure. Yes, the YCL leadership could make grandiloquent speeches against YSA cuts in December, but when it was necessary to organize militant sit-down strikes, demonstration, meetings, picket lines etc. concretely in October...nobody was home.

It is highly significant that at the picket lines for the jury auto strikers we, the YPCL, have sometimes outnumbered, sometimes equalled, and always had a larger proportion of our members present than the YCL. Is that good friends sabotage? It is a sin significant that we have participated fully in all the legitimate united front activities of the ASU, which were not utilized for political interests; that our members served on sub-committees despite the fact that we weren't allowed representation on the Executive Committee. Is that sabotage?

No, we have not sabotaged! The sabotage comes from the YCL leadership, nationally & locally, which violates both the spirit & the letter of past ASU conventions, which in the high schools has killed the anti-war strike, completely broken the student movement in order to deliver it to the principals in exchange for a false legality; (continued on page 15)
Our well-endowed Tower-of-Babel stands as a striking example of the intellectual bankruptcy of the capitalist class, and of the betrayal by that class of its own cultural inheritance.

An accusation like this, brought against the college, requires substantiation: let us see what we can do.

In a class-society, where one section lives at the expense of the other, social parasitism is reflected in the field of culture. This reflection takes the form of a divorce of Theory & Practice, a divorce as glaring as that between capitalist ... worker. Resultantly, the theoretical part is not only isolated from real life, but its content is adulterated in the interest of the of the parasitic class.

Education fails miserably to co-ordinate the thing taught and the life to be lived by the student. This is to be expected since capitalism has shown itself incapable of giving the cultural a place in the individual's existence—unless he excludes himself to the academic life and so divorce himself from the active life. This is what happens, a absorption on the part of the teacher in theoretical aspects of his subject has the result that his teaching will be so loaded with undigestible material as to be worthless.

In the Faculty of Arts this divorce between what is taught and what is and how it will be used, is laughable and damnable. An attempt is made to give some sort of literary education. Here one of two things happens, Here one of two things happen. Either the teacher is intellectually sterile—-as a result of long seclusion from the practical world, or because he entered academic life as an escape from the practical world (and in this case he should been put out to pasture instead of in a university) — and then his teaching is a collection of barren facts devoid of significance for the normal human being... Though it must be remembered that the bourgeoisie, because of its natural vulgarity, believes that knowing certain names (in literature or history) makes one superior to those who are unable to cite these with equal facility...

The alternative is, that the teachers, having preserved some intellectual vitality from the castration process of bourgeois education, really attempts to put some life into their subject. These are the few valuable members of the staff who are generally unpopular with their colleagues and appreciated only by intelligent students. But inevitably the enthusiasm for the subject takes the form of what we shall call Cultural Fetishism: the belief that literature, art, the things of the mind should have some sort of holy existence apart from real existence. In capitalist society, an existence apart they certainly have—but it is a most unholy one; and it is maltreated under capitalism so as to produce fetishism. Culture as a thing apart is really a Corpse Apart: though few of the vultures that feed thereon seem conscious of the nature of their diet. "Art has nothing to do with practical life", students are often told; and students obliged to enter practical life end by having nothing to do with 'art. We are tempted to ask, indignantly, "Are these gentlemen incapable of seeing that cultural creation and appreciation should be, not enclosed in a sanctuary, but a healthy part of the human animal?"
and then we realize that it is the whole social system which drives culture into the Ivory Tower or cheap movies, that it is the whole capitalist class which disfigures, utilizes and stifles its cultural inheritance.

It not only stifles it, however, it adulterates it.

Having got the cultural divorced from the practical so successfully that there is complete incoherence and absence of co-ordination between different courses and subjects themselves, so that we have a pitiable Tower of Babel of aimless clarioning, instead of a regulated system of education direct a toward definite ends—then our parasitic class of Big Business, which owns the college, alone, with the government and the militia, sees to it that what is taught shall be in line with class interests. For the most part of course it is scarcely necessary to intervene and curtail "free speech" since the unfortunate victims, by their background upbringing and education inevitably have a suitable reactionary outlook, and teach what is required of them. This is particularly true in the pay colleges, since in a school like City College there occasionally peeps through a progressive spirit.

What outlook is most pleasing to the ruling class? Obviously, one which ideals people to look as little as possible at reality, since they might there find things to shake their faith in the righteousness of Big Business, the Klan and our other sacred institutions; namely, the idealistic outlook. Professors of history(sic) teach that the important things are Ideals, and such things as exploitation, filth, & misery are unessentials in the progression onwards of Truth & Justice as exemplified in the colonial expansion of the fatherland; professors of literature teach that the masses are there to enable an elite of intellectuals to rhapsodize at leisure about works of art; and idealism reaches its final autothesis in departments of philosophy where contemplation of the Empyrean dispenses us from realizing the and understanding true existence.

"Well done thou good and faithful servant!"
Irwin Earle

The formal burial of the American Communist party took place at the investigation into subversive activities which the state of Massachusetts ran several weeks ago. Except the now notorious statement of Dave Grant, YCL leader, that he would defend his country in case of war, there were many other interesting tidbits. We reprint a few...

Boston Herald, October 1, ..."Stoutly denying Communists are plotting to overthrow the government by violence, he (Broder) insisted the revolution which is inevitable in his opinion will reach its climax with the Communists taking over control of the government through the process of elections".

Boston Post, October 1, "Frankfeld said the agitation of his party is a peaceful agitation and does not seek the overthrow of the government. "Confession of Faith" published by the CP of Massachusetts, says, "We Communists(sic) believe in accomplishing great social changes peacefully and through democratic processes".

Boston Globe, October 5, ..."Rep. Julian asked Frankfeld (Mass. CP organizer) if he did not believe some form of force violence is unavoidable'. 'No sir' was the reply".

