

18 CONVICTED UNDER ANTI-LABOR SMITH ACT; PLAN APPEAL TO HIGHER COURTS

Labor Unions Fight Anti-Strike Laws

Roosevelt-Sponsored Bill to Curb Strikes Is Introduced by House Labor Committee

By DON DORE

Dec. 2. — All sections of the American labor movement this week united in expressing opposition to the Administration and Congressional attempts to impose legislative restrictions on organized labor and its rights.

At the forefront of the battle to halt the drive for anti-strike and compulsory arbitration laws is the CIO, whose representatives summoned from all affiliated CIO unions convened in a special legislative conference in Washington starting last Monday "to discuss and take whatever action may be necessary regarding anti-strike legislation."

Committees of CIO leaders are visiting Washington legislators to impress on them the determination of organized labor to oppose any laws aimed at curbing labor's right to strike.

CIO CALL

An emergency appeal has been sent by the national CIO to every state, city and county CIO affiliate in the land to join the fight against the threatened anti-labor federal legislation. The call, signed by John Brophy, director of industrial union councils, declared: "The emergency with which organized labor is confronted at this juncture is of the gravest nature. It must be met with the utmost resolution and with swift and vigorous action."

The most important anti-labor

bill now before the House, on which a vote is expected this week, is the House Labor Committee's "modified" version of the Administration-sponsored Ramspeck Bill.

This latter bill was drafted in accordance with the recommendations of Roosevelt, following his special White House conference with leading members of Congress last week. Its principal measures included the granting of statutory powers to the National Defense Mediation Board to assume jurisdiction over any labor dispute and to order a compulsory sixty-day no-strike "cooling-off" period following unsuccessful mediation or arbitration, and giving dictatorial power to President Roosevelt to enforce compulsory arbitration on any union when in his opinion, a strike, following the "cooling-off" period, is detrimental to "national defense."

LABOR COMMITTEE BILL

In the House Labor Committee's final recommendations, the section of the Ramspeck bill giving

the President power to invoke compulsory arbitration was changed to give him the power to "seize" any plant threatened by strike, with a special government wage board empowered to fix wages in "seized" plants.

The plant "seizure" section was substituted for the compulsory arbitration clause because of the opposition of the National Association of Manufacturers, which expressed fears that under arbitration the bosses might in some cases — no matter how few — be bound to a decision considered favorable to labor's interest. Plant "seizure" would operate simply as an outright strikebreaking method, preserving the profits of the industrialists, enabling the government to smash the unions and then return the "seized" plants to the owners.

"COMPROMISE" WOULD BE FATAL

Roosevelt, it is apparent, is determined to push through legislation to prevent the exercise of the right to strike and to force the unions to submit their demands to government arbitration. There is a strong tendency among the trade union leadership to "compromise" with Roosevelt to the extent of agreeing to "voluntary" mediation or arbitration of all labor disputes in order to avoid legislative compulsion. In reality, this would be a step toward total surrender of labor's rights under the compulsion of mere threats.

Mapping Aid for Other Defendants



Acquitted by a directed verdict of the judge, these four defendants in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial, (from left to right) Minneapolis Local 544-CIO Organizer Walter Hagstrom, Dorothy Schultz, St. Paul SWP organizer, Rose Seiler, and Local 544 Vice-President George Frosig are discussing plans to aid the fight to free the remaining 18 defendants.

All Defendants Acquitted On Sedition Count

Minneapolis Federal Jury Frees Five More Of Original 28 Defendants; Appeal To Be Based On Clear-Cut Issue Of Free Speech

MINNEAPOLIS, December 2. — Eighteen members of the Socialist Workers Party and Minneapolis Motor Transport Workers Local 544-CIO were convicted here last night by a federal jury on charges of violating the notorious Smith "Gag" Law of 1940. Five other defendants were acquitted.

All 23 defendants were acquitted on a second count of "seditious conspiracy" to overthrow the government by force and violence under the old Civil War anti-slaveholders' law.

A jury composed predominantly of small town business men, without a single industrial worker or unionist on it, brought in its verdict at 8 P. M. yesterday evening. The jury had received the case at noon Saturday.

TO BE SENTENCED NEXT MONDAY

Judge M. M. Joyce, trial judge, announced he would pronounce sentence next Monday morning. Conviction under the Smith Act carries with it a prison sentence of up to 10 years.

Motions for a new trial will be made by defense counsel on Saturday morning. The defendants plan to appeal the verdict to higher courts, if necessary, up to the U. S. Supreme Court.

This is the first criminal prosecution under the Smith Act, which is the only federal statute which makes mere expression of opinion

the basis for a felony indictment. The defendants were charged under this act with advocating the overthrow of the present government, and thereby inciting insubordination in the federal armed forces.

DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT

Albert Goldman, defense attorney, and one of the convicted defendants, issued a statement following the announcement of the verdict, which declared:

"The government has succeeded in winning a verdict of guilty against eighteen members of the Socialist Workers Party. That does not in the least prove that they are guilty of charges leveled against them by the government. (Continued on page 2)

American-Japanese War Preparations Hastened

Rival Imperialists Hold 'Peace' Talks As They Rush Plans for War in the Pacific

By JOSEPH HANSEN

The hasty return of President Roosevelt to Washington from Warm Springs, Ga., indicates that the Kurusu diplomatic episode is nearing its end even sooner than the State Department had anticipated. The economic blockade of Japan which Roosevelt organized in accordance with Wall Street's plan to hasten United States entry into

World War II has now burned

like a fuse to the very tip of the powder keg in the Far East.

Both the American and Japanese General Staffs understood perfectly how slight were the chances that Saburo Kurusu could wangle an armed truce. The basic antagonism between Japanese and American imperialism in the Far East has been aggravated to the degree where diplomacy requires the bayonet to point its demands.

While Kurusu and Hull explored

"peace" possibilities in the marble halls of the State Department, the American marines leaving China to avoid becoming hostages of Japan were given a hurry-up order. The gunboats Luzon and Oahu stepped up their departure to Saturday instead of Monday and the President Harrison left on Friday morning instead of the scheduled Sunday.

At Singapore all leaves for officers and soldiers of the British garrison were suddenly cancelled and the entire garrison al-

tered. While reinforcements continued to arrive from other British colonies and possessions, volunteers were called up and several thousand militia men who have been under intensive training were mobilized. On Dec. 1, Governor Sir Shenton Thomas signed a proclamation declaring that a "state of emergency" existed in the entire Straits Settlement, including Singapore.

