

POWERS IN UNDECLARED AGAINST WAR U.S.S.R.

Another Squeezed
Lemon For Stalin

AN EDITORIAL

The League of Nations has now proceeded to carry out the task for which it was originally created—to organize the international struggle against the workers and colonial peoples and against the Soviet Union.

Many people have wondered more than once, during the last ten years: why do the French and British empires continue to maintain this dedicated corpse of a League, which all the imperialists flout?

The answer is now at hand. The League serves its original purpose: war against the Soviet Union.

It is able to serve this purpose very effectively, thanks to Stalin. Workers all over the world were beginning to understand that the League was truly what Lenin called it: "a league of imperialist bandits." But five years ago Stalin took the Soviet Union into the League. He and his hirelings explained to the workers that the League had ceased to be a league of bandits, had transformed itself into an agency of peace. Stalin helped recapture for the League of Nations the trust and faith of millions of workers.

The League of Nations turns out to be another one of Stalin's "squeezed lemons"—a phrase made notorious twelve years ago, when Stalin boasted he would use Chiang Kai-shek until he had served his purpose and would then throw him away like a squeezed lemon. Instead Chiang Kai-shek used Stalin's support to massacre the Chinese revolution, then cast off Stalin.

So, too, the League of Nations. What it would not do, after months and even years of haggling, for Ethiopia, Spain, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the League in a single day did for Finland. In a single day the "peace" machinery of the League was organized into war machinery against the Soviet Union. What is Stalin's explanation? His organ, *Pravda*, blandly announces: "The League of Nations has been turned from an instrument of peace into an instrument of war."

Stalin lies in order not to take the responsibility for his "squeezed lemon." From the day it was formed until today the League was and is what Lenin called it: a league of imperialist bandits. War against the Soviet Union was from the first and is now its fondest dream. Its war against Germany becomes more and more a business of hammering Germany until Hitler, or his successor, joins the anti-Soviet front. It is able to take this road thanks to Stalin's help: for five years Stalin was the tool of the League, scattering and confusing the workers of the world who are the only force really capable of defending the Soviet Union against the capitalist world.

One more terrible proof that Stalin is dragging the Soviet Union to destruction! One more—perhaps the last—warning to the international workingclass to get rid of this monstrous despot who knows how to organize only defeats of the working class. Either the workers will overthrow Stalin and regenerate the Soviet Union in the spirit which once moved it, the spirit of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917—or the Soviet Union will go down under the blows of the imperialists.

The Soviet Union must be saved! It can become again what it was in Lenin's time: drill ground of the world revolution! In spite of Stalin's depredations, the economic conquests of the October Revolution still remain, living proof that the workers can oust the capitalists and transform private property into state property, the necessary economic system for the road to socialism. That nationalized property is the Soviet Union. That is what we must defend against the capitalist world and against Stalin.

Behind the Lines

By GEORGE STERN

All year long we are fed pap from the pulpits and the press, on the screen and over the air waves. But it takes Christmas to place all this sham in its proper setting of sharply chiselled contrasts.

All the preachers and all the preachers' men bleat about peace and goodwill. But the gossamer web of their phrases fails to cover a single gaping wound in the bodies of men rent apart on the battlefields. It fails to cover the shivering frames of the cold and starving millions.

Every day of every year men, women, and children are nailed to the cross of war and greed and privation. And on this under the pathetic figure of one such crucified man the preachers try to tell us again that this is all in the order of things, that this is part of the divinely-ordained beauty and mystery of life, that after the cup of pain shall come the soothing draft of salvation in a world better than man can build.

And with that we're supposed to pull in our belts and go back to another 364 days of dying,

killing, starving—whatever our masters decree we shall do.

The capitalist system that still rules the world offers in the reality of things bloody war and mass starvation, dressing it up with tinsel, rouging the lips of a death's head. You can't deal with carriers of deadly disease unless you drain out the swamps where they breed, and you can't do away with war and want unless you put an end to the capitalist order of things.

The same people, the same newspapers, politicians, preachers, writers, radio commentators, who fill the Christmas air with their dripping phrases about peace on earth are preparing to sweep the working men and women of this country into the holocaust of war.

But if we are to take the idea of peace on earth seriously, we've got to work with might and main to prevent them from doing so, and we'll do this by thrusting them from the seats of power and setting out to build a new kind of world.

STALINIST HOLD
SLIPPING IN
CIO UNIONSBrophy Joins Witch
Hunt; South Bend
Demands Ouster

By GEORGE CLARKE

The Stalinists have been walking a tight-rope in the unions since the Hitler-Stalin pact. We said that in the *SOCIALIST APPEAL* two months ago on the occasion of Lewis' announcement of the CIO purge. In the last two weeks several prominent Stalinist performers have fallen off the tight rope and into the net of the official bureaucracy.

First is the case of John Brophy. A few days ago Brophy turned up at a convention of the CIO United Retail and Wholesale Employees in Detroit and denounced the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany in the same breath. Speaking as a representative of John L. Lewis, he said:

"We condemn the brutality of a Nazi Germany on the march and we condemn a Soviet Union turned imperialistic."

Brophy's Record

Brophy was one of the leading Stalinist caucus engineers in the top circles of the C. I. O. The job of replacing good progressive organizers with incompetent and bureaucratic Stalinist agents was one of his special assignments. The defense of Communist party dictatorships in the CIO unions against the revolt of the rank and file was another little duty he performed. It was Brophy who engineered the appointment of Harry Bridges as west coast CIO regional director which resulted in driving out the progressive Sailors Union, splitting the labor movement there wide open and plunging it into the most violent internecine struggle.

Brophy's defection is a major blow for the Stalinists. For the progressive rank and file, however it can only mean the weakening of the Kremlin bureaucracy and the strengthening of the Roosevelt-Lewis bureaucracy. Brophy, as his jingo statement indicates, will be no less faithful in the service of Lewis than he was in the service of the Stalinists.

South Bend Sours on C. P.

The second defection is that of the South Bend CIO Industrial Union Council. A resolution was presented by the Studebaker Local 5, United Automobile Workers of America, and unanimously carried by the Council on Dec. 6, denouncing Stalin's invasion of Finland, urging that the Communist Party be removed from the ballot in state, county and Federal elections and prohibiting any "known member of the communist party from holding office in any St. Joseph county CIO local or any CIO affiliate which may exist in said county."

The chickens are coming home to roost—with a vengeance. South Bend was a stronghold of the Stalinists almost since the inception of the CIO. The Studebaker local was considered their private property. Now in the mass revulsion and disgust with Stalinism, the movement is catapulted in a reactionary direction. Beginning with justified indignation against Stalin's criminal methods in Finland, the resolution concludes, however, with a denunciation of the Soviet Union in the same words as the reactionary capitalist press: "the ideological brothers of the maniac Hitler and his crew of gangsters who now rule Germany . . . a policy of unlimited aggression and imperialistic methods." And finally the resolution reaches the reactionary conclusion of the Dies Committee: outlaw the Communist party.

Stalinism waged a war against militants and progressives in the trade unions. Its methods and policies fed the most reactionary against the Puffer-Hubbard furniture strikers; J. D. Holtzman, merchant, Republican leader, friend of the Nazis, who has

(Continued on Page 3)

Why Doesn't Their Charity Begin At Home?

WPA Strikers' Enemies Lead
'Finland Day' In MinneapolisHarrington Evasive in Answers
To Queries on Frameup Trial

MINNEAPOLIS, Dec. 17—Col. F. C. Harrington, head of the WPA, was here this week for a two-day conference with WPA officials and businessmen. The colonel talked glibly about every topic under the sun except the ONE topic that the workers of Minneapolis are interested in: the conviction of 33 WPA workers and the pending trials of the others—162 in all were indicted—for the "crime" of joining the nationwide WPA strike last July.

When reporters queried him for an opinion on the mass prosecutions, Harrington said: "We don't consider we have anything to do with that. That is fully in the hands of the Department of Justice." It certainly is—that's where Harrington and his chief, Roosevelt, put it.

Harrington got off a lot of hypocritical statements about what the War Deal has done for the unemployed. But he also let slip a few interesting facts. He admitted that the 18-months layoff clause, one of the chief measures which provoked the WPA strike, would be "seriously debated" in the next session of Congress. Of the 750,000 men and women laid off WPA under that clause, less than 20 percent have gotten back on WPA, the colonel admitted.

Anti-Laborites "Help" Finland
The Minneapolis Citizens Alliance gang—the union-busters who pressed for the prosecution of the WPA strikers and who are at this very moment fighting tooth and nail against providing relief to the army of the unemployed here—are busy these days providing relief—for Finland! Enemy No. 1 of organized labor, Governor Stassen, has proclaimed a "Finland Day". Mayor Leach, whose police are this very week being used as strikebreakers against the Puffer-Hubbard furniture strikers; J. D. Holtzman, merchant, Republican leader, friend of the Nazis, who has

been appointed Minnesota chairman of the Finnish Relief Fund; J. G. Byam, president of the Minnesota National Bank, vice president of the First National Bank and treasurer of the Finnish Fund; B. F. Andreen, anti-labor former department commander of the American Legion; Mrs. John Dalrymple, fashionable anti-laborite; Charles Bolles Rogers of the Van Dusen Harrington grain firm, heading the program committee for the Finnish Fund—these and all sorts of doctors and lawyers who have never been known in the history of this city to support ONE liberal cause, are out collecting relief for Finland.

Trotsky Statement On
Dies Backing Down

Mr. Dies' declaration December 12 on the reasons for his dropping the plan to have Trotsky come to the United States is absolutely false. Dies claims that he "failed to receive assurances from Mexico that Trotsky would be permitted to return to Mexico." Nobody is obliged to furnish such assurances to Mr. Dies, who is neither the President of the United States, nor the Secretary of State, nor a consular official. The United States consul in Mexico was given full assurances in written form by the Secretaría de Gobernacion of Mexico that I may freely go to the United States and return to this country. Dies' attempt to unload the responsibility for his change of mind upon the Mexican government is completely disloyal.

I was invited on October 12 by the Committee to appear before it at Austin, Texas, on November 12. I immediately requested two collaborators from the United States to help me locate the necessary documents, quotations, dates, to translate them into English, and so on, because I considered the role and duty of a witness in a case of such importance as very serious.

On November 2, the representative of the Committee, J. B. Matthews, informed my attorney, Mr. Goldman, that the hearings had been postponed to December between the tenth and fifteenth, but assured him at the same time that my appearance was assured "one hundred percent." Mr. Goldman, in full agreement with me, explained to Mr. Matthews, the Chief Investigator of the Committee, that my political aims of course had nothing in common with the reactionary political aims of Mr. Dies, that the only thing I could promise was to speak the truth. I am afraid that this was the reason why Mr. Dies dropped his plan. If I wished to give this a severe but authoritative characterization, I would call it a "sordid procedure."