BOSTON GLOBE OCTOBER (..."Soutard (member of state committee of CP) denied that he had any antipathy towards those opposed to Communism adding that he believes the ends of the Communist party can be attained through legal means."
THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

~ ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE ~

Throughout history, organizations, both national and international have been destined to play progressive roles for definite historical periods, only to lose their 'progressivism' and lapse into reactionary roles after a certain period of time. Working class political organizations are no exceptions to this development in politics.

The first international: The International Workingmen's Association was organized by Marx & Engels and had as its definite task the indication to the workers of the world the international character of their task, emancipation. When the Anarchists seized the helm and began to regale the International to the background of secret machinations and terrorism, Marx & Engels did not hesitate to declare war on the International as a reactionary force in working class politics.

The Second International, organized while Engels was still alive, had as its specific task in the then yet expanding capitalism, to wrest reforms from the national bourgeoisie and to build up the national labor movements. However, it never was to give up its internationalism nor to forget the direction of its struggle against the bourgeoisie, the overthrow of capitalism. While in the struggle against Bernsteinism or revisionism in their own ranks, the parties of the Second International were slowly, but with increasing momentum embarking on this very same road of opportunist, anti-class struggle revisionism. The erection of grade unions and huge political parties gave the bureaucratic leadership of the Second International, a stake in the status quo, firming their positions as well-paid leaders of the labor movement. Nationalism was substituted for Internationalism, and in August 1914, these lackeys of imperialism, in flat contradiction to the anti-war resolutions passed at the congresses of the International, declared class peace, and in the name of fighting "For Democracy", "Against Kaiserism" (or Czarism) (how familiar these cries are today!), voted the military budget and supported the war.

Lenin then said that the Second International was dead and that a new revolutionary International should be built. From 1914 to 1919 from a little group of revolutionists participating in secret conferences in Zimmerwald and Kienthal, Lenin built up the movement for a Third International on the basis of Internationalism, revolutionary opposition to the Imperialist war. From 1919 to 1923 during the upswing in the revolutionary movement in Europe: in Germany, Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria, and the successful revolution in Russia led by Lenin and Trotsky, the Third International played an uncompromisingly revolutionary role, organizing workers and peasants in imperialist and colonial countries into revolutionary parties dedicated to class struggle, colonial liberation, and world revolution. With the recession of this post-war wave of revolution, the death of Lenin, and the isolation of backward revolutionary Russia in the world of Imperialism Stalin usurping control and utilizing the weariness of the Russian proletariat and peasantry, set up his reactionary theory of National Socialism: the completion of a classless socialist society in backward peasant Russia without the State aid of the revolutionary workers in the West. This abandonment of Internationalism is the root cause of the degeneration of the Comintern. The Third International became the docile instrument of the Stalin bureaucracy's foreign diplomacy. Its task was now to "prevent intervention", to maintain peace (i.e., world imperialism as it is today). The (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)
Realizing that this is the "epoch of wars and revolutions" (Lenin), the international character of world economy, the accomplished betrayals of the second and third Internationals in the face of the coming war, a new, a FOURTH INTERNATIONAL must be built. We cannot wait until the war comes; waiting is time wasted—we must prepare now. The Fourth International is the only movement today based on the principles of revolutionary Marxism, of Bolshevism—that is Internationalist, that combats the international bourgeois and its agents, that really defends the U.S.S.R. against Imperialism and the Stalinist termites, that fights the League of Nations, the Fascist & democratic imperialist bandits, that exposes the fakery of the pacifist and disarmament movements and their impotence in the fight vs. war, that really fights for the Chinese masses against Japanese Imperialism and exposes the impotence of that lackey and butcher Chiang Kai Shek, that really fights against Franco in Spain and Italy's betrayal of the popular front regime of Stalin—Negrin in Malaga, Irún, Bilbao, Saragossa, etc. Revolutionary workers must look to the fourth international for leadership in the world campaign against capitalism—in America the workers must join the Socialist Party (left wing) and the youth, the Young People's Socialist League.

To sum up:—The fight against capitalism and its concomitants war and fascism means the struggle against the Second and Third Internationals and the struggle for the new revolutionary vanguard, the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?????
Many observers have noted the close similarity between the current crisis and that of 1929. Not the least curious among these analogous characteristics is the propaganda, official and otherwise, which places the crisis in the indefinite category of "business recession." Yet even a cursory examination of this decline will reveal its greater significance. It is to be strongly feared that we are faced with a full-sized depression, not a mere "recession."

Steel was the key industry in the 1934-37 "prosperity" period; steel was the industry most affected by the administration's billion dollar war budget as well as by the British, Japanese and other armament drives. Steel production thus is a key index. From September 1934 steel rose from 35 to almost 116 in January 1937; after a 20 point decline it again rose to a peak of 116 in July and August. At this time ingot production was well over 90% of capacity. In mid-August the index took a precipitate fall. Between Labor Day and November 15 (a ten week period) ingot production fell 50%, thus dropping to approximately 41% of capacity. The decline was almost vertical, 7% in one week, 10% in the next, the figure for the week of November 24 giving 33% of capacity, the Gary district operating at 30.5%.

The great stock crash was not equal to 1929 only because the wave of prosperity and concomitant use of credit had been swollen. The Federal Reserve Bulletin (12/1/37) says that "the amount of credit liquidation that has accompanied the recent fall in stock prices has been correspondingly limited...by the cash buying." Corporation Lawyer O. M. Gardner informs us of the depth of the debacle: "It is true that market values on the Stock Exchange have decreased 28 billion dollars in the last ten weeks and that represents fully one third of our 1937 national income."