The United States naval base at Cavite, Philippine Islands, was blacked out as a "precautionary measure." At Hawaii U. S. army and navy forces were placed on a basis of continuous "alert" and a special order was issued requiring small fishing craft — largely Japanese owned — to obtain special licenses. U. S. consular officials at Shanghai warned Americans again to leave occupied China

(Continued on page 7)

USSR Scores First Major Victory In Rostov Battle

But Fate of Soviet Union Still Depends On Adoption of Policy of Revolutionary War

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The recapture of Rostov by the Red Army — the first victory for the Soviet Union and the first major reverse for the Nazis in this war — is most welcome news to every friend and defender of the workers state. A position of great strategic importance has been regained. Rostov, gateway to the Caucasian oilfields, commands Soviet pipelines supplying the Red Army and the industries with indispensable fuel, and is the pivot of the southern front.

This victory gives the Red Army forces a much-needed opportunity for restoring the gravely weakened southern front; it has undoubtedly dealt a blow to the morale of the German troops, and, conversely, raised the confidence of the Red soldiers and the Soviet masses; it will inspire the

heroic fighters in the occupied countries to greater action and initiative; and it indicates that it is not yet too late, despite the terrible losses and defeats of the first five months of the war, to save the Soviet Union from destruction.

But it would be a fatal illusion — and of no service to the defense of the USSR — to believe that now the tide has definitively turned in favor of the Red Army. The Nazis still hold an enormous

preponderance on the military arena. Despite their reverse at Rostov, the Nazi drive to encircle Moscow has not been lessened but intensified. The advances in the Klin and Volokovo (Continued on page 8)

Farmers Union Meets In St. Paul

ST. PAUL, Minn., Nov. 25. — The cooperative organizations affiliated with the Farmers Union in the Northwest states of Montana, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin and Minnesota will hold their annual convention here the week of December 8. This convention will bring together some 5000 delegates and farmer visitors from among the most progressive groups of the farm population.

Meeting as the country is entering a second World War "to make the world safe for democracy," a war that has temporarily brought some increases in farm income and will boost costs of farm supplies, the convention is of more than usual significance.

Within the Farmers Union (Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America) are grouped the major part of the elements that organized the farm mortgage sale stoppage under the banner of the Farmers Holiday Association in the early thirties.

TWO STEPS BY FDR

To head off the angry farmers at that time, Roosevelt, recognizing the threat to the capitalist system in the farm situation, took two major steps: He initiated the AAA, and he sought friendly political relations with some farm organizations. After the most critical period was over, the Su-

preme Court declared the AAA unconstitutional.

Meanwhile, Roosevelt undoubtedly knew that the Grange and the Farm Bureau were not the most useful organizations for his purpose. The Farm Bureau, drawing upon the more wealthy farmers and financed with government money, had already been exposed to the more progressive farmers as a sort of company union. The Grange was a horse-and-buggy organization that had outlived its usefulness and degenerated into a social club.

But Roosevelt found willing friends among some of the leaders of the Farmers Union, particularly through M. W. Thatcher, manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal association and chairman of the national legislative committee of the Farmers Union. As a member of the ill-fated Hoover farm board, Thatcher was well prepared for his role. As part payment for direct-

ing the unrest of the farmers into "safe" channels, Thatcher was able to obtain a great many concessions for "his" organization. He got a large finger in the patronage pie of the New Deal through the Farm Security Administration, which came to be manned in a large measure by Thatcher's friends in the Farmers Union, as well as financial aid.

But for the corporation rulers of the country, this was a dirt cheap price to pay for watering down the program of the progressive farmers.

PROGRAM WATERED DOWN

The watering down is shown by the fact that the farmers were turned away from their most effective means of stopping foreclosures, through the Holiday demonstrations, and were given as a substitute the program of agitation for the "Debt Adjustment Bill." This, in form, is a good progressive bill; but it will never be accepted by Roosevelt or any other capitalist politician, except under the most wide-spread organized militant pressure. Such militant pressure is blocked by the Thatcher leadership.

Furthermore, the Farmers Un-

ion as an organization has been treated on the war issue. A fixture of the Farmers Union program for many years has been its opposition to capitalist wars as shown by their sharp fight more determined than most other labor or farmer mass organizations, for the principles of the Ludlow amendment providing for a referendum vote of the people on war. This has been dropped.

Thatcher is doing the same job of hitching the organized farmers to the war machine that Sidney Hillman is doing in labor ranks.

The farmers of the country have amply demonstrated that they have the desire and the fighting will to find a way to the solution of their problems. They will learn through their own experiences that it is necessary, in firm alliance with the workers of the cities, to abolish the system of capitalist exploitation. This requires a sharp break with all capitalist parties, including the war party of Roosevelt, and the building of a labor party aimed at the establishment of a Workers and Farmers Government.

Some Facts On The Smith Act

All the leaders of the CIO could be indicted under the Smith Act of 1940, alleged violation of which is the basis for the conviction of 18 defendants in the Minneapolis "sedition" case. This act, which has been interpreted by the Department of Justice to prohibit any criticism of conditions in the armed forces as "incitement to mutiny", could easily be made to include the CIO Convention's protest against training soldiers in strikebreaking tactics or the protest of Negro and labor organizations against Jim-Crow practices in the Army, Navy and Air Corps.

The Smith Act was passed in the summer of 1940, in the midst of the anti-labor hysteria that followed the French defeat. Its author is the same poll-tax Representative Howard Smith, of Virginia, who is sponsor of one of the most vicious anti-strike bills now before Congress.

The Smith Act was most widely known at the time of its passage as the measure to require the registration and fingerprinting of aliens. In addition it was the vehicle for the Smith Omnibus Gag Law introduced in Congress in 1939. This latter measure was considered so reactionary at that time, that it was conceded no chance of passage. Roosevelt provided the disguise for it, when he requested his legislation against aliens. The provisions of the original Smith Omnibus Gag Law were incorporated into the Alien Registration or Smith Act. It was hastily shoved through Congress and signed by Roosevelt, despite the protest of the American Civil Liberties Union made directly to him.

It is sufficient to record that even so reactionary a newspaper as the "New York Herald-Tribune", July 31, 1939, was constrained to declare the Smith Omnibus Gag Law to be on the "stupid level of a Nazi campaign against the Jews." The "New York Times", in March, 1939, called it "a compendium of all the anti-radical legislation introduced in Congress during the last twenty years."

The Smith Act makes it a penal offense to advocate a revolutionary change in the government by force or violence "or by any other means," or to criticize conditions in the armed forces.

It is the only federal law which makes mere advocacy of ideas, without regard for overt acts, a felony. Virtually every labor and liberal organization, including the American Civil Liberties Union, has attacked the Smith Act as a clear violation of the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution.