Mr. Dies says that he may send an investigator to Mexico to "take Trotsky's statement." But I never invited his representative to Mexico, irrespective as to whether or not he presented me with an assurance that he would be permitted to return to the United States. I agreed only to make a public deposition before a Committee of the House of Representatives with the full possibility of elucidating all obscure questions through cross-examination. If Mr. Dies wishes my opinions in written form only, he can read my books.

L. TROTSKY

December 12, 1939
Coyoacan, D.F.League, Allied
Council, U. S.
Backing FinlandUndeclared War to Be Fought by Lending
Money, Arms, Planes to the Finns

Swiftly putting teeth into last week's action of the League of Nations against the Soviet Union, the Allied Supreme War Council, in a three-hour session Tuesday, decided—in the words of the Associated Press—"to give all moral and material aid possible to Finland without weakening its own war with Germany."

The decision means virtually war against the Soviet Union except that, as with so many of the wars in the last two decades, it is not officially declared.

The day before the Allied move, the United States left the stage of propaganda and "relief" and went on to direct war moves against the Soviet Union, with the announcement by Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the U. S. Navy, that more than forty of the latest and speediest fighting planes, built for the navy, were being released immediately to Finland.

That these planes were but the first shipment of arms with others to follow was indicated when Edison pointed out that because neither the Soviet Union nor Finland has declared war, the Neutrality Act provisions do not apply and therefore Finland can purchase arms here on credit. A "moral embargo" on the shipment of arms to the Soviet Union has been "requested" of manufacturers by Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Sending Troops Planned

The undeclared war was already indicated last week, after the League of Nations expelled the Soviet Union and urged its members to come to the aid of Finland, when the Associated Press reported from Geneva that "in high diplomatic quarters here it was suggested that foreign troops now idling in the allied armies may become fighting volunteers for the Finns. The idea of an International Brigade for Finland . . . began to leak out of the League corridor conversations. . . . Military experts said that the French were eager to find a wide open battleground and that the Baltic states and Western Russia might be viewed in Paris and London as the longest but easiest way around Germany's Siegfried Line."

SEEK AID FOR
FINNS, NONE
FOR RELIEFERSToledo Has Special
Day for "Poor
Little Finland"

TOLEDO, Ohio, Dec. 17—According to Governor Bricker, the Toledo-Cleveland relief crisis has been satisfactorily solved. The relief situation "is now in good shape," he told reporters in New York on the 15th.

Two days later the Toledo Times carried a story which completely refuted the governor. "Ninety-five families are facing immediate eviction from their homes because of nonpayment of rent." These are only the first victims, more are to come. For to the horrors of no relief have been added no payment of rent for relief clients. No, the relief situation is not solved, but on the contrary grows more acute daily.

For "lack of funds" the schools have been closed for a period of six weeks. To "solve" this problem, the Toledo Real Estate Board has proposed to cut away from the schools all the "frills"—by which they mean the kindergartens, health service, art, music, subject supervision, sick leaves for school employees, instruction in home economics and industrial arts, etc.

In the face of this atrocious situation, Mayor Roy C. Start, with the sanction of both the city council and the "substantial business elements", has issued a high-pressure plea for funds for . . . "poor little Finland!"

Even before the League action, the authoritative New York Times editorially declared: "Events are now moving with great speed, and setting in motion forces which, before they are spent, may radically change the whole nature of the war in Europe."

Among the "indignant democracies" coming to Finland's aid are Mussolini's Italy—not content with "student demonstrations" for Finland, it has sent already fifty bombers—France's Spain and Fascist Portugal.

The unexpected difficulties which the Red Army is experiencing in its invasion of Finland, ascribed by military experts to the disorganization of the Red Army by the loss of its leading personnel as a result of Stalin's purges, have enormously encouraged the swift development of the anti-Soviet moves.

With "poor little Finland" as a pretext, and immeasurably aided by Stalin's cynical and obviously false alibis for the invasion, the imperialists have moved against the Soviet Union with a brazen boldness which scarcely would have seemed possible a month ago.

This move of the imperialists was however, projected long before they found a pretext. At one stage or another of this war, it has been clear for years, the imperialists would attempt to forcibly smash the Soviet Union's monopoly of foreign trade and open to capitalist exploitation this area, closed to the capitalist world by the Russian Revolution.

In the Labor Unions

By B. J. WIDICK

The American labor movement is watching with considerable anxiety the fate of the union movements in England and France in the present war.

The facts of the situation in France have trickled into England and also America, and the story of the strangulation of the French labor movement is shocking. English unionists are wondering if the same tragic lot is in store for them. American unionists are confronted by similar thoughts.

Shop Stewards

Daladier and the French military machine recently ordered the abolition of the shop steward system, among other drastic decrees. This is like cutting the heart out of a body and expecting it to function.

The shop steward system has been recognized as the real life, the heart, and the backbone of a good union. In France, the creation and extension of the shop steward systems was one of the major victories of the famous 1936 sit-down strike.

Protection for the rank and file on the job comes primarily through the shop stewards. They negotiate and settle the day to day grievances that constantly irritate the workers.

In addition to that vital function however, the shop steward system in France was the basis for the workers committees that virtually took power in 1936—a fact that Daladier has not forgotten.

Daladier seeks to kill two birds with one stone in his order abolishing the shop steward system; break the backbone of the unions and prevent the workers from having committees capable of functioning in times of social unrest.

Daladier remembers too well how the shop committees became the embryo Soviets in 1936. It is this eventuality that he tries to block.

War Taxes

How much social dynamite is packed in the French industrial system is indicated by two other decrees of the Daladier government. All industrial workers have to "contribute" fifteen per cent of their wages to a war chest, and 40 per cent of all overtime is "contributed" to this fund.

Under the pressure of the rising costs of living on the one hand and the cut in wages on the other hand, combined with longer hours, speed-up, and accumulation of grievances, the French workers are building up a terrific resentment that will turn into a gigantic explosion. Not since the days of Louis Fourteenth have the French ruling classes been sitting on such a powder keg.

Is it a wonder that the French Foreign Legion and other picked colonial troops are "judiciously" distributed behind the front lines?

England Too?

The rank and file workers in England are worrying about the probability that the Chamberlain government, with the approval of the labor fakers, will further curtail the rights of the union movement under the guise of war emergency measures.

Do they also face the signing of a pact between the government and the labor bureaucrats which brings the application of compulsory overtime and wage cuts, coupled with longer working hours? Are concentration camps for militant workers, and forced labor under military control the next step in England? And are the shop committees in England going to be suppressed?

A story appeared last week that indicates how the English workers are feeling. Union bureaucrats agreed with an industrial concern not to press for the solution of certain grievances and a wage dispute. However, the rank and file through the shop committee organized a strike that was averted only with the greatest difficulty. The shop stewards are still sore about the sellout. Orders from the union bureaucrats are being disregarded. Another strike is threatened.

How many more of these events occurred which do not escape the censorship? Undoubtedly many. The seeds of unrest are inherent in the war production schedules.

COUPLE desires furnished room in Bronx with comrades. Write care of S. Stanley, 116 University Place, N.Y.C.

Trotsky On Lenin's Program

Editor, The New York Times
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

On November 25, The New York Times published a letter signed by John Stuart Hamilton which begins with the words: "Leon Trotsky's letter in The Times is replete with unproved insinuations."

A very serious accusation. You will permit me, I hope, to prove that it is false and to unmask in passing some of the methods by which Moscow and her agents bring into misapprehension an important section of public opinion throughout the whole world. This case is extremely favorable because the theoretic and political question touched upon in my letter has been, in and of itself, of great interest to every intelligent person regardless of his ideological tendencies; and because Mr. Hamilton—through ignorance or carelessness—seized a wire highly charged with disagreeable surprises for him as well as for his retainers, Stalin.

My letter contained the affirmation that Lenin and the whole Bolshevik party without a single exception considered it impossible to build a socialist society in one country, all the more so in one as backward as Russia; and that only at the end of 1924 did Stalin make an about-face of 180 degrees thereby branding his viewpoint of yesterday as "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism."

The political reason for Stalin's turn was that the Soviet bureaucracy had succeeded by that time in erecting their own "socialism," that is, in firmly assuring their power and well-being . . . in one country. This question long ago passed the bounds of internal Marxist discussion. It is not possible to understand either the evolution of the ruling party of the U.S.S.R. or the character of the present Soviet power's foreign policy if clear account is not taken of the question as to how and why Stalin and company broke with the tradition of Bolshevism on the question of the international nature of socialist revolution.

A SINGLE QUOTATION AND THAT ONE DISTORTED

In order to demonstrate that there was no break whatsoever, Mr. Hamilton takes the following quotation from Lenin's article written in 1915: ". . . The victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in a single capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production, would confront the rest of the capitalist world, attracted to itself the oppressed classes of other countries. . . and so on. These lines express nothing more than the elementary idea that the socialist revolution cannot surge up at the same time in all the countries of the world but must inevitably begin 'first' in a few or even in a single country."

By the "victory of socialism" Lenin means here, as is clear from the quotation, the conquest of power by the proletariat and the nationalization of the means of production but not at all the construction of an isolated socialist society. On the contrary, Lenin directly states that the conquest of power would place in the hands of the proletariat means for the development of revolution on an international scale. The whole argument of Mr. Hamilton like that of his Moscow teachers is based upon the identification of the victory of the socialist revolution with the construction of the socialist society. It is a grotesque sophism! More than once we called the October revolution a great "victory of socialism" but we saw in it only the beginning of a new historic epoch which over a period of generations would transform human society throughout the whole planet. The quotation contains no other meaning.

Is it moreover not astonishing that on the question of the construction of socialism in a single country Mr. Hamilton is incapable of finding anything aside from a falsely interpreted quotation of 1915? Power was conquered by the Bolsheviks in 1917. During the five years in which Lenin remained at the head of the Soviet nation he expressed himself innumerable times in speeches and articles about the conditions for realizing a socialist society. In my *History of the Russian Revolution*, Vol. III, pp. 738-418, I gave dozens of Lenin's pronouncements during the years 1917-1923. Permit me to quote a few of them here:

INSTANCES OF LENIN'S REAL POSITION

When departing for Russia after the February revolution, Lenin wrote in a farewell letter to the Swiss workers: "The Russian proletariat cannot with its own forces victoriously achieve the socialist revolution. But it can . . . improve the situation in which its chief, its reliable ally, the European and American socialist proletariat, will enter the

decisive battle."