The Federal Reserve Bulletin likewise reports, "October's total is smallest for any month since February 1935 with the exception of last August," as regards new financing. Food sales have declined 70,000 for car loadings fell 5.1% in the first week in November. Since September 1 carloadings fell 5%. Bank deposits fell 9%. Excess reserves rose, reflecting decline in production-loans. Cotton production fell from 143 in mid-August to 112.5 in November 12 with sales 25-30% below production. Stagger systems have been introduced in steel for 500 thousand men and 60 thousand men have been completely laid off. A number of U. S. Steel subsidiaries have closed shop. The AFL estimates an employment decline of 500,000 men since August and the Industrial Conference Board a fall of 6.4%.

The above picture could be blackened considerably by citation from production of work tools, from wages, from housing, from profits and from any other economic criterion. It is sufficient to say that the decline is entering the crisis stage as it extends into its fifth month and is actually not being alleviated by the usual Christmas stimulant.

From a certain point of view we are in a recession. The capitalist system of economy has been in decline since 1914. Since then it has not extended capitalism to new areas, it has not raised productive capacity one world scale, it has found a positive break on economic progress both in colonial
and advanced countries. All post-war depressions are in this sense recessions along the secularly declining path of world capitalism.

American capitalism entered this general crisis stage in 1929. Since then, even in the "prosperous" years of 1931-37, the level of economy has been low. During this period unemployment has never been below 8,700,000 and has gone above 10 million. This means that 12% of the American labor force has been rendered permanently unemployed. Likewise, this period, by contrast with previous prosperities, witnessed no great increase in productive capacities, which was the outstanding contribution of capitalist economy to world history. Too much time was taken in reducing inventories, in liquidating debts, in rationalization. Also a permanently unemployed army of 10 million represents that much market contraction and the infiltration of British, German, and Japanese in South America didn't ease the situation any.

American capitalism was considered the most endurable system of all time because it raised the standard of living of the meanest beggar within its borders. But the heyday is past. While the level of profits is close to that of 1929 (and this is the real meaning of prosperity) wages, employment, and living standards have fallen. It is estimated that there is a shortage of about 6,000,000 homes today in America. Brookings Institute estimates, "An effective economic demand" (i.e. an ability to pay for 4½ million homes by 1941). American capitalism is no longer capable of supplying elementary life needs to a large and ever-growing proportion of its population. On the contrary, crises are more frequent, general decline sharpened.

The implications are that we have reached a stage at which Europe arrived a decade ago, and we may expect similar solutions to be applied here. Fascism and war for markets (no matter what the shibboleth advanced) are the only solutions capitalism is capable of advancing.
The loss of Philip Rahv, W.F. Dupee, John Dos Passos, James T. Farrell and André Gide has not taught the Communist Party the impossibility of blueprinting a pattern for creative art. The witch-hunt is still on.

Jerome Weidman's story, "One Thing You Learn Down South" is assailed by the Stalinist-Jesuits as Jim-Crowism and anti-Semitism. Point one - a negro is pictured as a degenerate. Point two - the un-amiable character, Schlimowitz, is Jewish.

The accusations against Weidman would be thoroughly justified if the generalizations to be drawn from the story are that negroes are usually both rapists and cowards; and that Jews are doltish, drunken brutes. There are several flaws in this presentation that should have been pointed out previously to dam the deluge of virtuous letters to the "Campus."

This generalization is an artificial abstraction from the context of the story. If the story were a picture of race brutality, the geography would be irrelevant. The Stalinist version of "One Thing You Learn Down South" does not tell us the one thing you learn down South.

The theme should be obvious to any unbiased observer - the South is an embodiment of the viciousness of race passion and racial superiority. Weidman adequately portrays the degenerate moral and mental level of the defenders of white superiority in their discussion around the restaurant table. Because Weidman gives an artistic portrayal of the effects of this slave society, not only on the oppressor but also on the oppressed, and does not add an explicit political appeal for the Negro People's Front, he is, ergo, a racist.

Our subtle "defenders of culture" also choose to ignore one of the finest aspects of the story - the irony by which the Jew, Schlimowitz, is portrayed as the racist; by which a representative of an oppressed race is shown in specific circumstances, moulded by his own social milieu, a defender of race superiority. If we are to draw political meaning from this story, it can only be that race theories and race hatreds are not inherent in race itself but in the social environment which necessarily produces them.

Every sincere radical must fight against that disgusting sectarianism which attempts, by index purgatorium, to make artistic expression conform explicitly to a narrow political line.

SOCIALIST CULTURE IS THE CONTINUATION OF THE BEST TRADITIONS OF BOURGEOIS CULTURE. THE WORKING CLASS WILL NOT RISE TO POWER BY A BURNING OF THE BOOKS.

Irving Wells
Who's Who in the Alcove

Oehlerites and Stalinists, Altmanites and Clarityites, Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, — what's it all about? To the perplexed students who wonderingly listen to the awesome noise issuing from the College Kremlin, Alcove #1, we offer this brief guide-book:

1) Reading from right to left the Stalinists, or the Young Communist League, the official minions of the "Infallible Father Stalin". The Communist International, founded in 1919 by Lenin, Trotsky, Radek, Zinoviev, and a lot of other "fascists", has today, become the servant of those who wish to maintain the capitalist system and lead the masses to a new World War in defense of "democracy" (read Anglo-Franco-American investments and colonies). The "Communists" have completely abandoned the struggle for the Socialist society in which they profess to believe. For it, they have substituted the time-honored stock-in-trade of the "practical politicians", the opportunist. Today they attack militancy — they crave respectability. They disregard the United Front; they prefer the "People's Front, the old.

2) The Second International Socialists - a small group composed of the followers of the old "socialism thru evolution" reformers of the Norman Thomas, Harry Laidler stripe, and some "revolutionary followers" of Gus Tyler and Herb.