The first uses of the Act have been against labor leaders. It was used against Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's Union, CIO, who has been ordered deported. The first actual criminal prosecution under the act was the trial of the 28 in Minneapolis,

Telegram To Defendants From Civil Rights Defense Committee

Our Committee in conjunction with Civil Liberties Union starts work immediately to appeal conviction of eighteen. The struggle for your freedom is fundamental to the preservation of the rights of American labor and the liberties of the American people.

GEORGE NOVACK, Sec'y
Civil Rights Defense Committee

From Socialist Workers Party

December 1, 1941

Inspired by your example we pledge ourselves to go forward in the struggle for Socialism and for the freedom of our convicted Comrades, Leaders and Friends. Socialist greetings.

C. CHARLES
Acting Secretary
Socialist Workers Party

Day by Day Summary of the Minnesota Trial

18 Convicted Under Smith Act

(Continued from page 1)

"It still remains a fact that the conspirators are Dan Tobin (president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters), President Roosevelt and Attorney General Biddle who have initiated this frameup for the purpose of violating the will of the truck drivers of Minneapolis and of stilling the voice of the revolutionary opposition to the second world war.

"We intend to exhaust every step and every resource for appeal purposes. Above all we shall appeal to the American people in an attempt to convince them that the rights of free speech, free press and free assembly are in real danger of suppression."

At the same time in New York George Novack, secretary of the Civil Rights Defense Committee, a body of prominent labor and liberal figures, announced that the C.R.D.C., in conjunction with the American Civil Liberties Union, would appeal the convictions in Minneapolis. The work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee in mobilizing public support for the defendants has already been endorsed by scores of trade unions and liberal organizations.

DECISION OF JURY

The 18 defendants who were found guilty by the jury were: James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the S.W.P.; Albert Goldman, defense counsel; Farrell Dobbs, National Labor Secretary of the S.W.P.; Felix Morrow, editor of THE MILITANT; Grace Carlson, Minnesota S.W.P. organizer; Oscar Coover, Minneapolis S.W.P. secretary.

V. R. Dunne; Carl Skoglund; Harry DeBoer; Clarence Hamel; Emil Hansen; Carlos Hudson; Jake Cooper; all officers or mem-

bers of Local 544-CIO; and Edward Palmquist; Max Geldman; Carl Kuehn; Oscar Schoenfeld; all active in the Federal Workers Section, unemployed and WPA union affiliated to Local 544-CIO.

The five defendants acquitted by the jury on both counts of the indictment were:

Miles Dunne; Kelly Postal; Ray Rainbolt; Ray Orgon; and Harold Swanson, all officers or members of Local 544-CIO or Federal Workers Section.

HISTORY OF CASE

The prosecution was originally initiated to help force the Minneapolis truck drivers back into the AFL Teamsters after they had voted to join the CIO on June 9. On June 13, Tobin had wired Roosevelt for aid in his fight against Local 544-CIO. Roosevelt replied that he was directing the "government departments and agencies interested in this matter" to act. Two weeks later the FBI raided the SWP headquarters in the Twin Cities, and on July 15 the Department of Justice secured the indictments.

During the course of the trial the prosecution based its evidence on the testimony of witnesses personally hostile to the defendants. Most of these witnesses were paid agents of Tobin. The prosecution denied that it was compelled to offer evidence of overt acts. It based its case, in part, on the fact that the Socialist Workers Party openly circulated Marxist and Socialist literature, including classics such as the Communist Manifesto available in all public libraries.

(A report of the sentences handed down in this case and a complete summary report of the trial will be contained in next week's MILITANT).

The Defense Reviews Its Case

By FELIX MORROW

MINNEAPOLIS, Nov. 30.—As we sit here, waiting for the jury to come in with its verdict—I am writing at 8:30 P. M., 32 and a half hours after the jury was sent out—it is in order to review the last part of the trial.

Readers of THE MILITANT may have been puzzled, last week, to read, in one and the same issue, the story of the testimony of the first defense witness, James P. Cannon, and a bulletin announcing that the defense had closed its case. Puzzling, perhaps, especially in view of the fact that for weeks THE MILITANT had been filled with a day-to-day account of the prosecution's lengthy presentation of its case.

The explanation is simple. The prosecution had taken three full weeks for its side—fifteen court days. The defense then took only four court days to present its side, that is, just a little more than one-fourth of the time taken by the prosecution.

Of those four days, which began Tuesday afternoon, Nov. 18, the first defense witness, Jim Cannon, was on the witness stand, including cross-examination, for just a little less than two whole days. His testimony is being published verbatim, beginning with last week's issue of THE MILITANT. Cannon was on the stand Tuesday afternoon, all day Wednesday, and (Thursday was the Thanksgiving holiday) part of Friday morning.

Eighteenth Day MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24

V. R. Dunne concluded his direct testimony and then was subjected to cross-examination by District Attorney Anderson. Anderson devoted his time principally to attempting to convey to the jurors the idea that Dunne and the other leaders of Local 544 had incited the drivers to

violence in the famous strikes of 1934.

Anderson also, following the pattern set by Assistant Attorney-General Schweinhaut in his questioning of Jim Cannon, confronted V. R. Dunne with numerous quotations from Marxist literature, asking the witness whether

he disagreed or agreed with the quotation.

Roy Orgon, Local 544-CIO organizer, was the next witness. Although not a member of the SWP, Orgon declared himself in complete solidarity with the other defendants. In cross-examination District Attorney Anderson charged that Orgon had incited violence in the WPA strike of 1939 and introduced into the record the fact that Orgon was among those convicted in the WPA strike trial.

Ray Rainbolt, Local 544-CIO organizer, next took the stand. Rainbolt described himself as not a member of the SWP, but vol-

unteered the information that he had often contributed funds to the party, subscribed to its press, and generally sympathized with it.

Rainbolt was head of the Union Defense Guard during its existence. He described how it was organized to meet the Silver Shirt menace in 1938.

Miles B. Dunne, President of Local 544-CIO, was the next witness. Under cross-examination he declared himself fully conversant with Marxist literature and a sympathizer of the SWP, in complete agreement with it although not a member. He was still being cross-examined when the session ended.

Nineteenth Day TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25

The morning opened with the concluding section of the cross-examination of Miles B. Dunne.

Grace Carlson took the stand next, principally to describe the election campaigns of the SWP in Minnesota (the prosecution had sought to convey the idea that the "Trotskyist insurrectionists" were not interested in balloting), and to refute the prosecution's interpretation of the texts of two radio speeches made by her in 1940.