On April 23 (1918) he said at a session of the Moscow Soviet: "Our backwardness has pushed us forward, and we shall perish if we cannot hold out until we meet a mighty support on the part of the insurrectionary workers of other countries."

"For us it is easy to begin a revolution and harder to continue it," he said in May (1918). "In the west it is harder to begin a revolution but it will be easier to continue."

On the third anniversary of the October revolution, Lenin confirmed this: "We always staked our plan upon an international revolution and this was unconditionally right. . . We always emphasized the fact that in one country it is impossible to accomplish such a work as a socialist revolution."

At the tenth Congress of the Russian Party, March 1921, Lenin explained: "In Russia we have a minority of workers in industry and an enormous majority of petty land-owners. In such a country the social revolution could achieve its final success only . . . on condition of its timely support by a social revolution in one or several advanced countries. . ."

THE DEWEY COMMISSION DECISION ON THIS

Mr. Hamilton refers to the fact that Lenin's quotation of 1915 is "familiar" to me and that consequently I am hiding it consciously from the readers of The New York Times. As a matter of fact, I am acquainted not only with this quotation but with Lenin's work in general and with his whole historical conception. For the agents of the Kremlin, Lenin is reduced to a falsified quotation from 1911. The thing went so far that Prosecutor Vyshinsky introduced the 1915 quotation in his indictment against me and others.

This necessarily made it the object of a special research by the Commission of Dd. John Dewey in its investigation of the Moscow trials. One can disagree with John Dewey and his collaborators in the sphere of philosophy and politics, that is precisely the case with me, but there is scarcely one reasonable man in the world who would dare to deny the outstanding intellectual honesty of John Dewey, without mentioning his capacity to analyze textual matters. His collaborators: Professor Edward Alsworth Ross, John Chamberlain, Suzanne LaFollette, and the others are of high intellectual and moral qualifications. A more authoritative investigation, especially for American public opinion could not have been made. Here are the findings of the Commission on this particular point:

"Lenin's article (1915) . . . can be taken to mean that socialism can be definitively established in a single country only if one leaves out the crucial phrase 'at the beginning' (or 'first' in the quotation cited by Mr. Hamilton) and wrenches the quotation from its context in the matter under discussion: (2) that Trotsky and Lenin are in essential agreement that the socialist revolution can begin on a national basis but that it will be completed internationally. . ."

And further: "A careful study of the relevant historical material has convinced this Commission that Lenin's actual view on this subject was that while the socialist revolution could triumph initially in a single country, it could not be ultimately successful without the aid of successful socialist revolutions elsewhere. . . We are not in the least concerned with the correctness of Lenin's view. What does concern us is (1) that the Prosecutor falsified Lenin's position; and (2) that Trotsky, far from opposing Lenin on the question of 'socialism in one country' was in essential agreement with him. Obviously, if Trotsky had not held this position he would have opposed instead of vigorously supporting the October Revolution." (My emphasis—L.T.) (Not Guilty. Report of Dewey Commission, Harper & Brothers; New York, 1938, pp. 343, 348.)

HOW STALIN TRIED TO CHANGE LENIN'S THOUGHT

The initiative for the falsification belongs however not to Vyshinsky but to Stalin. In April 1924 in a pamphlet entitled "The Foundations of Leninism" Stalin wrote: "The overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the power of the proletariat in one country alone does not, per se, mean the complete victory of socialism. The chief task, the organization of socialist production, still lies ahead. Can this task be performed, can the final victory of socialism be gained, in one country alone, and

Existence of Opposition In U.S.S.R. Revealed by Soviet Newspapers

It is becoming more and more difficult to penetrate behind the thick veil of secrecy and official verbiage of the Stalinist Russian press, which now arrives weeks late. The newspapers are filled with glowing reports of successes in every field, peasants to Stalin—with the war news pushed to the background. The official tone is that of "calm assurance", "optimism" and "invincibility".

Interspersed with these ritualistic reports, however, are extremely cautious comments which supply a key to the real situation. Hints are forthcoming of the fact that industry and agriculture are suffering from many grave weaknesses. Who is to blame? No longer do we hear that it is the fault of "wreckers" etc. Nor does the blame fall on the indiscipline and backward elements. Not at all. Local and regional directing bodies are blamed, especially the party organs. We cite only the latest instance at hand of this new approach. In discussing lags in collective farms, *Pravda* has the following to say:

"Everything is unloaded on the shoulders of the collective farmers, but the leaders of the region and of the collectives seek in every way to shield themselves. Yet the real reasons for the lag of the collective farm . . . are rooted in nothing else but the inept leadership of the labor force both on the part of the regional leaders as well as of the administration of the collective itself. . . Leaders of no small number of other regions can easily lay bare these evils among themselves, if they seek seriously to study the rea-

sons for the lag of this or another collective in their territory." (*Pravda*, November 21, 1939).

THE EXISTENCE OF DISSIDENTS REVEALED BY PRESS
This drive against the local party leaders is undoubtedly closely connected with the recent party purge which was in part a blow against opposition to the Stalin-Hitler pact. Very frequent reference has been made in the press to those who adopt an "oversimplified approach to Marxism" and a "onesided view on the methods of struggle against Fascism." At whom are these words directed if not at the opponents of Stalin's latest policy?

The clearest indication of actual opposition to Stalin's moves is to be found in the pages of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, the official organ of the Soviet Young Communist League. In issue No. 213 of this paper it is stated that in the ranks of the party and especially the youth are to be found many "scholastics and muddleheads who seize on the letter of Marxism and hold the view that such things as communism and the (existence of) the army are incompatible." The involved and cautious comment nevertheless makes it quite clear that there is disapproval of the use of the Red Army in the execution of Stalin's foreign policy; that is, the invasion of Poland! This is attacked as the viewpoint of Trotskyites and Bukharinites. And the *Komsomolskaya Pravda* warns the dissidents to bear in mind the fate of the "Trotskyites, Bukharinites and Gamarniks."

The inclusion of Gamarnik's name in this instance is of special significance. Gamarnik was head of the Political Department of the Red Army, purged together with the other Marshals of the Red Army. The "fate of the Gamarniks" is of particular meaning to the Red Army ranks where thousands have been purged on that very charge. It can only be a warning to dissidents within the Red Army itself!

Industry still suffers from acute labor shortage. Since September there has been a consistent campaign in favor of lengthening the working day. Supplementing it, has been a campaign to draw in women into industry and to remove "outdated" restrictions for the employment of women in the heavy industries. Out of the 37,000 unemployed in the city of Lvov (recently sovietized) some eight thousand were removed to the Don Basin to work in the mines. (*Pravda*, November 21).

The situation in the coal industry has not improved. The leading article in *Pravda* for November 12 places the responsibility for the "shortcomings" in coal production on the regional heads and the administration.

Miliukov's paper, *Poslednyaya Novosty*, (published in Paris) carried an interesting interview with a recent "arrival" from Moscow who stated that Molotov and Zhdanov did not expect the outbreak of war and refused to believe the war news when first reported. (*Poslednyaya Novosty*, September 22, 1939).

Without the joint efforts of the proletarians in several of the most advanced countries? No, this is out of the question. The history of the Russian Revolution shows that the proletarian strength of one country alone can overthrow the bourgeoisie of that country. But for the final victory of socialism, for the organization of socialist production, the strength of one country (especially a peasant country, such as Russia) does not suffice. For this, the united strength of the proletarians in several of the most advanced countries is needed. . . ("Leninism," by Joseph Stalin. New York: International Publishers, 1928, pp. 52-53.)

Stalin concluded this explanation with the words: "Such, in broad outline, are the characteristics of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution."

By the end of the same year he changed this explanation to read as follows: "Having consolidated its power, and taking the lead of the peasantry, the proletariat of the victorious country can and must build a socialist society." Can and must! And this diametrically contradictory explanation of Lenin's position ends with the same words: "Such, in broad outline, are the characteristics of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution." Thus during the lapse of half a year Stalin ascribed to Lenin two diametrically opposed conceptions on the most fundamental question of revolution. Yagoda, the chief of the G.P.U. was commissioned to prove the correctness of the new point of view.

Mr. Hamilton tried to accuse me of the concealment of one quotation from Lenin—we have just seen with what success. I accuse the Comintern school not of the concealment of one quotation but of the systematic falsification of ideas, facts, quotations in the interests of the Kremlin ruling clique. A codified collection of such a series of falsifications, *The History of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.*, has been translated into all the languages of civilized mankind, and published in the U.S.S.R. and abroad in tens of millions of copies. I take upon myself to prove before any impartial commission that in the library of humanity there is not a single book more dishonest than this "History" which serves now not only as the basis of political propaganda but also as the directive for Soviet painting, sculpture, theater, films, and so on. Unfortunately one can be certain in advance that my opponents will not accept my challenge.

L. TROTSKY

December 6, 1939
Coyoacan, D.F.
Mexico

sons for the lag of this or another collective in their territory." (*Pravda*, November 21, 1939).

THE EXISTENCE OF DISSIDENTS REVEALED BY PRESS
This drive against the local party leaders is undoubtedly closely connected with the recent party purge which was in part a blow against opposition to the Stalin-Hitler pact. Very frequent reference has been made in the press to those who adopt an "oversimplified approach to Marxism" and a "onesided view on the methods of struggle against Fascism." At whom are these words directed if not at the opponents of Stalin's latest policy?

The clearest indication of actual opposition to Stalin's moves is to be found in the pages of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, the official organ of the Soviet Young Communist League. In issue No. 213 of this paper it is stated that in the ranks of the party and especially the youth are to be found many "scholastics and muddleheads who seize on the letter of Marxism and hold the view that such things as communism and the (existence of) the army are incompatible." The involved and cautious comment nevertheless makes it quite clear that there is disapproval of the use of the Red Army in the execution of Stalin's foreign policy; that is, the invasion of Poland! This is attacked as the viewpoint of Trotskyites and Bukharinites. And the *Komsomolskaya Pravda* warns the dissidents to bear in mind the fate of the "Trotskyites, Bukharinites and Gamarniks."

The inclusion of Gamarnik's

name in this instance is of special significance. Gamarnik was head of the Political Department of the Red Army, purged together with the other Marshals of the Red Army. The "fate of the Gamarniks" is of particular meaning to the Red Army ranks where thousands have been purged on that very charge. It can only be a warning to dissidents within the Red Army itself!