Stalin Exposed as a Trotskyist!

In Pravda of November 6, 1936 he writes: "All practical work in connection with the uprising was done under the leadership of Trotsky. The party is primarily indebted to Comrade Trotsky for the rapid going over of the garrison to the side of the Soviet..."

But now he is a Stalinist again!

In Pravda, November 26, 1934, he wrote: "Comrade Trotsky did not get on the center to organize the uprising... Trotsky was a novelist in the party, and did not, could not have played any special role either in the party or in the uprising..."

Varsity Show

Peace on Earth

Wed-Thur-Fri-Nights Dec. 29, 30, 31

Pauline Edwards Theatre

Tickets at: 85, .75, 1.00

Curtain at 8:00 PM.
The "red book"

Zinoviev makes speeches about revolutionary socialism, and at the same time help the Thomas-Altmann Right Wing crowd throw the revolutionary elements out of the party. The Thomas-Altmann group is headed straight towards liquidation into the American Labor Party, while the Tyler-Zam, or Clarity group protestingly crowds along. The undisciplined heterogeneous amalgam that makes up the Socialist Party (Right Wing) today will not stay together long. Even the few honest revolutionaries who were fooled into remaining in the camp of La Guardia's "Socialists" after the expulsion of the revolutionary Left Wing, this summer, cannot remain much longer in the Social Democratic camp International of Major Atlee, Leon Blum, Negrin, Thomas and Altmann.

3) The Lovestonites - are almost negligible outside of a few spots. This group which calls itself the Independent Communist Labor League was originally a splinter off the Communist Party. They were at that time, 1929, far to the right of the Stalinists! To some justifiable criticisms of the Ultra-Left tactics of the "Third Period" (1928-1935) Stalinists, the Lovestonites added a distinct tough of opportunism, by kowtowing to the big labor leaders. However, while the Lovestonites remained relatively in one position, the Stalinists in their breakneck swing to the right, went far to the right of the Lovestonites. So far, that after after wasting eight years of acting as a "Communist Opposition" group, trying to reform the C.P. they have had to give up the job. Nevertheless, their apparently incurable opportunism - opposition to the People's Front in principle but support of it in action (with La Guardia), acting as the boot-licking sycophants for the big burocrats in the labor movement (Dave Dubinsky in the ILGWU and Homer Martin in the HAWA) - makes the Lovestonites, as an organization, incapable of leading a courageous revolutionary movement, although some of them have broken with Lovestone and have come over to the Fourth Internationalists.

4) The so-called Trotskyists - or the Young People's Socialist League (Fourth Internationalists) - are the result of a fusion of the better revolutionary elements out of the Communist movement, and the left tendencies in the old Socialist movement. The YPSL (4th Int.) and the revolutionary Socialist Party (Left Wing) carry forward the best of Marx and Engels, Liebknecht and Luxemburg, Lenin and Trotsky, and Eugene Debs. (For more information see "Now is the Time" on page 3)

FOR A CLEAR CUT, HONEST, REVOLUTIONARY POSITION!
FOR THE UNITY OF LABOR IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITALISM!
JOIN THE YPSL (4th Internationalists)!

Donald Reeves

The Times Spills the Beans (cont)

These symptoms appear today in a very clear form -- Roosevelt is capable agent of American imperialism, has initiated the largest peace time budget in American History; his Chicago speech bears a striking resemblance to some of Wilson's pre-war 1916 speeches.

But if capitalism is to provide America with a war, the slogans for that war will be of Stalinist manufacture. The Stalinists have the function of providing exactly what capitalism lacked; a "left" basis for the support of imperialist war.

How familiar are these cries of "Defend the U.S. against fascism". And what a great consolation they will be to the victims of the next imperialist war.

War presents a threat to the very future existence of humanity. Only a resurgent wave of working-class militancy sweeping aside the false reformist slogans - only that can end war.
The struggle against war sees the constant falling away of the weak and vacillating elements to the camp of the war-makers. The YCL has trod that path. The ASU is at the crossroads and must choose at its coming convention.

We come to its Christmas with a four point program: 1) REJECTION OF THE OXFORD PLEDGE AND OPPOSITION TO COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN ANY FORM; 2) Concrete support for labor; 3) Militant action for student demands. No substitution for the student strike. 4) The retention of extension of internal ASU democracy. Against the expulsion of anyone!

The struggle against war (which is but a phase of the struggle for Socialism) is the prime task of the youth. If the ASU can be utilized for that purpose, all well and good. If the ASU is controlled by war forces, as seems quite likely, it will be necessary to label it as such. No doubt such a situation would make that struggle more difficult. But, regardless of what happens to the ASU, the fight against war and its social roots must continue to its inexorable end.

Irving Howe

It's an indication of the decline of the City College student movement that nothing of any concrete value has been done about the NYA cuts. It takes no exceptional imagination to picture what would have happened in the "OLD DAYS" if several hundred students had been thrown off NYA—picket lines, sit-down strikes, demonstrations, meetings, etc. We appealed at the time in a leaflet for a united front of all student organizations in order to fight the cuts. That was no doubt an example of our "sectarianism". But there was no response from any of the other groups on the campus. The few spasmodic actions taken by the Stalinist leadership of our ASU were pathetic. A meeting two months after, a few weak half-hearted attempts at NYA student organization, a few resolutions—and that's all. It is time to reasure the old tradition of militant struggle. Talking with administrators, conferences etc just don't work...

The "Teacher worker", organ of the Communist Party branch of City, has accused the head of the English Dept of being anti-Semitic. In view of the fact that Dr. Horne has been a teacher in Yeshiva College for years, has appointed a majority of Jewish teachers since he's been head of the dept., we must demand concrete proof for this charge. Too often has the Stalinist press indulged in calumny to be believed so easily...