The next and last witness for the defense was defendant Farrell Dobbs, National Labor Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party. Dobbs was formerly General Organizer for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. He described the successful organization of the 11-state over-the-road drivers' movement of nearly 250,000 truckers.

On cross-examination of Dobbs, the anti-labor bias of the prosecution was shown when Assistant Attorney-General Schweinhaut attempted to convey to the jury the idea that the SWP was constantly fomenting strikes by instructing its followers never to accept arbitration of any labor dispute.

In this encounter, Schweinhaut came off second best, for Dobbs testified as an expert in this field, having negotiated and signed many union contracts. Dobbs was spokesman for the IBT 11-state Area Committee, which signed contracts covering more than 250,000 over-the-road drivers and 800 employers.

SWP UNION POLICY

Dobbs explained that the SWP trade union policy favored direct negotiations between union and employer. Nevertheless, at times it was necessary and permissible for unions to arbitrate certain issues.

As an example, Dobbs cited to the court the case of the present United Mine Workers dispute.

WORKERS' FORUM

How the Drafted Army Develops Initiative

Editor:

My first experiences in the drafted army may give you an idea of how effectively the officers are training the men to fight against fascism.

The first thing that was impressed on us is that a soldier is supposed only to take orders and not do any thinking for himself.

When after a long week of dreary chamber-maid, ground-janitor, kitchen-help work at our reception center, we were assembled to be told that we were to be sent to our training center next day, one of us asked the natural question, "Where are we going?"

He promptly had his head bit off by the sergeant, who informed him that it would be time enough for him to find that out when he got off the train. Drafted, their families and friends, he said, are not supposed to know their destination or think about where they are being sent to.

When we were put on the train we were given a long list of rules and regulations governing the conduct of soldiers on trains. One of these rules stated that before a soldier may pull the emergency cord, he must first obtain the

permission of an officer.

Even if he sees the train approaching a precipice, he must ask an officer for permission to pull the cord. This is how initiative is encouraged in the army!

However, we may be sure that the draftees, fresh from the farms and factories where they learned that they could depend only on themselves and their fellow-workers for the protection of their interests, will not allow themselves to be led over a precipice without some action on their own account.

R. U.

Editor:

At the close of the War Chest Drive on Sept. 1, 1941, you published my letter pointing to the reasons for the non-fulfillment of New York's full quota in the Drive. The readers of MILITANT may recall that by the close of the drive we had turned in \$2,066.08 of the \$2,500 pledged. This amounted to 83% of our pledge. My letter explained that the difference between the \$2,066.08 turned in and the \$2,500 pledged was to be made up by some of our comrades who were working out of town at the close of the drive.

Now, despite the late date, Lo-

Twentieth Day WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26

U. S. District Attorney Anderson opened the final argument for the prosecution with a day-long speech. Under federal procedure, the prosecution has the privilege of both opening and closing the final argument.

Obviously a review of the activities of each of the 23 defendants in the labor movement, Anderson's argument was an appeal to every backward prejudice that might exist among the jurors.

Anderson urged a conviction by the jury in the name of the sanctity of the family, the home, the church, the schools and the nation. Referring to the amount of literature on the Soviet Union published by the Socialist Workers Party, he demanded of the defendants: "Why don't they go to Russia?"

Uttering numerous exhortations to the Almighty, the District Attorney urged that the jurors go into the jury-room with the same kind of simple faith in the government case that the disciple Paul had in Christ. "Believe, believe!" he shouted.

Anderson told the jury in a shocked whisper that the defendants held meetings "on the Sabbath."

In asking the conviction of defendants Ed Palmquist and Roy Orgon, leaders of Local 544-CIO's Federal Workers Section and active in the 1939 WPA workers strike, Anderson stated that the only conceivable purpose of the Federal Workers Section (a WPA union) was to seize power. "to take over Minneapolis." "Why."

Twenty-First and 22nd Day THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 27-28

Defendant and defense attorney Albert Goldman spoke 10 hours in two days in his final argument to the jury, before a packed courtroom.

Goldman's address was a defense of the right of the socialist movement to voice its ideas. To enable the jury to understand the justice of his plea, he outlined

Labor Leader Acquitted In Texas Frame-Up Trial

HOUSTON, Texas, Nov. 23.—An attempted frameup by the local Texas Courts of Jack Frye, Regional Director of District 50, United Mine Workers, CIO, (Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers) for alleged violation of the infamous W. Lee O'Daniel Anti-Strike Law, was defeated when a jury in Judge Willford's court here yesterday returned a surprise verdict of not guilty.

The O'Daniel Law prohibits strikers, under penalty of a penitentiary term, from "interfering in any way" with "non-strikers" attempting to cross a picket line. The law is deliberately worded in such a fashion that a striker may be framed even for talking to a potential scab or flunk.

Frye was accused of "interfering" with one, Jesse Martinez, a lumber handler for the United Crosstoting Company of Houston. The prosecution tried to establish that Frye, on July 28, had told Martinez he would "get hurt" if he crossed the picket line before the struck crosstote plant.

Defense testimony showed that Frye had not threatened Martinez, but had merely urged him to join the picket line and support the strike. He had pointed out to Martinez that because of the inexperienced scabs messing up the dangerous work and causing injuries inside the plant, that Martinez would be taking a risk in working alongside the scabs. Martinez did not join the picket line, but he did start to return home. While on his way, he was buttonholed by the boss, who then called the police. Between them, the frameup was cooked up and Frye arrested.

During the trial, the prosecu-

cal New York wishes to announce completion of its payment on the War Chest. Since Sept. 1st in addition to our other obligations we have paid a total of \$250 to raise our War Chest payment to the final sum of \$2,506.08.

L. Cooper, Financial Secretary, Local New York, S.W.P.

the main ideas of Marxism and contrasted the real ideas of socialism with the distorted version attributed to the defendants by the prosecution.

It is difficult to attempt to convey in a few words the quality of Goldman's speech. If anything could convince this jury, consisting predominantly of men and women from the rural areas, Goldman's speech would have done it. THE MILITANT will publish the verbatim text of Goldman's speech and that is the only way to appreciate it.

Goldman stigmatized as a deliberate lie the prosecution charge that the defendants were involved in a conspiratorial plot to overthrow the government by force. Social revolutions, Goldman explained, are not made by a few individuals nor even by a party. "The inexorable laws of society, inherent in the social system and independent of the will of individuals, are responsible for the development of society towards socialism."

Goldman systematically refuted the government charge that the SWP advocates violence. Instead, he stated, again quoting from his own authoritative pamphlet: "The actual conduct of the capitalist class at the present time . . . confirms the historical lesson and justifies the prediction that they, who will lose their wealth and power, will utilize all forms of violence against the overwhelming majority."