Industry still suffers from acute labor shortage. Since September there has been a consistent campaign in favor of lengthening the working day. Supplementing it, has been a campaign to draw in women into industry and to remove "outdated" restrictions for the employment of women in the heavy industries. Out of the 37,000 unemployed in the city of Lvov (recently sovietized) some eight thousand were removed to the Don Basin to work in the mines. (*Pravda*, November 21).

The situation in the coal industry has not improved. The leading article in *Pravda* for November 12 places the responsibility for the "shortcomings" in coal production on the regional heads and the administration.

Miliukov's paper, *Poslednyaya Novosty*, (published in Paris) carried an interesting interview with a recent "arrival" from Moscow who stated that Molotov and Zhdanov did not expect the outbreak of war and refused to believe the war news when first reported. (*Poslednyaya Novosty*, September 22, 1939).

Without the joint efforts of the proletarians in several of the most advanced countries? No, this is out of the question. The history of the Russian Revolution shows that the proletarian strength of one country alone can overthrow the bourgeoisie of that country. But for the final victory of socialism, for the organization of socialist production, the strength of one country (especially a peasant country, such as Russia) does not suffice. For this, the united strength of the proletarians in several of the most advanced countries is needed. . . ("Leninism," by Joseph Stalin. New York: International Publishers, 1928, pp. 52-53.)

Stalin concluded this explanation with the words: "Such, in broad outline, are the characteristics of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution."

By the end of the same year he changed this explanation to read as follows: "Having consolidated its power, and taking the lead of the peasantry, the proletariat of the victorious country can and must build a socialist society." Can and must! And this diametrically contradictory explanation of Lenin's position ends with the same words: "Such, in broad outline, are the characteristics of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution." Thus during the lapse of half a year Stalin ascribed to Lenin two diametrically opposed conceptions on the most fundamental question of revolution. Yagoda, the chief of the G.P.U. was commissioned to prove the correctness of the new point of view.

Mr. Hamilton tried to accuse me of the concealment of one quotation from Lenin—we have just seen with what success. I accuse the Comintern school not of the concealment of one quotation but of the systematic falsification of ideas, facts, quotations in the interests of the Kremlin ruling clique. A codified collection of such a series of falsifications, *The History of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.*, has been translated into all the languages of civilized mankind, and published in the U.S.S.R. and abroad in tens of millions of copies. I take upon myself to prove before any impartial commission that in the library of humanity there is not a single book more dishonest than this "History" which serves now not only as the basis of political propaganda but also as the directive for Soviet painting, sculpture, theater, films, and so on. Unfortunately one can be certain in advance that my opponents will not accept my challenge.

Have the Time of Your Life!

at the

NEW YEAR'S REVEL

Entertainment and Dance

Saturday Eve.

December 30

at 8:30 P. M.

IRVING PLAZA

Irving Place & 15th Street

TICKETS (in advance) 49c

AT DOOR 65c

Aspices:

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, N. Y. DISTRICT

116 University Place

YPSL XMAS SOCIAL—916 9th Ave., at 59th St. Meet you under the mistletoe at the greatest affair yet. Dancing, refreshments, entertainment. Admission, 25 cents. Aspices, New York Division YPSL.



Comrade Editor:

The return of the Appeal to once-weekly publication can only signify for us an unfortunate and inopportune retreat. At this time, on the very eve of a world war, it is absolutely imperative that we reach an ever greater number of workers with our message and our program. The Appeal, as the best bearer of that message and program, should, nay must, receive a wider and wider circulation among the working classes. Every comrade worth his salt will agree with me on this.

What has caused this retreat? I would lay the blame primarily upon the branches and not the National Office. Let me cite the case of Toledo (with which I am most familiar) as an example.

During the time I have been in the branch (approximately a year) we have most certainly not taken the paper into the workers' neighborhoods. I can't offer any excuses; we just failed to perform this fundamental task.

For a short period during the anti-Coughlin campaign we sold the Appeal on the downtown streets. At the expiration of the campaign we relapsed back into our old lethargy. Whenever the Appeal bill began to assume alarming proportions we threw a party or social and managed to send in a few dollars. Then, with sighs of relief at the narrowness of the escape, we went back into our comfortable inertia. In most respects we had a first-rate branch. We conducted classes, discussion groups and the like, our attendance was regular, our morale good, and we had an excellent proletarian composition.

But our definite and most paralyzing weakness was the inability to activate the comrades in this one all-important respect: taking our paper into the homes of the workers!

About three weeks ago, by dint of concerted effort and determination, we succeeded in breaking out of the rut. How did we do it? I'll tell you. First by establishing definitely who was and who was not exempted from the job. Heretofore everybody had claimed exemption on one pretext or another. Clearly, all were not entitled to exemption. After the members who had legitimate reasons for exemption were determined we found that we had a few who could go out and sell. The next step was a motion that we mobilize on the following Sunday morning at ten sharp. On the motion leading branch comrades spoke of the absolute necessity of such action. Motion passed unanimously. Next Sunday at ten sharp five comrades showed up. They disposed of the papers on hand in a little less than twenty minutes with enough money collected to more than defray the cost of the papers. Last Sunday we had seven comrades on the job. Next Sunday we feel confident that every available comrade will be on hand.

The ice has been broken, distribution turns out to be very simple and doesn't take over an hour or so, and the comrades actually get a kick out of it! Which all proves that the Appeal can be circulated.

I take the liberty to speak in this manner because I know from personal experience that the Socialist Appeal is today better received by workers than our press has been in any former period. Oakland, Calif.

Elsie Meyers

I want to urge every branch in the country that has difficulty in solving this problem to try our tactics. (1) Exempt only those who have very valid excuses; (2) let the leading comrades (this is most important!), the executive committee, etc., set the pace and show by example what can and must be done; (3) impress upon every member the vital necessity of carrying on this work.

I stated above, the primary reason for our retreat lies in the failure of the branches, by and large, to carry on their share of the work. However, the National Office is not entirely blameless. As the letter from comrade Curtis testified, the Appeal in the not-too-distant past has not been very suitable for popular consumption. The headlines devoted to Shachtman's councilmanic campaign etc., are a case in point. The last several issues have been decidedly improved, which shows that the staff is following our criticisms and profiting by them. It's up to us now. Comrades, it can be done, let's do it.

DOYLE CLARK

Toledo, Ohio

WORKERS READ APPEAL—IF THEY'RE REACHED

Editor:

In a recent issue of the Appeal, C. Curtiss discusses the problem of Appeal sales. While his letter contains some concrete suggestions of value, it appears to me that many of the statements in the letter are unjust. I do not believe it to be true as Curtiss says that a worker will not read our paper twice.

I have covered some local trade union meetings with the Appeal consistently for the last three months selling from 15 to 25 papers at each meeting and repeating sales to the same workers week after week.

Perhaps if Curtiss would check on the local situation which he discusses, he may find that insufficient effort has been made to sell our paper to the same group of workers consistently.

Capable and nationally known leaders of our party often travel hundreds of miles for the opportunity of speaking to no greater number of workers than a capable and devoted comrade can interview while selling the Appeal at union meetings. There is too much of a tendency to relegate the sale of the Appeal to just anybody, instead of seeing in it an opportunity for capable comrades to contact workers. The problem of improving our paper is an important one but in addition, we must realize that our paper, not any more than any of our comrades, can succeed in contacting workers unless they consistently go to those workers at their places of meeting and do not expect the workers to come to the party office for their paper.

There are lots of people in this town trying to organize progressive unions, but it isn't easy to build healthy unions in a town, where your leaders are either killed, jailed, or badly beaten and chased out of town, and many of the people who are for them (especially the CIO) have had very little or no union experience and are all waiting for someone else to tell them how to do it.

Several likely looking movements started in this town recently, but they are all suffering from New Dealitis.

As soon as enough people here discover that the NLRB is not a Board whose sole purpose is to help the workers organize, but is just an organ created for the purpose of preventing strikes, even this town can become a good union town.

Let's hear from a few Southern workers occasionally.

Just call me Memphis

Memphis, Tenn.

Editor:

I never see any letters from Southern workers in the Forum, but I know you must have some readers in the South because I have met some in this town. If you have them here, you must have them in other places in the

HUGO POLLOCK, Secy. Non-Partisan Committee For the Defense of Fred E. Beal.

Editor:

I never see any letters from Southern workers in the Forum, but I know you must have some readers in the South because I have met some in this town. If you have them here, you must have them in other places in the

South, because they do not make places much tougher for workers and progressives than Crump's Memphis.

I suppose people in other parts of the country think that workers here like to be slaves and do not care to build any unions, but that is not so. We, no more than workers in the East and West, want to be slaves, but circumstances over which we have no control have made this a tougher spot to unionize than the East and West.

There are lots of people in this town trying to organize progressive unions, but it isn't easy to build healthy unions in a town, where your leaders are either killed, jailed, or badly beaten and chased out of town, and many of the people who are for them (especially the CIO) have had very little or no union experience and are all waiting for someone else to tell them how to do it.

Several likely looking movements started in this town recently, but they are all suffering from New Dealitis.

As soon as enough people here discover that the NLRB is not a Board whose sole purpose is to help the workers organize, but is just an organ created for the purpose of preventing strikes, even this town can become a good union town.

Let's hear from a few Southern workers occasionally.

Just call me Memphis

Memphis, Tenn.

The Negro Question

By J. R. JOHNSON

Ethiopia 1935, Finland 1939. What is being done for "brave little Finland," and what was not done for Ethiopia, is causing some bitter reflections among Negroes. P. L. Prattis, Pittsburgh Courier columnist, expresses a widespread sentiment in the issue of December 16th:

"England is reported sending airplanes and other equipment to Finland. Did she send any to Ethiopia? . . . The United States is eager to play a hand. Recall our ambassador from Russia, our indignant leadership demands. All right. Recall the ambassador. Let us do anything we can to show our disapproval of Russia. But what did we do about the Ethiopians? Did anybody demand that we recall our ambassador to Italy? Did anybody become concerned enough to urge that we try to help Ethiopia? Indeed not? This is his conclusion. And he began:

"However hopeful dark people may try to be, things are happening every day to show us just how hopeless is our cause and plight. Nobody cares a great deal about us. That doesn't mean just in the United States nor does it mean dark people in the United States alone. It means that in the entire world in which we live the folk with dark skin aren't considered. Maybe this obvious, but sometimes things happen that make you feel it all the more keenly. If you are looking out over the world, incidents, tragic incidents, occur which get you down."

No Time For Tears!

Mr. Prattis's tears do not deserve even the loan of a dirty handkerchief. Negroes have shed many tears in the past, with good cause, but if in 1939 they are going to shed new tears whenever they have new proof of the treachery of what Mr. Prattis calls "England" and "the United States," then they had better all trek to the Grand Canyon and sit in a row on both sides. There they can appoint Prattis tear-master and cry to their hearts' content without the risk of causing floods.