The school has for the last few days been spread with Nazi stickers. It would be ridiculous to get too excited about a few mislaid Nazi youths, but vigilance being the eternal price of liberty, let's see to it that all Nazi propaganda is mercilessly eradicated....

It is extremely interesting to note that our article about the Weidman affair was written & printed before Mr. Weidman's article....

One of the more embarrassing situations is the plight of student who must go—but, alas, there are not students worth speaking of in Townsend-Harris. And what about doors in the toilets? Must we wait till we get Socialism?
who take the pledge knowing that they will fight against American imperialism's war aims, who take it because they want Congress to consider a declaration of war in fear -- fear of mass reaction by the American populace."

Who, you ask, was the author of such shocking statements which all good Stalinists now realize are inspired by France and the Ghostpo. No less a wicked Trotskyite than Albert Sussman, editor of the "Campus" at that time. In addition, headlines of that distant day lyrically proclaimed the fact that at the last April 12 ant-war strike, "3,500 students took the Oxford Pledge."

Of course, that was only the attitude toward the Oxford Pledge. With regard to the "Trotskyites" the "Campus" was just as staunch and slanderous as it has ever been; though never to the present extent. For Feb. 19, for instance, a good section of the paper was sacrificed so that Mr. M. U. Schappes' 1800 word letter attacking "Trotskyites" might be printed in full. Naturally there were protests both from readers and staff men who somehow felt that what Mr. Schappes had to say on "Trotskyism" was neither interesting nor important enough to warrant throwing out one third of the news. Oh, yes, the "Campus" as usual was completely impartial. The Trotskyites were allowed 350 words in rebuttal. However, this extraordinary allocation of space to Schappes' distaste did not come as much of a surprise to those who had read Sussman's editorial "Trotsky After Dinner" two weeks before. Among other things, Sussman came to the conclusion that "Leon Trotsky and his followers are the advance agents of fascism and stimulants to war." This from the "Campus" -- a "liberal" newspaper.

Since that time the YCL and with it the "Campus" has come a long way. Now, together with the ROTC, the Hearst newspapers, and the Board of Higher Education, the YCL has joined the offensive against the Oxford Pledge. Dave Grant, one of the YCL heads, has publicly disavowed any opposition to the ROTC. In line with this the "Campus" has undergone a mysterious change. No longer do headlines triumphantly announce that 3,500 took the Oxford Pledge. Instead, insignificant type-lines at the bottom of stories drone, "The audience seemed about evenly divided in their sentiments." No longer do editorials point out, "Abolish the ROTC." That slogan, though not disavowed, has been silently packed away in mothballs -- for future reference -- perhaps.

But the attitude on Trotskyism remains the same -- only more so. For with the rightward rush toward social-patriotism, the YCL becomes increasingly vulnerable and when you are logically barren there is only one thing to do -- you shout epithets at the top of your lungs, over the roof-tops and far-away, so loud that all argument is impossible. And since it has become increasingly necessary for the Stalinists to shout about "Trotskyism" as a subterfuge for their own chauvinism, and since a too consistent use of the editorial columns of the "Campus" for this purpose might be a give-away, Sussman's "Set-Em Up" now provides a convenient avenue for airing the YCL line. And as a master of slander and outright falsification, Sussman should go down with the masters of history.

The "campus" in another example of decent journalism, accused the Pilsbury Club of being an organization for the dissemination (cont'd)
The Spirit of the U.S. Constitution

During the controversies of the past few years over the Constitution & the Supreme Court, provoked by Roosevelt's Court proposal & his New Deal laws, the fundamental question involved has been ignored. The most "progressive" critics suggested that the Supreme Court had misinterpreted the Constitution in the interest of reaction and that its powers should be curtailed and the Court "liberalized." Some even went so far as to say that the Supreme Court should be abolished. No one considered that the fault might lie within the Constitution itself and not in the Supreme Court.

Louis Boudin in "Science & Society" (Spring, 1937) says that the Supreme Court "exercises 2 functions: one, that of the highest court of justice, and the other, that of a supreme legislature." He claims that the latter function has been usurped by the court. He forgets that, like other "left-wing" writers, this "usurpation" of power was made possible by the Constitution and was desired by the framers of that document, some of whom were members of the Court when it first asserted its power. The No. 78 of the Federalist papers, universally accepted as representing the opinion of the Founding Fathers, we find the statement that "Limitations of this kind (limitations on the legislative authority) can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice, whose duty it is to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void." This statement denies the contention that the Court's power of review was usurped by Marshall, & shows that this right of judicial review to have been desired by the Founding Fathers.

Creating an all-powerful judiciary was only one of the means used by the authors of the Constitution to construct a bulwark against fundamental social change (the most explicit development of which was No. 10 of the Federalist Papers in which Madison spoke of the necessity of restraining & hampering democracy) the development of a system of check & balances makes control of the government impossible by a revolutionary majority in Congress. When we consider that there are 48 sovereign states which exercise many major government functions we realize that the Constitution must be destroyed in order to establish workers control. The suggestion, advanced by the Norman Thomas ballot-box school of "Socialism," that we attempt to amend the Constitution must also be discarded when we consider that a majority in the legislatures of the 13 least populated states can effectively prevent any constitutional amendment. The provision for amendment has successfully thwarted such elementary reforms as the child labor amendment. It would thus, be rather "difficult" to amend Socialism, or its legal basis into the Constitution.

Fundamentally, the Constitution rests upon, and in turn supports, the capitalist system of production. The political machinery of a Socialist State (or, since in strict Marxist terminology there is no such thing as a Socialist state, a workers state) resting upon the workers, organized in the factories & farms, must be suited to an economic organization of society radically different from the existing one today. The Constitution can provide neither the political machinery for a socialist society nor the means to achieve it. It must, as an outlive political manifestation of capitalism, together with its parent, capitalism be destroyed. Anything else is sheer utopianism.