Twenty-Third Day SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29

Assistant Attorney General Schweinhaut opened the session with a one-hour address concluding the final argument. U. S. District Attorney Anderson had made the main argument for the prosecution Wednesday in a day-long speech.

The crux of Schweinhaut's argument was an attempt to drive home to the jury a direct analogy between the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Trotsky and the Socialist Workers Party. It may be asserted on behalf of the defendants that they are today a "tiny minority" but, said Schweinhaut, this does not make the defendants less dangerous. As proof of this he went on to cite James P. Cannon's testimony that the Bolshevik Party was only an "infinitesimal minority" in February 1917, yet grew speedily enough to take power on November 7, 1917. Schweinhaut also cited defendant Farrell Dobbs' testimony that a small strike of textile women-workers was the spark that "ignited the conflagration" that overthrew Czarism.

Hence, Schweinhaut vehemently concluded, the Socialist Workers Party, though small today, might make a revolution soon by "preying upon the distress and despair of people during war and depression." For "hungry men" could be induced to "insurrection."

BARTLETT'S TESTIMONY

The rest of Schweinhaut's appeal for a conviction consisted of rebuttal of the ten-hour final argument of defendant and defense attorney Albert Goldman.

continued to insist that Frye had merely warned them they "might" get hurt.

The jury which turned in the acquittal included several workers, either union men or former union men.

Asking if the astronomer should be held responsible for the eclipse that he predicts, Goldman asked if the Socialist Workers Party, operating in the field of the social sciences, should be held responsible for predicting that the reactionary minority would resist the future revolutionary majority.

Goldman urged the jurors to study carefully the SWP literature, introduced as evidence; this literature, he declared, particularly the official declarations and resolutions of the party, should determine the jury's verdict, rather than the "private conversations" alleged by the prosecution witness.

EXPOSES DISTORTIONS

He charged that many of the excerpts introduced by the government were distortions, consisting of isolated sentences and paragraphs, torn from their true context. Dramatically demonstrating the ease with which any literature could be distorted, Goldman quoted several excerpts from the New Testament. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." With this and other isolated quotations, Goldman showed, Christ could also be indicted as an advocate of violence.

Following the conclusion of Goldman's address to the jury at 3:30 P.M. Friday, associate defense counsel and former Judge Arthur LeSueur spoke for 90 minutes, principally on the civil liberties issue.

Schweinhaut's main problem was to rehabilitate the character of his main witness, Tobin-appointed AFL Teamsters official James Bartlett. Goldman had proved in a number of key instances that Bartlett's testimony had consisted of lies and perjury.

Schweinhaut's answer was that perhaps Bartlett had made errors in statements of fact, but that he wasn't a deliberate perjurer. Goldman had spent most of his time outlining to the jury the main ideas of Marxism and contrasting the real program of socialism with the distorted version attributed to the defendants by the prosecution. He spent about one hour on Bartlett's testimony.

Bartlett had testified that he left the SWP early in 1940 when, after 3 years' membership, he "discovered" it believed in "force and violence." Goldman asked the jury if it was possible to credit Bartlett's story when the testimony revealed that Bartlett had been a leading member of the Communist Party in 1932-1934 and a contributor to the *Daily Worker*, and had read Marxist literature since prior to 1932.

Bartlett had testified that he bought the main prosecution exhibit, the mimeographed pamphlet, "What Is Trotskyism," at the SWP headquarters in Minneapolis, while he was a member, early in 1940. Defense testimony established that the pamphlet had not been published until March 1941, a year after Bartlett left the party.

*** The case of the 23 defendants went to the jury at noon. Judge Matthew M. Joyce took an hour and a half to give his final instructions to the jury. He told the jury that it could return a verdict at any time between 10 AM and 9 PM, including Sunday.

LATEST "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL" FEATURES MANY TIMELY ARTICLES

The December issue of *Fourth International* appeared this week with a highly diversified and interesting table of contents.

The leading article this month deals with the Minneapolis trial of members of the Socialist Workers Party, written by William F. Warde and entitled: "Capitalist Frame-Up, 1941 Model". It presents a thorough analysis of the trial and its significance to the American working class in the struggle to maintain civil rights in a period of preparation for war.

A characteristically splendid piece of writing by Leon Trotsky dealing with French politics and appearing here for the first time

in print under the title of "Edouard Herriot, Politician of the Golden Mean." Written with the inimitable clarity and incisiveness of Trotsky, the piece goes far beyond a mere dissection of the politician Herriot to an illumination of the wavering and indecisiveness of "radical" parties and of bourgeois parliamentarianism in general.

Under the heading of "Who are Hitler's Agents in Russia?", G. Munis answers the slanderous writings of Ex-Ambassador Davies concerning the implications of the Moscow Trials.

A splendid article by Marc Lorris on the processes of capitalist development, "Capitalist Economy in War," deals with the

changes in capitalist production preceding and following the first world war and their sequence in present times, including a study of the nature of fascist economy.

Joseph Hansen writes an article on two fronts of the war, the Soviet Union and Japan, and John G. Wright deals with "Stalin's Pre-War Purge." C. Charles contributes a timely work on priorities and unemployment.

Book reviews and editorial comment complete the issue, which can be purchased at local newsstands and through the editorial offices of *Fourth International*, 116 University Place, or from literature agents, of the Socialist Workers Party. The magazine sells at 20c.

Cannon Tells The Jury How Trotskyists Oppose All The Imperialists In The War

Last week's issue of THE MILITANT printed the first part of the testimony by Comrade James P. Cannon on the witness stand at the government's "seditious conspiracy" trial against 23 members of the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO.

In his testimony on Tuesday, Nov. 18, as the first witness for the defense, Comrade Cannon, on direct examination by chief Defense Albert Goldman, himself one of the 23 defendants, told of the formation of the Trotskyist movement in this country and its history and activities up to the formation of the Socialist Workers Party and the present day.

He declared that the aim of the Party was the establishment of a socialist society that would abolish imperialism, fascism and unemployment.

Now go on with Cannon's testimony on Wednesday, Nov. 19, printed below:

Q (By MR. GOLDMAN): Mr. Cannon, will you tell us the position of the Socialist Workers Party on the causes of modern war?

A: Modern wars, in the opinion of our Party, are caused by the conflict of imperialist nations for markets, colonies, sources of raw material, fields for investment and spheres of activity.

Q: What do you mean by "imperialist", Mr. Cannon?

A: Those capitalist nations which directly or indirectly exploit other countries.

Q: What is the Party's position on the inevitability of wars under the capitalist system?