What infinite stupidity is this! Who expects England to be friendly to an African state? England is the greatest oppressor of Negroes that history has known. Today England is chief jailer over sixty million blacks in Africa. Of the twenty billion British dollars invested overseas, five billion are invested in Africa. That is the only interest England has in Africa.

Come nearer home. Let Prattis dry his tear-filled eyes and look about him. Doesn't he read his own article, his own paper? Has he read the history of the Negro people in America? Presumably, before he started to cry so much he used to. Did Abe Lincoln love Negroes or hate slave owners? Prattis knows. And yet he comes weeping and wailing because the United States government didn't help Ethiopia and now helps "poor little Finland."

Aesop Knew the Answer

Let Mr. Prattis buy a copy of Aesop's fables. There are many copies for children, with large print, which he will be able to read despite his present infirmity. On page 1 he will decipher the following fable: "Once upon a time there were lots of lambs and a few tigers. Every day each tiger would eat a lamb, and sometimes the tigers would fight with each other as to who should have a fat, juicy lamb. One day one of the tigers ate a little black lamb. Whereupon another little black lamb (his name was Prattis) called all the other black lambs together and, his eyes streaming with tears, said, 'Isn't it a shame? Those tigers over there allowed this bad tiger to eat up this poor black lamb. It is because he is black. Boo-hoo!'"

England and France, by which we mean British imperialism and French imperialism, stood by and watched Italian imperialism rape Ethiopia. Why? Simply because it is the nature of imperialism to gorge its appetites on all colonial countries. What they were quarreling about was not whether the little black lamb should be eaten, but who should get the choice parts.

In 1936 a great revolution of the workers and peasants burst in Spain. Germany and Italy pounced on Spain, to help Franco and gain concessions for themselves. And what did the other imperialist tigers do? Chamberlain, the British Tory, declared for non-intervention. So did Blum, the French labor leader. Roosevelt, the New Dealer, clapped an embargo on arms to Spain. Stalin, the bureaucrat and murderer of Bolsheviks and Bolsheviks, sold some arms to Spain—but on the condition that the workers and peasants would not abolish landlords and capitalists. You have only to look at a map to see how dangerous it was for British and French imperialism to have German and Italian imperialism dominant in Spain. But the "democratic" imperialists were prepared to allow even that, rather than give arms to the workers and peasants, who might conquer Franco and transform "democratic" Spain into socialist Spain.

Not a Color Question

Then Britain and France sold out Czechoslovakia. Suppose someone had said, "It is because the Czechs are white." Wouldn't Prattis have laughed at him as an idiot?

But by this time Germany was becoming too strong. So that these tigers, who didn't lift a finger for "Poor little Ethiopia," or "Poor little Spain," or "Poor little Czechoslovakia," are now weeping almost as much as Prattis over "Poor little Finland." Back of this there is another more fundamental cause. All imperialists (Hitler included) hate Stalin. So when they yell "Poor little Finland," what they mean is "Down with Russia." But one way or the other, it is all a matter of imperialist power.

And any Negro who seeks to defend Finland against Russia, along with Roosevelt, Hoover, Mussolini, and the rest, is making himself the ignorant tool of imperialism. That is the truth. And all the tears of Mr. Prattis will not wash out a word of it. The moment you begin to look at world politics from the point of view of black against white, you end up either in the imperialist camp of loot and slaughter or the Prattis camp of tears and despair.

There is a third camp. Turn your back on imperialist politics. Follow the road to the socialist revolution. A long road? A hard road? Yes. But is there any other road? The workers and peasants in Czechoslovakia, in Spain, in Ethiopia, looked for help to the imperialists. And where are they today?

Indian Left Wing Flays Ghandi

By SHERMAN STANLEY

The struggle of India's 375,000,000 people for their freedom from British tyranny is centered today in the struggle between the contending wings of the Indian Nationalist Congress.

The conservative right wing, headed by Mahatma Gandhi, indulged in much radical talk and threats for a while, but has again staged a treacherous retreat and is doing its utmost to prevent any action. Utilizing the false grounds that the country is not prepared for a campaign of civil disobedience, Gandhi is pushing for further negotiation with the British authorities.

Subhas Chandra Bose, former president of the Congress, spokesman for the left-wing Nationalists, has lately issued a statement blasting Gandhi and his supporters from stem to stern. It is one of the bitterest denunciations of the Gandhi leadership ever to be made. In his statement Bose accused Gandhi of sabotaging the desire of the Indian people to struggle and of dissipating the revolutionary energies of the masses.

Of still greater significance was Bose's statement that the Congress left wing would not go along with the Gandhists unless they immediately adopted a program for action. Bose stated that the left wing would go forward on its own, regardless of Gandhi's attempted sabotage. He likewise accused Gandhi—and correctly so—of more violently opposing the Congress radicals than the British imperialists.

No Support To Britain!

The Congress Socialist Party, India's leading radical party, in a statement criticizing the Gandhi leadership for attempting to bargain with the British on the issue of the war, has declared: "We cannot conceive of any gesture or concession on the part of the British Government that could possibly justify the Congress in supporting the imperialist war."

This viewpoint genuinely represents the sentiments of all Indian radical workers. No support to the British under any circumstances!

Meanwhile, the struggle of the masses continues. In the city of Jubbulpore, 100 natives were killed and wounded by British police—who were exercising their democratic right to murder unarmed people—when they held a demonstration protesting against rising food prices produced by the drainage of India's food supplies for British war needs. Pravda, publication of the Soviet Russian government, reports "mass arrests" of Congress radicals are now going on.

Figures released by the British authorities dealing with strikes for the first six months of this year reveal the growing activities of India's working class. There were 109 strikes, involving 100,000 workers. A total of 1,580,000 working days were spent in these strikes. Textile and jute workers accounted for 40% of the strikes and 62% of the workers involved. The figures for the last six months of 1939 will run far higher.

Stalinist Hold Slipping in CIO

(Continued from Page 1)

A third blow for the Stalinists was the defection of the top leaders of the Communist Party fraction of Local 22 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in New York. Expelled from the Communist Party were: Ben Gerjoy, Sol Lipnack, Hyman Grossman, Meyer Kravetz—all business agents; Morris Rosenberg, executive board member and Abe Fell and Isidore Gross—adjustors.

The official C. P. statement on the expulsion accuses the expelled of "wavering in the face of the war danger." The statement of the expelled counters with an accusation that the Stalinists demanded they put their party interests over the interests of the union. Neither statement tells the story.

End of the "United Front"

The statement of the expelled says nothing about the Stalin-Hitler pact, nor about Stalin's invasion of Finland, nor about their stand on the pro-ally resolution of the American Labor Party. But their opposition to the Stalinists is a direct result of these events. Up until the Stalin-Hitler pact and the new turn of the Communist party the expelled business agents, following the Stalinist line, were in a united front administration with the Lovestonites manager of the local, Charles S. Zimmerman. They were preparing a united front slate again with Zimmerman prior to the Stalin-Hitler pact. Under the conditions of the "new

line" they were instructed to break with Zimmerman and go into opposition. They balked. Hence the expulsion.

Zimmerman says in a statement that the "new line" of the Stalinists "is most injurious." True. But was the old line, the rotten popular front that made the unions an adjunct of the War Deal Roosevelt administration any less injurious? Or is the mere fact of unity with the Zimmerman administration sufficient to "make them (the business agents) more welcome to the dressmakers"?

Which Way Now?

By breaking with the Stalinists, the business agents took a step in the right direction. But that was an easy step at a time when Stalinism is as popular as a crateful of skunks. The question is: where do they stand today? Obviously, their denial of the infamous Stalinist charge is true. The C. P. charged they had "deserted to the camp of the Lovestonites, Trotskyites, and Social Democrats, the pro-war, Red-baiting stooges of the bosses and the Dies Committee against the best interests of the working class." Only an Egyptian contortionist could possibly get into all those camps at the same time—and even he would have his difficulties.

Having denounced the Stalinists, the expelled business agents owe the class conscious workers an answer on their position towards the social patriots of the I. L. G. W. administration. Have

Prosperity Is Here! Don't You Know It Yet?

Prosperity came back to this country last month. Industrial production in November broke all records, soaring to 125 in terms of the Federal Reserve Board's official index. In the boom year of 1929 the index was 119.

BUT labor-saving machinery, other technological advances and, last but not least, new methods of speed-up which squeeze the most out of a workingman in the shortest possible time, make it possible for the bosses to produce more today than in 1929 with fewer and fewer workers. In addition, the sons and daughters of the workingmen insist on being born and growing up.

So, the new peak of production means—

At least ten million eating their hearts out for non-existent jobs—

Less relief than ever since 1932—

Hunger and outright starvation in every part of the country.

But what are you kicking about? Prosperity is here—for the bosses.

you broken with the Stalinist war camp to join the camp of the Allies and Roosevelt? Or have you joined the Third Camp of struggle against imperialist war?

The progressive workers will judge all those who break from Stalinism by their answer to these questions.

Loire and the other is one of the most important members of the Bourse de Travail of Saint-Etienne."

The mutinies had one important result: it was over a year before the French high command dared to send its troops into another major offensive. The mutineers failed to make either peace or a revolution, but the uprising is an inspiring episode in the long history of mass rebellion. And the hundreds of thousands of poilus who faced court martial and execution to make their protest known, could say, with the anonymous mutineer who told his comrades: "If they shoot me, at least I shall know why I am dying."

NOTICE TO ALL APPEAL READERS

Subscription rates to the Socialist Appeal are now uniform for the entire country.

The rates are \$1.00 for 6 months; \$2.00 for 1 year.

This includes the Bronx and Manhattan counties of New York City where the rate was formerly higher.

XMAS EVE PARTY

UPPER WEST SIDE
HEADQUARTERS
919 9th Avenue, New York, N.Y.
SUNDAY, DEC 24, 1939
8:30 P.M. at
DANCING & GAMES
Admission: 25c
Asuspices:
Upper West Side Branch
Local New York

(Concluded from last week)

We have seen that the immediate cause of the mutinies which paralyzed the French Army in the spring of 1917 was the disastrous failure of the Nivelle offensive. To gain a few miles in Champagne, 100,000 French soldiers died and 150,000 were wounded. As World War standards went, this was "not so bad." But General Nivelle had raised high hopes in the army with his promises of a complete break-through and the end of the war. This time the incompetence of the General Staff was more glaringly revealed than usual.