Martin Harvey
Archives of the Revolution

(This letter, unimportant in itself, is a prophetic warning to Bukharin, the ally of Stalin in 1927; by Fishelev, a leading Bolshevik. Today what Fishelev predicted has come true: Bukharin rots in a GPU jail, a victim of the same Terroristic methods that he himself used against the Trotskyists.

"Archives of the Revolution" will be a permanent section of our magazine, reprinting basic documents of working-class history and theory.

Comrade Bukharin:

The case of comrade Fishelev impels me to write you. You have known Fishelev for twelve years; I for eighteen. I know that in his youth he was in the Russian social democratic party; that he was arrested as far back as 1906; that he remained in prison for two years, and that he was banished for life to Siberia, whence he escaped. When he arrived in the United States, he and comrade Voskov founded the journal "Novy Mir". When you arrived in New York and joined the editorial board, the paper had already become a daily. You yourself know how difficult it was to establish a paper under the conditions set down by American capitalism. You know at the beginning the small number of proletarians who published "Novy Mir" had to lend money out of their meagre wages, to write the articles and print them themselves after their day's work. In a word, you know that in America we expended the true Russian muscular power. And you know that Fishelev stood in the front ranks of those who fought for a new world, literally ("Novy Mir" means: new world).

In 1917 he worked in a Kharkov printshop and joined the Menshevik Internationalists (a group of left Mensheviks led by Martov, closely associated with Maxim Gorky's radical socialist paper "Novaia Zhizn" and on many issues friendly to the Bolsheviks Ed.). He was soon elected secretary of the Typographical Union of Kharkov, and in that capacity, organized the general strike of the printing trades workers during the German occupation. He was arrested for this by Jetliura's soldiers and would have been killed but for the solidarity of the workers who refused to return to work unless he was set free. Everywhere he worked as a true proletarian, vigorously and honestly. Now he is arrested and expelled from the party. Why?

Comrade Bukharin you who are a member of the Political Bureau, why do you arrest workers like Fishelev?

You were imprudent enough to print an article in your paper, in which Fishelev is accused of having published in New York the journal of Trotsky, "Novy Mir". But you and I, as members of the editorial board of "Novy Mir" also published the articles of Trotsky. Why do you forget that? Why do you neglect, as editor-in-chief to call yourself a Trotskyist? Because you go insane when faced with comrade Fishelev and those like him. He only printed the platform of the Opposition, a platform which rightly reflects the interests of the proletariat—and that is why Fishelev is now lying in a GPU prison while his family dies of hunger.
Comrade Bukharin, such a state of affairs is dangerous to the building of socialism. Socialism is inconceivable with the imprisonment of communist workers. How can you reconcile the chairmanship of the Communist International with the job of jailer of the best communists?

I know that it is part of your struggle of self defense. But you cannot frighten us off. Fishelev's place will be taken by a hundred others. You have fallen to such a low level of political degeneration, that the struggle in the ranks of our party before the congress has been conducted against the Opposition exclusively by violent practices. By expelling hundreds of communists from the party, you are trying to kill them politically. Every day you will be compelled to arrest more Bolshevik-Leninists. And why? So that your group may select the delegates to the eleventh congress (C.P.S.U.) and separate yourself completely from Leninism. But can a congress convoked under conditions have any authority in the disputed questions? And afterward? Have you ever asked yourself this question?

Do you remember the time when you were fighting Lenin, just before the Kronstadt rebellion had reached Leningrad? We who fought against you nevertheless organized meetings for you, printed your platform, and proportionately elected delegates to the congress. That's how we acted in Lenin's time, when you and Stalin didn't have the slightest power. Whereas today, armed men come to arrest Fishelev in his home. They seize a pamphlet containing the resolutions of the fourteenth congress. They triumphantly carry off the pamphlet and drag Fishelev along. They conduct him to the Central Control Commission, the purgatory before prison. He is probed at the G.P.U.:

"Where did you get the platform of the Opposition?"

"Who suggested the idea that you print it?"

And you, Comrade Bukharin, who gave you the idea of doing against Lenin all that Fishelev is doing now? Had we employed such methods then, do you think we would have come out of the discussion stronger and more united? Have you asked yourself: how will the party come out of this battle?

The problems that have arisen in the present party crisis must be discussed intelligently and freely by every party member. Only then will the discussion help the party and the revolution. Take care, Comrade Bukharin! You yourself have often fought against our party and probably you will some day have to carry on another fight against it. Examples are contagious.

Fishelev and other comrades are imprisoned. They have no right to receive food. They are deprived of all visitors. Their families starve. Evidently all this makes you happy. This forces me to make a gesture. Either you set free the workers who are with us in the fight for Leninism, or I shall print this letter by every means at my disposal and distribute it to the party membership. Arrest me for it! Only remember that from the prison our voice will reach deeper into the party and carry further.

This time without greetings,

Sergei ZORIN
TROTSKY'S LATEST BOOK

"The Revolution Betrayed": Leon Trotsky.—2:00.

The essential value of Trotsky's new book is in its analysis of the relationship of the Soviet bureaucracy to the economy of the Soviet Union as determined by the actions & conditions of the October revolution.

The tremendous growth of the productive forces gives promise of the still unfulfilled possibility of planned economy according to Trotsky. But this growth has occurred in contradiction to the increasing political usurpation of the bureaucracy, the growing economic inequality, the inroads upon many of the social relationships established by the October Revolution.