A: As long as the capitalist system remains, and with it

"OUR PARTY IS OPPOSED TO ALL IMPERIALIST WARS"

Q: What is the attitude of the Party towards a war which it designates as an imperialist war?

A: Our Party is unalterably opposed to all imperialist wars.

Q: And what is meant by opposition to imperialist wars?

A: By that we mean that we do not give any support to any imperialist war. We do not vote for it; we do not vote for any person that promotes it; we do not speak for it; we do not write for it. We are in opposition to it.

Q: How does the Socialist Workers Party oppose the idea of the United States entering into the war?

A: Well, we do it as every other political party promotes its ideas, on any foreign policy. We write against it in the paper; we speak against it; we try to create sentiment in any organization we can approach, to adopt resolutions against the war. If we had members in Congress, they would speak in Congress, in the Senate, against it. In general we carry on public political agitation against the entry of the United States into war, and against all measures taken either by the executive or by Congress which in our opinion lead towards active participation in the war.

Q: What do you mean by "active"?

A: For example, all measures which have been taken, which put the United States into the war, in effect, without a formal declaration to that effect.

Q: What was the Party's position with reference to amending the Constitution to give the people the power to declare war?

FOR THE LUDLOW AMENDMENT

A: For quite awhile now we have supported the proposal that was introduced into Congress, I think by Representative Ludlow, and is known as the Ludlow Amendment, for an amendment to the Constitution requiring a referendum vote of the people for the declaration of a war. Our Party supported this proposal and at times has carried on a very energetic agitation in favor of such an amendment to require a referendum vote of the people before war could be declared.

Q: And is that still the position of the Party, Mr. Cannon?

ANSWERING THE CHARGES RELATING TO SABOTAGE

Q: Would the Party take any practical steps, so-called, to show its opposition to war, or non-support of the war?

A: Well, practical steps in what sense?

Q: Would the Party try to sabotage the conduct of the war in any way?

A: No. The Party has specifically declared against sabotage. We are opposed to sabotage.

Q: What is that — what do you mean by sabotage?

A: That is, interference with the operation of the industries, of transportation, or the military forces. Our Party has never at any time taken a position in favor of obstruction or sabotage of the military forces in time of war.

Q: And will you explain the reasons why?

A: Well, as long as we are a minority, we have no choice but to submit to the decision that has been made. A decision has been made, and is accepted by a majority of the people, to go to war. Our comrades have to comply with that. Insofar as they are eligible for the draft, they must accept that, along with the rest of their generation, and go and perform the duty imposed on them, until such time as they convince the majority for a different policy.

Q: So, essentially, your opposition during a war would be of the same type as our opposition prior to the war?

A: A political opposition. That is what we speak of.

ON INSUBORDINATION IN ARMY

Q: Did the Party ever, or does the Party now, advise its members or any of its sympathizers, or any workers that it

those conditions which I have mentioned, which flow automatically from the operation of the capitalist and imperialist system, wars, recurring wars, are inevitable.

Q: And can anybody's opposition, including the opposition of the Socialist Workers Party to war, prevent wars under the capitalist system?

ECONOMIC CONFLICTS CAUSE WAR

A: No. Our Party has always stated that it is impossible to prevent wars without abolishing the capitalist system which breeds war. It may be possible to delay a war for awhile, but eventually it is impossible to prevent wars while this system and its conflicts of imperialist nations, remains.

Q: Then is it true that the Party is of the opinion that wars are caused by international economic conflicts, and not by the good-will or bad-will of some people?

A: Yes. That does not eliminate the possibility of incidental attacks being caused by the acts of this or that ruling group of one country or another; but fundamentally wars are caused by the efforts of all of the capitalist powers to expand into other fields, and the only way they can get them is by taking them away from some other power, because the whole world has been divided up among a small group of imperialist powers. That is what leads to war, regardless of the will, or not, of the people.

We do not maintain that the ruling groups of any of the imperialist powers now at war really desired the war. We have stated many times that they would have been glad to have avoided it; but they could not avoid it and maintain the capitalist system in their country.

A: Yes, that is incorporated as one of the points of practical daily policy, in the editorial masthead of our paper. If I am not mistaken, it appears on the editorial page as one of our current principles, and every once in awhile there appears an editorial or an article in the paper attempting to revive interest in this idea.

Q: If the United States should enter into the European conflict, what form would the opposition of the Party take to the war?

A: Well, we would maintain our position.

Q: And that is what?

A: That is, we would not become supporters of the war, even after the war was declared. That is, we would remain an opposition political party on the war question, as on others.

Q: You would not support the war?

A: That is what I mean, we would not support the war, in a political sense.

WHAT THE PARTY WOULD DO DURING WAR

THE COURT: May I ask you to develop the significance of that last statement?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

Q: When you say, "non-support of the war," just exactly what would the Party do during a war, which would indicate its non-support of the war?

A: Well, insofar as we are permitted our rights, we would speak against the war as a false policy that should be changed, in the same sense, from our point of view, that other parties might oppose the foreign policy of the Government in time of war, just as Lloyd George, for example, opposed the Boer War in public addresses and speeches. Ramsey MacDonald, who later became Prime Minister of England, opposed the war policy of England during the World War of 1914-1918. We hold our own point of view, which is different from the point of view of the two political figures I have just mentioned, and so far as we are permitted to exercise our right, we would continue to write and speak for a different foreign policy for America.

comes in contact with, to create insubordination in the United States armed forces or naval forces?

A: No.

Q: Will you explain the reason why?

A: Fundamentally the reason is the one I just gave. A serious political party, which is aiming at a social transformation of society, which is possible only by the consent and support of the great mass of the population, such a party cannot attempt while it is a minority to obstruct the carrying out of the decisions of the majority. By sabotage and insubordination, breaking discipline and so on, a party would absolutely discredit itself and destroy its possibilities of convincing people, besides being utterly ineffective so far as accomplishing anything would be concerned.

Q: If any expressions have crept into the papers of the Party which would lead people to believe that the Party would obstruct the conduct of the war, if war is declared, what would you say with reference to those expressions?

A: Well, I would say the resolutions of the conference of September, 1940, and my speeches to the conference which were published, which speak authoritatively in the name of the conference, as to Party policy, are the line by which we want to guide the Party, and the line by which we should be judged.

I personally do not know of any articles or expressions in the paper that divert from that line, but such expressions, in the light of the official resolution, and in the light of the official speeches, would be obviously unrepresentative of the real policy of the Party.

THIS IS NOT "A WAR OF DEMOCRACY AGAINST FASCISM"

Q: Will you state the reasons why the Party would not support a war conducted by the present Government of the United States?