The army was thoroughly fed up with the slaughter by 1917, utterly war-weary. Truck drivers on the Verdun road had a hard time keeping from running over infantrymen, who would try to get in their way. "Won't you just break a leg for me, old chap?" they would plead. Troop trains began arriving at the front with "VIVE LA PAIX!" and "TO THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE!" chalked on their sides. Corday, in Paris Front, tells about a company of young recruits marching through a French village "baa-ing like sheep." Astonished, the villagers asked why the strange noises. "What do you expect?" was the answer. "Aren't they taking us to the killing pens?"

Morale had been going down in the army since 1914. That year there were 509 desertions; in 1917 there were 21,174 officially recorded. On February 28, a month and a half before the offensive began, General Nivelle wrote that more illegal tracts had been seized among the troops in the fifteen days just past than in the last three months of 1916. "I feel that severe measures must be taken to prevent pacifist agitation from seriously undermining the morale of the troops."

The War Ministry took "severe measures." Leaves were cancelled—it was on their leaves that the troops became "infected" with pacifist and revolutionary ideas. Mail from home was held up. But these measures made the situation worse. One of the reasons the troops finally mutinied was simply in order to get back home again and see their families. For years now letters from home had told of increasing misery and privation. Governmental allowances to soldiers' families were negligible, as was the soldiers' pay. The mutinies were "strikes" against not only useless slaughter but also against subhuman living standards forced on the masses by the wartime government. Cutting off leaves thus merely aggravated the unrest in the army.

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION INSPIRES MUTINIES

Another serious miscalculation by the authorities was in respect to the February revolution in Russia. When the Czar was overthrown and a respectable bourgeois democratic government set up, the Allied propagandists joyfully hailed the event. Czarism had always embarrassed them, and now they could welcome "the new Russian democracy" into the idealistic fraternity making war against "Kaiserism." The authorities, therefore, not only allowed

2. . . At Least I Know Why I Am Dying!"

MUTINIES!

The 1917 Mutinies in the French Army

by "Spartacus"

but encouraged the spreading of the news of the Russian revolution in the trenches. It was a great mistake. The poilus cut through all the idealistic bunk to the real heart of the matter: one of the warring governments had been overthrown, a loophole for peace had been opened.

Trotsky writes of a Russian soldier who, when he heard the Czar had abdicated, began to pack up to go home. Questioned by his officer, he replied: "The Czar sent me to war, and what is the use of freedom if I still have to rot in the trenches?" Neither Miliukov nor Clemenceau (nor, doubtless, the officer) understood the soldier's logic. The poilus, cooped up in their filthy trenches, badly fed, shivering in the cruellest winter of the war— they understood just what their Russian brother meant.

The mutinies took place against a background of unrest and strikes on the home front. All through the first half of 1917 the agitation for sending French delegates to the Socialist peace conference at Stockholm went on. Corday records in his journal: "Lunch with Jean Longuet, Socialist. . . He showed me letters he has received: 'Go to Stockholm. . . If you succeed, your name will be immortal,' ran one. Another: 'They will settle you as they settled Jaures. . .'" The encouragement came from soldiers at the front. The threats came from civilians.

The government finally decided against allowing a French delegation to go to Stockholm. In his memoirs, Poincare tells why: "I asked General Petain: 'If there is an international Socialist Congress in Stockholm, and if the French meet with the Germans there to discuss peace terms, would you be able to hold your army in hand? Could you prevail upon it to continue fighting?' Petain answered very bluntly, 'No. This monosyllable, uttered in a strong voice, produced a profound impression on the members of the committee.'"

That spring there was also, for the first time since the war, a great May Day demonstration in Paris. A "Committee for the renewal of international relations" held a mass meeting attended by ten thousand people. A wave of strikes rolled over Paris. Corday writes:

"May 26: The strikes. . . Great excitement at the Labor Bureau. Endless processions of laughing women. . . A crowd of strikers compelled the cafes and restaurants in the Place de la Republique to shut. It was a swift move. The crowd shouted: 'Off with the aprons!' In a

trice, not a single customer was left on the terrace. A deputa-tion went in. The staff at once went on strike. The news was announced by a strike leader standing on a table. He was cheered. The shutters were rolled down with a loud noise. The whole operation took only five minutes for each cafe.

"Meanwhile the women strikers lolled on the deserted terraces with an attitude of laughing independence. It made one think of the French Revolution, with the populace over-running the royal palaces. . . The newspapers are unanimous in their claim that we must suspect foreign influence in the strikes. They all demand a firm attitude."

It was the failure of the mutineers to establish contact with the workers and revolutionaries behind the lines that made the mutinies merely an episodic revolt and not the prelude to a political revolution. During the period of the mutinies, every railroad station and road leading out of Paris was closely guarded, and no less than 1280 civilians were arrested at Paris stations as "suspects" and "agitators." News of the mutinies, likewise, was kept out of the Paris press until they had been gotten under control.

CONCESSIONS—AND SEVERE REPRESSIONS

General Petain, who replaced Nivelle as commander-in-chief, granted many of the immediate demands: more leaves, better rations, more pay for the soldiers' families at home. He made a personal tour of the entire front, assuring the troops that no more offensives would be required—for the present, at least. These concessions he combined with some severe repressions, "to make an example." He demanded and got from President Poincare a special order allowing the army courts martial to condemn and execute men without granting an appeal to the civil authorities.

The official number of executions was small, only twenty-three. But there is reason to believe Petain found other and even more terrible means. Wintringham tells this story, taken from Barbusse, who insists it is one of many such instances:

"Several battalions had mutinied, near Soissons, had taken and then had been surrounded and disarmed. Two hundred and fifty were chosen at random, taken in trucks round and round about until they did not know where they were, and then marched under escort to a quiet part of the front. They were told to wait at a point

beyond the front-line trenches—they did not know that they were in no man's land. The escort was withdrawn, and the French artillery began to hammer to pulp into the earth these two hundred and fifty men. Steel and high explosive and the hailing shrapnel came first, German machine guns woke as their sentries reported a raid, then French machine guns, rifles, even bayonets finished the tragedy. . ."

LABOR UNIONS SAVED LIVES OF MUTINEERS

The great pressure which the workers' organizations were able to exert on the rare occasions when they established contact with the troops, is dramatically shown in the case of two non-commissioned officers who were condemned to death.

"I had to retrieve these men," explained Paul Painleve, War Minister, "because their execution would have provoked a general strike in the great city of Saint-Etienne against which the Government would have been defenseless for lack of police. One of the condemned is a member of the Teachers Federation of the

In This Corner

• by MAX SHACHTMAN •

The Diplomatic Double-Cross

Although the second World War has been on for more than three months, it would be a mistake to suppose that the present division of the two camps and their supporters is so fixed that the line will not be crossed in either direction for the duration of the fighting. Quite the contrary. One of the reasons why large-scale hostilities have been so slow in developing between the two camps is that each of them is rather reluctant to engage the other decisively before having exhausted all possibilities of further alignment and realignment. Both sides are making desperate attempts to cajole or coerce into alliance those countries which have not yet definitely committed their sympathies and those which have committed them but not very firmly.

More plainly, at no time in modern history has the dirty diplomatic game of duplicity, of double and triple crosses, been played so feverishly as today. At no time has trust of the peoples been so cynically abused, their ideals and aspirations so cunningly subverted, their lives so cold-bloodedly used as pawns, as at the present.

Take the single case of Stalin's invasion of Finland.

The Italian fascists, for example, worked up a veritable passion over the war, organized semi-official pro-Finnish demonstrations, and even sent or promised to send a few airplanes to the Finns. Why? Because of their devotion to the sacred cause of national independence and the sovereign integrity of small nations? The sad ghosts of Ethiopia and Albania would laugh out of court anyone stupid or cynical enough to ascribe such lofty motives to Mussolini.

Despite his uneasy alliance with Hitler, Mussolini knows that the Nazis and, for that matter, Stalin, have a yellow eye on the Danubian and Balkan countries. His "gesture" to Finland is Mussolini's way of telling Moscow and Berlin: "Keep your dirty pig's snout out of my cabbage patch" (as Stalin would say). "Or else, please see to it that I get another patch, else I may yield to the ardent advance of my Anglo-French suitor." At the same time, he is saying quite unsensibly to countries like Rumania, Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey: "Resist the Germans; resist the Russians; you will find in me a real ally and protector. The help I merely promise to Finland will be very substantial in your case."

Much the same practical objective is pursued by England and France. To be sure, one of the aims—by no means without importance—of the democratic demagogues is to exploit Stalin's criminal invasion for the purpose of discrediting the name of communism in the eyes of the masses, who are rightly outraged by the latest abomination of the Kremlin gangsters. The demagogues of course know that Stalin and his acts have as little in common with communism, with revolutionary Marxism, as Hitler has with socialism, but this does not prevent them from making the most out of the situation for their own reactionary ends.

While England and France are just as little concerned with the right of self-determination as Italy (see India, Indo-China, etc.), they are interested in blackmailing or blackjacking the Hitler-Stalin alliance into two parts. For a series of reasons that need not be dwelled upon here, they did not succeed in getting Hitler to play the role of "super-Wrangel", of spearhead of the imperialist intervention into the Soviet Union—at least not at this stage. If they could isolate Hitler and make him their tool without the expense and risk of a world war, so much the better. Hence the alternate wooing and threatening of Hitler's Moscow partner. An example of the wooing was what was tantamount to the British whitewash of Stalin's invasion of Poland, much to the discomfort and anger of the ludicrous remnants of the Polish "government" in France. An example of the threatening is the way England and France have "rallied" to Finland. While practically nothing is excluded from possibility in these hectic and changeable times, it is most unlikely at the present stage that the "democracies" will launch a war against Stalin.

The British promise of material aid to Finland, like the farcical expulsion of Russia from the League of Nations, has primarily different aims for the moment. The countries of Southeastern Europe are teetering uncertainly between the German and the Anglo-French camps. The miserable, reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries is saying to itself: If England and France do as little for us as they did for Poland or are doing for Finland, then we might as well go over as servants of Hitler before he crushes us completely and dismisses us even as servants. The "democratic" gestures of aid to the Finnish bourgeoisie are calculated to reassure the Balkan vassals of London and Paris, to encourage greater resistance to Hitler's encroachments.

At the same time, Stalin is being warned: Don't go much further; don't tighten your alliance with Hitler. We are still capable of making it hot for you, if not today then tomorrow, unless you break with Berlin and join us, as we proposed last August.

The warning is not entirely purposeless. But Stalin will part with Hitler only when Hitler has ceased to be a menace to him. And Hitler will cease to be a menace only if the "democracies" reduce his military capacities by a series of successful battles.