Trotzky correctly describes the origin of the bureaucracy in the isolation of the Soviet Union accentuated by the defeats of the working class caused by the reactionary national policy of Stalin. The obvious conclusion that Trotsky derives is the necessity for the extension of the October Revolution throughout the world and the elimination of the bureaucracy "at home".

In his customarily brilliant polemical style Trotsky defines the Soviet Union as a "workers state with bureaucratic degenerations" and calls for its defense both against world capitalism and Stalinism.

AND RUSSIA, ONCE AGAIN

"What Has Become Of The Russian Revolution?" by Yvon.—25 cents.

Once in a while a book like the present one is produced which suffers from a plethora of facts. The author has compiled more facts than he can integrate meaningfully.

The material in this book is important insofar as it demonstrates the absurdity of the Stalinist dictum: "Socialism has been achieved in the USSR". It shows the various devices thru which the Soviet citizen is deprived of his freedom and forced into subjection.

In yet another respect Yvon makes a serious contribution to the struggle against Stalinist distortions. By pointing out the gross inequalities in social privileges between the bureaucrats and the masses he dispels the fog spread by "Friends" of the "Happy Land".

But it is not sufficient to mass facts; it is necessary to understand them. Here Yvon fails.

Yvon's criticism of the present Soviet regime embodies a theoretical conclusion around which controversy has been raging: What is the nature of the Soviet state? All serious observers acknowledge it to be a degenerate state. Trotsky has among the first to answer this by characterizing the political structure of the Soviet Union. Yvon goes further by claiming that a new state form a new class has been established in Russia and that there exists state capitalism.

A book review cannot answer these questions, but it can raise some important questions that Yvon and his followers must answer more satisfactorily than they yet have: The socio-economic bases created by the October revolution still exist. The Soviet state therefore exists on the basis of proletarian rule. Does the political expropriation of the workers constitute a reversion to bourgeois rule? The traditional Marxist point of view that property relations determine the character of the state seems thus to be rejected by Yvon.

R. German

"Bread & Wine" by Ignazio Silone.$2.75.

Silone is one of the few modern writers who speak in strong significant accents, causing him to stand out above the current literary trends of sadism, dissipating realism (Romain), and "revolutionary" pap.

(continued on next page)
Silone (cont)

He has steadily grown in scope as a writer & has maintained his integrity as a revolutionary by his courageous refusal to bow to the Ikons of Stalinism. His new novel is a powerful, profound & provocative study of Italian life.

Despite the wracked misinterpretations given to it in the capitalist press, "Bread & Wine" is a tremendous attack upon bourgeois ideology, not an apology for liberalism.

Through the eyes of Pietro Spina, an exile returning for revolutionary work, we see the crumbling of the Italian intellectuals, their pathetic surrender to Fascism, their attempts to destroy their own spiritual consciousness.

But it is of the peasant that Silone writes best: their mute, helpless, yet heroic suffering. This is literature at its best.

The basis of Silone's success lies in the fact that he has combined the necessity of literary vision with that of a propagandist attack upon Fascism into one movement of thought.

Of his discussion of revolutionary tactics and of many other interesting questions he raises, nothing can be said here. For a fine discussion of that the reader is referred to Lionel Abels article in the first issue of "Partisan Review". Suffice it to say that this is one of the few books written today that has a chance to live.

M. Paul

HOME BRED STalinists!

"Spark" published by CCNY chapter of Young Communist League.

"Spark" pretty fine. Content pretty fine with the exception of two articles - a short story by Edgar Banton and an article on the plight of the tech man by Daniel Stone.

When the "Spark" gets political it misses fire. "Selarue" on collective security dishes out tripe.

defeating the fascist aggressors -- the usual excuse for supporting one set of "peaceful" satred nations against another "peace" hungry set.

John A. Weaver in his "Vituperation in the Aamoves" dishes out some unusual tripe about "Trotskyism". Vituperation is a correct title for a book that consists wholly of lies. -- that the YPFL calls the AUM a company union; that the "Trotskyites" discuss themselves under the name of YPFL. We do, of course use the additional designation of Fourth International to make sure that no one mistakes us for the Thomas-Blum-Morin type that we consistently espoused factionalism in the AUM then play tell if the Right Socialists, Lovestoneite Zionists, liberals etc. who composed the militant Progressive group were thus also... Trotskites.

One last gem deserves mention. There's a little crack headed "I'd Like To Seek At" via a Trotskyite leaflet attacking Hitler instead of Stalin. On Nazi Day a few weeks ago, there was out one organization demonstrating against Hitler the YW. Where was the YLD? Writing articles attacking Trotskyites-Fascists! D.R.

"PARTISAN REVIEW" DEC. 1943, 10 cents NEW SERIES.

Because of outrageous position which the editors of the old "Partisan review" held:it is not the poet's duty to supply the reader in advance with the historical solution of the conflicts he describes, they were in constant conflict with their own angel, the Communist Party. No, no, no. Hicks, Stalinist literary expert, they must follow the formula of Boy meets Strike, Strike spurns Boy, Strike wins Boy to Stalinism. All else is folly. If Dos Passos, who writes predominantly of despair, who fails to communicate the

(Continued on next page)

"NOTE: communism as good news".

S writes Hicks, CP literary expert. It is therefore necessary, he concludes, for revolutionary creative artists to concern themselves with the propaganda of Good News!
Communist conviction of the ultimate victory of the working class has a far more effective technique than the Stalinist hacks, it is only because it is much easier to write today of a mood of disgust and despair than to reflect the militancy of the proletarians. The only comment needed on such absurdity is that the formula-followers are not creative artists. They are wishful thinkers, intellectual masochists as it were, the ivory tower manifests itself in reverse. If the working class had any degree of militancy at present, they would not tolerate such balderdash.