A: Well, in general, we do not put any confidence in the ruling capitalist group in this country. We do not give them any support because we do not think they can or will solve the fundamental social problems which must be solved in order to save civilization from shipwreck.

We believe that the necessary social transition from the present system of capitalism to the far more efficient order of socialism, can only be brought under a leadership of the workers. The workers must organize themselves independently of the capitalist political parties. They must organize a great party of their own, develop an independent working class party of their own, and oppose the policy of the capitalist parties, regardless of whether they are called the Democratic or Republican, or anything else.

Q: What kind of a war would you consider a war waged by the present Government of the United States?

A: I would consider it a capitalist war.

Q: Why?

A: Because America is today a capitalist nation. It is

different from the others only in that it is stronger than the others and bigger. We do not believe in capitalist policy. We do not want to conquer any other country. We do not want to gain any colonies. We do not want bloodshed to make profits for American capital.

Q: What is the Party's position on the claim that the war against Hitler is a war of democracy against fascism?

A: We say that is a subterfuge, that the conflict between American imperialism and German imperialism is for the domination of the world. It is absolutely true that Hitler wants to dominate the world, but we think it is equally true that the ruling group of American capitalists has the same idea, and we are not in favor of either of them.

We do not think that the Sixty Families who own America want to wage this war for some sacred principle of democracy. We think they are the greatest enemies of democracy here at home. We think they would only use the opportunity of a war to eliminate all civil liberties at home, to get the best imitation of fascism they can possibly get.

Q: What is the position of the Party with reference to any imperialist or capitalist enemy of the United States, like Germany or Italy?

A: We are not pro-German. We absolutely are not inter-

ested in the success of any of the imperialist enemies of the United States.

Q: In case of a conflict between the United States and Germany, Italy or Japan, what would the Party's position be so far as the victory or defeat of the United States, as against its imperialist enemies?

A: Well, we are certainly not in favor of a victory for Japan or Germany or any other imperialist power over the United States.

Q: Is it true then that the Party is as equally opposed to

OUR PROGRAM CAN BRING ABOUT THE DEFEAT OF HITLER

A: If the workers formed the government I spoke of, if the workers' form of government were in power, we would propose two things:

One, that we issue a declaration to the German people, a



JAMES P. CANNON

National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party.

solemn promise, that we are not going to impose another Versailles peace on them; that we are not going to cripple the German people, or take away their shipping facilities, or take away their milk cows, as was done in the horrible Treaty of Versailles, starving German babies at their mothers' breast, and filling the German people with such hatred and such demand for revenge that it made it possible for a monster like Hitler to rally them with the slogan of revenge against this terrible Treaty of Versailles. We would say to them:

"We promise you that we will not impose any of those things upon the German people. On the contrary, we propose to you a reorganization of the world on a fair socialist basis, where the German people, with all their recognized ability and their genius and labor, can participate equally with us." That would be our Party's first proposal to them.

Second, we would also say to them, "On the other hand, we are going to build the biggest army and navy and air force in

THE RELATION OF THE PARTY TO OUR PRESS

Q: What is the chief method used by the Party to spread its ideas?

A: We publish a press and —

Q: What press?

A: We have a weekly paper, and a monthly magazine. We publish leaflets, pamphlets and books — not so many books, but as many as we are able to.

Q: How are the editors of the publications designated?

A: They are appointed by the National Committee as a rule.

Q: What, if any, control does the Party have over the contents of those publications?

A: Well, the National Committee is responsible for the publications and exercises general supervision over them.

Q: Well, what methods are used by the National Committee to exercise that general supervision?

A: The most important one is the appointment of editors. The Committee, as a whole, does not edit the paper. They designate individuals to do it.

Q: And those individuals are responsible for the general contents of the papers?

A: From issue to issue, yes.

Q: What were the publications of the Party at the time of the indictment?

A: The Militant —

Q: That is a weekly paper?

A: Yes — and the Fourth International, a monthly magazine.

Q: And was it always called the Militant?

A: No, at one time it was called the Socialist Appeal.

INTERPRETATIONS OF EVENTS

Q: What is the policy of the Party with reference to permitting various opinions and interpretations of current events in the Party's publications?

A: Well, it is not prohibited. Usually, individual members of the Party write articles with a certain slant, on current events, that is not necessarily shared by the majority of the Committee.

Q: And does the Party take any steps to prevent such expressions of opinion contrary to the majority?

A: No. As I say, it is not prohibited. We do not have a completely airtight uniformity, about every question, in the press.

EDITORIALS, SIGNED COLUMNS AND ARTICLES IN OUR PRESS

A: An editorial is more authoritative, and the Party bears greater responsibility for it than for a signed article. If an article is signed by an individual member, the possibility exists at any time that it is not fully responsive to the official opinion of the Party, or the opinion of the editorial board. Columnists have more latitude than writers of signed articles. Columns are not to be tampered with by the editor, unless there is something of a very fundamental nature raised against them.

Q: What would be the attitude of the Party towards columns or signed articles written by older and more responsible members of the Party, and columns and signed articles written by less well-known members of the Party?

A: Well, so far as their impression on the Party itself is concerned, a column that is written by a prominent leader of the Party is taken with greater weight than columns written by unknown columnists. We have such columnists and have had in the past humorous columns, some of which depart more or less from the regular line of thought of the Party, but they are not as a rule taken with the weight of authority that would be given to a column signed by the most prominent leaders of the National Committee.

Q: So that a column or an article signed by you would

Hitler, as it is to the capitalist claims of the United States?

A: That is uncontested. We consider Hitler and Hitlerism the greatest enemy of mankind. We want to wipe it off the face of the earth. The reason we do not support a declaration of war by American arms, is because we do not believe the American capitalists can defeat Hitler and fascism. We think Hitlerism can be destroyed only by way of conducting a war under the leadership of the workers.

Q: What method does the Party propose for the defeat of Hitler?

the world, to put at your disposal, to help smash Hitler by force of arms on one front, while you revolt against him on the home front."

I think that would be the program, in essence, of our Party, which the Workers' and Farmers' Government of America would advance so far as Hitler is concerned, and we believe that is the only way Hitlerism will be destroyed, only when the Great Powers on the other side can successfully prevail upon the German people to rise against Hitler, because we must not forget —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT (prosecutor): You have answered the question, Mr. Cannon.

Q: Now, until such time as the workers and farmers in the United States establish their own government and use their own methods to defeat Hitler, the Socialist Workers Party must submit to the majority of the people — is that right?

A: That is all we can do. That is all we propose to do.

Q: And the Party's position is that there will be no obstruction of ways and means taken by the Government for the effective prosecution of its war?