Like Chamberlain, Roosevelt is not only warning Stalin to break with Hitler, but at least as important as that, he is warning him not to make an alliance with Japan for the subjugation of China, which would temporarily protect Stalin's eastern flank and turn over most of China to the Japanese—to the exclusion of American imperialism. At the same time, Ambassador Drew tells Tokyo that Washington will not tolerate an alliance with Moscow at the expense of "China" (read: of U. S. imperialist interests in China).

As always in such cases, Finland is a mere pawn of all the imperialist bandits, and its cause a pious fraud on their lips. Not only its socialist interests but its democratic right to independence are defended in reality only by its revolutionary internationalists.

Special X-mas and New Year Gift Offer!

May we suggest that one of the following offers will make an ideal gift for your friends and comrades during the holiday season.

These special offers hold good until DECEMBER 31:

- (1) One year of the SOCIALIST APPEAL and NEW INTERNATIONAL. **\$3.00** (reg. price \$4.00)
- (2) One year of the SOCIALIST APPEAL and bound volumes of the SOCIALIST APPEAL for 1938 and first 6 months of 1939. **\$4.00** (reg. price \$5.50)
- (3) Two bound volumes of the SOCIALIST APPEAL covering 1938 and the first 6 months of 1939. **\$2.00** (reg. price \$3.50)
- (4) One year of the NEW INTERNATIONAL and a 1938 bound volume of the NEW INTERNATIONAL. **\$3.50** (reg. price \$5.00)



Send all orders and payments to:

SOCIALIST APPEAL
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. III, No. 94 Saturday, December 23, 1939

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Editors:

PELIX MORROW MAX SHACHTMAN

General Manager: Assistant Manager:
GEORGE CLARKE SHERMAN STANLEY

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879."

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty—\$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

Kuusinen's "People's Government of Finland"

The Stalinist press has had very little to say about Kuusinen's "People's Government of Finland," since it was "established." We should like to hear a little more about it and about the backbone of this government, the Finnish Communist party. How strong a section of the working-class and peasantry backs it? What is its membership—if only in round numbers? Just what are the claims of the Kuusinen "government" to sovereignty?

We ask these questions because a painstaking study of the records of the Comintern fail to provide us with the answers. More accurately, our study provides us with evidence on the basis of which one can come to only one conclusion: the Communist party of Finland has been practically non-existent for years in any shape or form and, consequently, Kuusinen's "government" has no constituency to represent. We propose to prove this fact to the satisfaction of any Communist party member or sympathizer who is seriously trying to understand the present events.

From 1918 to 1933

The Communist party had been illegal in Finland for some years before the present events, but that is scarcely the explanation for its impotence. The capacity of the Finnish revolutionists to function under conditions of illegality and terrorism has been established time and time again since the end of the civil war of 1918. A hundred thousand Finnish workers and peasants were struck down by Mannerheim's White Guards aided by German troops—well over 30,000 executed and dead of hunger and sickness in the concentration camps, the others tortured and then imprisoned for long terms. Despite this frightful blood-letting, the Socialist Workers Party was organized by 1920, was joined by the vast majority of the organized workers and at once assumed control over the trade unions. After its affiliation to the Comintern, twenty of its leading members were accused of high treason, condemned to long prison terms, and the party press banned. Nevertheless in the elections of 1921 the party received 128,000 or 14 per cent of all the votes cast.

In 1923 some 140 more leading party members were arrested, in 1924 some 189 more; more than 400 years of imprisonment were meted out to them. In the elections of 1924 a make-shift workers and peasants party was set up to participate in place of the official Comintern party which had been forcibly dissolved; it received 11.6 per cent of all the votes. In 1925, again, there were mass persecutions, and again illegalization of the party; it was represented in elections by a "Socialist Workers and Peasants" party which in 1927 and 1929 received 12 and 14.5 per cent of all the votes. Again in 1930 the Communist party was proscribed, its property seized and 269 of its members accused of high treason and convicted. This was the time of the peak of the Fascist Lappo movement. The illegal Communist movement withstood the Finnish fascist storm, however, and retained its mass character up to 1933.

Thus, during fifteen heroic years of struggle, from 1918 to 1933, the best sections of the Finnish workers and peasants remained adherents of the Comintern. Neither the blood-letting of

the civil war nor the ensuing waves of persecution and illegality shook them from their loyalty. That loyalty was at last shaken, not by the Finnish bourgeoisie, but by Stalin. When he ordered the German Communist party to go down into the dust without striking a blow against Hitler, the Finnish workers lost their faith in the Comintern. And the Moscow trials gave the Finnish Communist party its knockout blow. Stalin's "socialism" as experienced by the Finns of Soviet Karelia, just across the border, grew more and more abhorrent—until today the point has been reached where Mannerheim can, without any difficulty, mobilize the Finnish proletarian.

The Official Record

As a matter of fact, the Stalinist movement has made little pretense, during the last two years, of possessing a Communist movement in Finland. Here is what is revealed by an examination of the files of the Comintern weekly, *World News and Views* (formerly the *International Press Correspondence*). During the entire year of 1938—in 52 issues—Finland appears only twice in its elaborate index—two minor articles neither of which even mentions the Finnish Communist party. It is ironical to note that one of those articles approvingly quotes a Helsingfors workers' mass meeting resolution for defense of the independence of Finland, and goes on to comment:

"The organized working class of Helsingfors is emphatically in favor of defending the independence of the country. But it demands that the army shall be purged of those elements who want to drag Finland in the wake of the Nazis' war policy."

The other article complains that Holsti has been forced to resign as Foreign Minister because of his hostility to Nazi pressure!

As with these two articles, so in the general report on "May Day in the Various Countries" for that year, there is no mention of the existence of a Finnish Communist party.

During 1939 the Comintern weekly again mentions Finland only twice. The first time to report that "The toiling population of the country has taken up with enthusiasm the slogan issued by Tanner" against fascism (Jan. 7)—the same Tanner whom the Stalinists now claim represents no section of the toiling population. In Manuilsky's report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (March, 1939), there is a lengthy and verbose section on "The situation in the Communist Parties." In boastful language it mentions many parties, including many which have no real existence; but among those mentioned the Finnish Communist party does not appear! Likewise in the general report on May Day for the year, there is no mention of the Finnish party. The "Premier" of the "People's Government," O. Kuusinen, contributes (March 18, 1939) a lengthy article on "Twenty Years of the Communist International." It mentions many things and many parties—but not the Finnish party. Reports appear of the congresses of the various Scandinavian parties, at which fraternal delegates appear from the parties in the neighboring countries—but never a representative of the Finnish party.

The second reference to Finland in the year 1939 appears in the Comintern weekly of July 15, an article entitled "The Finnish People for Democracy." It reports the results of the July 1 elections: "The results of the Finnish parliamentary elections on July 1 prove that the people of Finland are for freedom and democracy and against fascism." It records 500,000 votes for the social democrats, an increase of nearly 50,000 over 1936. It records no votes for the Finnish Communist party, not merely because that party was illegal; the party itself was illegal, as we have pointed out, in almost every election, yet up to 1930 managed to express itself in the elections; it records no electoral activity for the Finnish Communist party because that party had, in the intervening years, completely lost its following.

In that July 15 article, the Finnish Communist party is mentioned—the first and last mention of it in the Comintern weekly during a period of two years! It is mentioned in a curious context: the ban on it should be lifted, anti-fascist prisoners should be released, etc.

"These measures would be best calculated to mobilize the people for the defense of Finland's independence and frustrate the big Finnish bourgeois plans of the Lappo fascists for drawing Finland into the fascist war of conquest."

* * *

The final collapse of the Finnish Communist party to the point where it is mentioned once in the last two years in the Comintern weekly—that is a clear index to the stature of the party which "established" a "People's Government" for Finland.

There is no better gauge of the enormously reactionary role of the Stalinist bureaucracy than the post-war history of the Finnish working class. A proletariat with a long and glorious past—it was in the vanguard in the Revolution of 1905—and which quickly recovered from the civil war of 1918, which tenaciously resisted capitalist terror and illegality and showed its strength even by the bourgeois index of electoral results, was finally driven into the arms of the Finnish bourgeoisie by Stalin.

By Dwight Macdonald

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

Understatement Dept.

"Experiments in how best to entertain soldiers back of the Maginot Line have shown that movie shows come first, cards second and games like dominoes third in popularity. . . . Few men show any disposition to read books, possibly because there is always too much interruption."—news report in a recent N. Y. Times.

Death, Inc.

In previous columns, I have noted how the former sharp distinction between war and peace has become blurred in our age, until by now war has been absorbed into the normal, everyday routine of life under capitalism.

This seems to hold true of both the bourgeoisie and the workers in this war. As to the former, the British Government announced a few weeks after the outbreak of the war that it would pay compensation for all damages to civilian life, limb and property "due to action by or against the King's enemies." In announcing this policy, Sir John Simon, Chancellor of the Exchequer, explained: "The risk is one which affects us all and a particular person or a particular property which is struck is a casual victim of the general peril which the State is engaged in doing its best to resist." Thus war is officially recognized as one of the normal hazards of doing business under capitalism, and the shopkeeper whose windows are shattered by German bombs can collect from the State for them just as if the damage had been done by His Majesty's police officers in the discharge of their duty.

The British business man can also insure himself—with private firms—against the hazards of peace. "Armistice insurance" is now one of the regular forms of insurance in London. For a premium of ten pounds on every hundred pounds worth of business, a business man can fully insure himself against all losses which might result if the war ends in the next two months. For every additional month after that, he must pay ten pounds more.

For the workers as well, this war has taken on something of the character of normal peacetime activity. In the last war, workers began functioning as soldiers only when they put on their uniforms. This time in uniform they still retain the character of workers engaged in some vast industrial undertaking. Thus one recent news item from the Maginot Line read: "So great are the distances that the troops actually ride to work on bicycles. We passed details of them

pedalling up from their living quarters to gun positions. . . ." The phrase, "ride to work," is significant.

Another report describes the new field uniform of the British Army: "The Highlanders whom General Gort visited were in their picturesque uniforms. . . . The day was one of the last occasions on which these and other Scottish troops will appear in the field in their traditional uniforms. The change is being rapidly made from the peacetime uniform to 'battle dress'—a most unromantic but eminently practical costume for combat, consisting of a one-piece khaki overall with a zipper fastener down the front and snaps at the trouser bottoms to keep out the mud."