Shortly after the Moscow trials the Stalinists closed the Partisan Review. Now the magazine has been reissued. The editorial statement will probably provoke more interest than the contents although the standard is excitingly high throughout. The editors, who have been subjected to the usual unprincipled vilification the Stalinists throw at anyone who decides that Stalin is not Father Divine, have come to the conclusion that the creative artist cannot affiliate himself to any political party. They point out that to become involved in factional struggle means either to cease functioning as artists or to break with the party. They point out that to cease functioning in factional struggles means either to cease functioning as artists or to break with the party.

The featured article is the first of a critical series which will concern itself with the ideas that shaped the work of men like Stendhal, Balzac, Rimbaud, Proust, Gide etc. The first article on Labor's politics is well done by Edmund Wilson. He has avoided the errors made by the "critics group" and not felt obliged to show that Labor was an unconscious Marxist.

The book reviews have one aspect especially interesting. Reviewers make a distinction between the objectives the author set up for himself and what they think of those objectives. The result is that you get clear literary evaluation with narrow confusion of literary value and political allegiance. Limitations of space prevent mention of numerous other features but it must by now be obvious that its appearance will be a relief to all who have been haunted by nightmares of poets and novelists walking around murmuring "Thank you, Father Peace, Browder is the sun."

For a different point of view on "Partisan Review" see the Socialist Appeal, Dec. 4.
of the views of Leon Trotsky" without taking notice that the "Campus"
had degenerated into an organ for the dissemination of the views of
Josef Stalin.

Not to be outdone, the editors of the "Campus" came out
with an editorial a week later entitled, "Not Marked Private". Af-
ter going into a prolonged theoretical discussion of the theory of
Permanent Revolution one sentence long, the editorial boldly says
of the Trotskyites, "They have found it part of their program to
collaborate with France to overthrow the People's Front government."
It was in the same editorial that the number of students listening
to Max Schachtman speak against war was referred to as "a scant
hundred-odd", while on the next page the news story reported 200.
Of course, 200 via Stalinist "logic" can be rationalized easily to
a hundred-odd, especially if it be convenient.

On October 5, of this term, however, Susman's "Rats is
Rats" even swings a little to the right of the party line. Borrowing
a leaf from Mussolini's Blackshirts, Susman advocates the use of
castor oil on the "rats", namely, the "Trotskyites". Writing of the
proposal to institute P. R. into the ASU, Susman assumes the air
of sweet Little Nell innocently stumbling into a den of thieves all
intent on rape. "I couldn't tolerate the guts of an evil-looking
gang which announces itself in advance as the Fourth Internation-
als. The gang contrived a phoney maneuver. They proposed propor-
tional representation for the ASU executive committe." And wasn't
that wicked? Naturally the mere fact that all other political groups
with the exception of the YCL supported P. R. didn't prevent "set-
Up" from nailing the "Trotskyites" to the cross.

The list of quotations could, of course, be extended ad
infinitum. However, that would be needless.

In this connection it is interesting to thumb through the
back files of the "Campus": -- I mean far back, before the war. Up
to 1915, the "Campus" was a liberal paper. But with the gradual
increase of war propaganda, the pressure brought upon it by many
powerful influences, the "Campus" slipped into its place in the huge
belt of the war machine. But the City College student was above the
average in intelligence. So refined lies, educated falsehoods, had
to be invented. No atrocity stories for City College. So "this is
not an imperialist war." thundered the Campus, "this is a war of the
democratic nations against the autocratic ones. This is a war of
democracy against autocracy!"

Perhaps some time in the near future when the unhappy day
is reached when the capitalist robbers of America must pick up the
gauntlet flung down by their Japanese brigand brothers, a Stalinist
ditor of the "Campus", weary of thinking up new slogans to get the
boys into uniforms, will look for inspiration to the Campus of 1917.
Then catching a glimpse of "This is a war of democracy against autoc-
cracy" he'll shout, "Why hero's just the thing Bill! And then taking
up his pencil he will cross out the word autocracy and write "fascism"
in its place..... So, armed with a brand new catchpenny, the dunder-
heads will march to war and get their guts blown out for United
States Steel Preferred.
"The Challenge of Youth"

--- Official Organ ---

Young Peoples Socialist League

"4th Internationalists"

$0.50 A YEAR $0.25 6 MONTHS

116 University Place N.Y.C.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The New International is the only organ in which you can find a record of the development and the tasks faced and performed by the movement of the Fourth International. 

...a magazine that gives a Marxist analysis of the American economic and political scene, of the problems of labor and the revolutionary movements...

Arts and letters are not the main field of our attention, but the literature dealt with in our book section is treated soberly and objectively from the standpoint of Marxist criticism.

RATES: $2.00 PER YEAR

THE VERBATIM REPORT OF THE HEARINGS OF THE DEWEY COMMISSION

"The Case Of Leon Trotsky"

IN MEXICO CITY

"This book is most readable. It contains Trotsky's final speech & summation which will, most likely, go down in history as one of the greatest indictments of all time."

- James T. Farrell

SPECIAL PRICE: $1.50

AT ALCOVE 1 OR LABOR BOOKSHOP - 28 EAST 12th ST.
CARToONS
Or Whatever You Want To Call Them

That ORGAN-GRINDER'S SWING

"He Who Pays The Piper"

"Me pop's A democrat, 'n his Old Man just wrote from the poor house for him to stick by the old party."

"Don Quixote"

Before They DIScovered "Comrade Roosevelt"

"O.K., It's All Very Simple--Our Little Group Simply Seize The Power House and The Radio Station."

Capt. Roosevelt Distributes The Life-Savers... to Capital
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Down with bosses war
For a workers world

The Oxford ROTC YCL
W. R. Hears

Et Tu, Brute?
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Goodby, Goodby

War Special
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Riding the rods