Kilts and tartans give way to zippered khaki overalls. The soldier has become a mass production worker who wears overalls and rides to work on his bicycle. If the war drags on this way much longer, whole industrial towns may spring up behind the lines, inhabited by families of soldiers. The infantry "worker" will kiss his wife goodbye in the morning and tramp, or cycle, off to "work", a rifle on one shoulder and a well-filled lunch box and thermos of hot coffee under the arm. The thoroughly tamed trade union bureaucracies in France and England will then raise some inspiring new slogans: TIME AND A HALF FOR OVERTIME IN THE TRENCHES! NO OFFENSIVES ON SATURDAY AFTERNOONS AND SUNDAYS!

Anthology of War Poetry, No. 1

Bernarr MacFadden, publisher of pulp magazines, last year offered a \$1,000 prize for an official song for the U. S. Army Air Corps—hitherto songless. I reproduce below the first verse of the winning ditty, officially approved by Major General Henry H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps:

Off we go into the wild blue yonder,
Climbing high into the sun;
Here they come zooming to meet our
thunder,
At 'em boys, Give 'er the gun!
Down we dive spouting our flame from
under
Off with one helluva* roar!
We live in fame
Or go down in flame
BOY! Nothing'll stop the Army Air
Corps!

*NOTE (by publisher of song): For radio, substitute "ter-ri-ble".

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

Australian Labor Bucks Conscription for War in Europe

Resistance to the dragooning of youth for imperialist slaughter goes on in one form or another in all the belligerent countries. It is only rarely, however, that censorship allows a glimmer of the true situation to break through to see the light of day.

In Australia, for instance, our comrades of the Communist League (Fourth International) carried on a vanguard struggle against the so-called National Register long before the war started. They explained patiently that the registration of all man-power by the government was merely a prelude to conscription. All the opposition parties, including the Labor Party and the Stalinists, supported the government then, and ridiculed the idea that Australia was preparing to conscript youth for war overseas.

When the war broke out, the Menzies Government finally proclaimed its intention to put conscription into force. However, the Sydney Sun, pro-Government organ, explained on October 23: "They (the conscripts) will not bleed for Imperial ambitions or capitalistic advantage. They will simply learn how, if an enemy attacks their own country, Australia, to put up a good fight against him, instead of being pitched, untrained, into massacre."

Now we learn that this last shred of deception has been dispensed with and that an Australian Imperial Force is to be raised and "would proceed overseas early in 1940." This was the announcement made by Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies in the Australian House on November 29.

After going along for months in support of the government measures on the ground of their purely defensive character, the Labor leaders find themselves hard put to go the whole hog when the naked imperialist content of the war preparations is revealed.

The New York Times of November 30 reports: "A motion by the leader of the Labor Party, John Curtin, that Parliament go on record as opposing the dispatch of an Australian Imperial Force to fight in Europe was defeated today in the House of Representatives. The government defeated the Curtin motion by only 33 to 28."

The strong vote for the Curtin motion is indicative of the tremendous unrest which serves as pressure from the ranks upon the Labor leaders. The laboring masses have boycotted the National Register from the first. The voluntary recruitment system initiated by the government at the outset of the war was a flop.

Whether the Labor skates in Parliament and in official control of the unions will be able to stem the tide, whether the government will be able to make use of the pro-Hitlerite treachery of the Stalinists to derail the workers, is still a matter of conjecture. In their bi-weekly paper, the *Militant*, our Australian comrades wind up their exposure of conscription in the following words:

"Menzies' conscription can be defeated. The workers are willing to follow a militant lead, as was shown by the National Register boycott. It is necessary that their opposition be mobilized and expressed by the medium of mass meetings, demonstrations and above all, by the enunciation of a clear-cut anti-capitalist policy." (*The Militant*, November 11, 1939).

That the Australian Fourth Internationalists are doing their bit toward mobilizing the workers in this direction is evidenced clearly by their paper and by the successful mass meetings in Sydney and Melbourne, which they carry on incessantly despite the war regime.

Comrade Franz Meyer Imprisoned in Antwerp

At the beginning of September, our comrade Franz Meyer, member of the International Communists of Germany (I.K.D.) was arrested in Antwerp, Belgium.

Comrade Meyer was charged with furnishing anti-war cartoons to the weekly paper of our Belgian Revolutionary Socialist Party, *La Lutte Ouvriere*, under the name of Holz.

Here is an example of the "justice" meted out by the so-called "Socialist" Minister of Foreign Affairs, Paul Spaak, to a man whose alleged crime is that he puts his art in the service of the struggle against war. Is Belgian "democracy" really in such a poor state of health that it has to resort to the use of police measures against cartoonists and caricaturists? Is Spaak's conception of the "democratic right of asylum" one in which a refugee artist from Hitler's Germany is to be subjected to the same type of persecution as in Nazi Germany?

Meyer has been imprisoned since September. What is the accusation filed against him? Why is he being held incommunicado? What intentions does the Spaak government have with respect to this refugee revolutionist? Is this rebel artist to be deported and turned over to Hitler's hangmen?

Every class conscious worker, every upright writer and artist has the right to demand an answer from the Belgian "democracy" on the case of Franz Meyer.

Swedish Section of "International Front Against War" at head of Reaction

Stalin's invasion of Finland has called forth a tremendous reaction in Scandinavia. Sympathy with the attacked Finns reaches deep into the workers circles. The reactionaries are utilizing the situation for an attack on civil liberties. In Sweden the Communist paper *Ny Dag* has been banned and the government has ordered the press distribution bureau, which has a monopoly over the sale of papers on the streets and at the kiosks, to stop the distribution of the paper. Instead of protesting against this unheard-of coup of the government, the representative in parliament of the Swedish Socialist Party, Flyg, has become the advocate of even stronger measures. In a speech at the Riksdag session of December 2, he declared that it was "absurd" to grant Swedish democratic rights to the "agents of a foreign power" and demanded more appropriate measures on the part of the government. This adaptation of Flyg to the moods of reaction is not only cowardly but stupid. For, it is clear that the attacks of Swedish reaction against freedom of the press will not be halted at the doors of the Stalinists. Already, the weekly of Ture Nemann, "Tross allt," (*In Spite of Everything*), has been confiscated because of its criticism of the Hitler regime is "too sharp." Nemann has been hauled into court for that. Flyg is simply digging his own grave.

Flyg's party is a member of the "International Front against War," the successor of the London bureau. What attitude do Lovestone, Brockway and Pivert take towards the actions of their Swedish confrere?

Their Government

by James Burnham

The 1940 Legislative Program of the CIO

The CIO's Legislative Program for 1940, which was made public this week, deserves careful study. However inadequate we may think it, however much we may disagree with part or all of it, its contrast to the Platform of American Industry (the manifesto of the National Association of Manufacturers that I discussed last week) is immediately apparent and in all respects favorable to the CIO. The CIO document says something, and what it says is relevant to the concrete realities of present-day life. The N.A.M. said nothing; its platform is a meaningless jumble of abstract rhetoric. There is little doubt that the CIO deliberately intends to have its program appear in the public eye as the direct challenger of that of the bosses.

The C.I.O. States the Problems

John L. Lewis has many times proved himself a sensitive reflector of the moods of the workers in this country. This, indeed, is the source of his great strength and superiority as a labor leader. (That he ruthlessly exploits and perverts these moods for reactionary ends is another matter.) He is the shrewdest of opportunists, riding on the crest of proletarian mass sentiment. It was in this way that he took triumphant leadership of the industrial union movement, leaving behind in his wake the case-hardened old fogies.

The new CIO Legislative Program gives witness once again to Lewis' sensitivity. In clear and open fashion, the Program states, and states correctly, the really major problems facing the American working class. Every worker will find himself in agreement on the statement of problems. There is no twaddle about "Hull's trade treaties" or "balanced budgets" or "municipal corruption," with which the boss press is now filled in an effort to confuse the people, but: the war, jobs, and democratic rights.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations urges for the serious consideration by the Federal Congress a legislative program based upon certain fundamental objectives: (1) The United States must keep out of involvement in the foreign wars; (2) The attention of this country and the energies of our Government, industrial and labor leaders of this country, must be directed toward the immediate solving of the problem of unemployment; (3) The democratic rights and institutions of this country must be preserved and maintained; and (4) There must be continued assurance and protection of the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively as the cornerstone for the preservation and extension of any economic and social program."

These points are elaborated in the body of the program. In addition there are sections on the Wagner Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Social Security, Health, Housing and Taxation. So far as they go, no exception can be taken to what is advocated in these sections. The demands, it is true, do not in any case go far enough if we judge them in terms of the needs of the masses, but their direction is undoubtedly right. As a matter of fact, they are more adequate and enlightened than I remember in any comparable CIO or AFL document in recent years.

In passing, it is worth observing that the old CIO policy of calling for "no amendment" to the Wagner Act, as the means of fighting against reactionary attempts at amendment, has been changed to a counter-attack. The CIO now demands amendments of its own directed toward strengthening the Act in labor's interests by providing criminal penalties for employers' offenses against the Act, prohibition of government contracts to firms violating the Act, and prohibition of the splitting up of industrial unions.

What Is Left Out

From what I have said so far, it might seem that I ought to urge support and acceptance of the Program as a suitable platform for the Socialist Workers Party. Indeed, I do believe that most of its specific proposals ought to be supported by the S.W.P. and by all workers.

But a Program has a history; and must be judged by what it omits as well as by what it says. If we examine this CIO Program from a more extended point of view, we must add new conclusions.

The Program, for example, says nothing about whom labor must fight against in order to achieve its objectives; nor how to carry on the fight for them; nor—also most important—what the record of Lewis has been in the past fights for similar objectives.

The Program advocates a minimum of 3,000,000 jobs in public works, plus public jobs for all youth who are out of work and out of school. In the past also Lewis has been for jobs; but he persuaded the workers to fight for them by putting all faith in Roosevelt, who was the man who cut the jobs.

The Program advocates keeping out of war. In the past, too, Lewis has spoken against getting into the war; but he has been and remains a part of the Roosevelt machine which is itself the chief war-making apparatus.

The Program demands democratic rights for labor. But in the past Lewis has got the workers to support the candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, who, once in office, are the ones who smash those rights.

The Program advocates decent housing, medical service, social security. But it says not one word against the rotten system of private property and private profits which, so long as it continues, guarantees that the workers will never have decent housing or medical service or social security.

This is the record, and this is why the Program, from the point of view of Lewis and his fellow-bureaucrats, is a fake, designed not to organize the workers for a real struggle toward the objectives of peace, jobs and freedom, but to head off such a struggle and to keep them tied to things as they are.

This does not mean that the Program should be just forgotten (as Lewis will forget it when the time for voting comes). It means that if its progressive aims are to be realized, the workers, and especially the CIO members, should take the struggle for those aims out of the hands of Lewis, and fight in closed, militant and independent class ranks.