A: No obstruction in a military way, or by minority revolution; on the contrary, the Party has declared positively against any such procedure.

THE WAR WILL BE FOLLOWED BY REVOLUTION

Q: What is the opinion of the Party as to the relationship between war and a possible revolutionary situation?

A: Well, wars frequently have been followed by revolution; wars themselves are the expression of a terrible social crisis, which they are unable to solve. Misery and suffering grow at such a tremendous pace in war, that it often leads to revolution.

The Russo-Japanese war of 1904 produced the Russian revolution of 1905. The World War of 1914 produced the Russian revolution of 1917, the Hungarian revolution, near-revolution in Italy, and the revolution in Germany and Austria; and in general, a revolutionary situation developed over the whole continent of Europe, as the result of the first World War.

I think it is highly probable that if the war in Europe continues, that the mass of the people, especially in Europe, will undertake to put a stop to the slaughter by revolutionary means.

Q: So that it would be correct to say that a revolutionary situation is created by a war, and not by the Socialist Workers Party, if a revolutionary situation will arise?

A: I would say it is created by the privations of the capitalist system, which are tremendously accelerated by a war.

Especially, we have columnists to write columns. They are given a certain latitude for personal expression, within certain limits. Of course we would not permit anyone to write against socialism in the paper, or against the basic principles, unless it was when a principle was being considered prior to a convention.

Q: With reference to predictions or opinions about future occurrences, would you say the Party is more liberal in granting that freedom?

A: Yes, it must necessarily be, because predictions are not verifiable, completely, until after the event, and different opinions arise. We have had in the Party, especially since the outbreak of the World War, conflicting opinions as to when the United States would make formal entry into the war, or whether or not the United States would enter the war. There were not very many that doubted that it would, but I heard some people in the Party express such opinions.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Q: And would you say that the opinions of Party members with reference to a possible future revolutionary situation is in that category of opinion, concerning which there are many differences of opinion?

A: Yes, there must necessarily be.

Q: Do you include in that category also, predictions as to whether the revolution would be accompanied by force or not?

A: Well, within limits, within limits. There is more agreement among the educated leaders of the Party who have studied history and Marxism — there is more agreement on that question, than on such a question as to the prospect of entry into the present World War.

Q: But there can be, and there are, differences of opinion as to the exact time of the revolutionary situation and the approximate development of it?

A: As to the time of a revolution, that is absolutely speculative. There isn't anybody in the Party that has anything more than a tentative opinion on that question.

Q: Does the leadership of the Party make any distinction between editorials, and columns, and signed articles, in the press?

A: Yes, I think a distinction is made among all three of them.

Q: What distinction is made?

necessarily represent greater authority than one signed by an unknown member of the Party?

A: Yes, or one signed by you.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOME MATERIAL

Q: Would you make any distinction between official resolutions of the Party and editorials?

A: Yes. A resolution is a formal document, approved by the National Committee itself, or by a convention. It is thought out, and becomes an official statement of the Party. In my opinion that carries and should carry a greater weight than an editorial which might be knocked out by an editor while he is rushing the paper to press, and is not written with the same care and preciseness of expression which obtains when a resolution is formally signed by the National Committee.

Q: Is it the custom of you, or of myself or anybody else in authority, to look over every editorial written for the press?

A: Well, I presume that would be the ideal way, but it does not work out, because the paper goes to press every week, and frequently the editors who are immediately responsible for the paper rush copy over to the printer to keep him satisfied, without giving it the necessary blue-penciling. That happens

(Continued on Page 4)

We Want Military Training Under Control Of The Unions

Our Military Policy Alone Provides The Kind Of Training And Leadership That Can Destroy Fascism

(Continued from page 3)

I think frequently on any publication that is of frequent issuance.

Q: And, frequently you and I are away from the office for months at a time?

A: Yes. We travel a great deal.

Q: And the paper goes to press without us?

A: Yes, they don't miss us much in that respect.

Q: Does the Party accept officially all opinions expressed in signed articles, or even editorials?

A: No. I would say, not officially, no. Signed articles by prominent leaders of the Party, in the minds of the Party members, have at least a semi-official status, I think, but they do not have the weight of a formal resolution of the Committee, or of a convention.

CIRCULATION OF THE PARTY PRESS

Q: What is the circulation of the Militant, the weekly organ of the Party?

A: I think it is between 15,000 and 20,000 at the present time.

Q: What is the circulation of the Fourth International?

A: I think about 4,000. That is the magazine.

Q: Now, besides the Militant and the Fourth International, you said that pamphlets are published?

A: Yes.

Q: Have you any idea how many pamphlets have been published in the last year or so?

A: Oh, I imagine half a dozen — not more.

Q: Referring to the Declaration of Principles, what is your best estimate as to the number of those pamphlets published?

A: I think the first edition was 5,000 or 10,000 — I am not sure which. That was published in 1938.

Q: Were there any subsequent editions?

A: No.

Q: So when you say "the first edition" you mean the only edition?

A: Yes, that is correct. The amendments that were made were not incorporated in a new edition. They were only printed in the press.

Q: And what is your best opinion as to the time when that Declaration of Principles was fairly well exhausted, and no more copies left, to give to the various branches for sale?

A: Well, as I recall it, the great bulk of them were sold or distributed in the first period. Thereafter they were sold in

drabbles to the branches. Whether the whole edition was sold or exhausted, I really don't know. I don't remember.

Q: Did the Party continue to sell the Declaration of Principles subsequent to its suspension?

A: No. There was an order issued by the Political Committee to the literature department not to send out any more after the decision of the December convention.

Q: But copies that were left in the possession of the branches remained there for sale, did they not?

A: Well, in the branches where there are book stores, they sell everything. In fact, they are encouraged to sell historical documents and pamphlets and books of other parties.

INTERPRETATIONS OF PARTY POLICY

Q: Would you say that there is a difference between general Party policy, which may or may not be misinterpreted by members of the Party, and a decision of the Party with reference to doing something concrete?

A: Yes. One is much clearer than the other.

Q: Explain that, will you please.

A: Well, for example —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: That explains itself, I think.

MR. GOLDMAN: No, I don't think so.

A (continued): To make a decision of the Party to participate in a given election — in that event, the Party members have to get out and gather signatures to put a candidate on the ballot. That has to be done once the decision is made. On the other hand, a declaration of policy about the conflict between the AFL and the CIO is not so easily assimilated. As a matter of fact, it is a continual question of difference of interpretation, which arises even among members of the Committee after the policy has been made.

I can cite, as an illustration, that since we were here for this trial we have had occasion — those of us who are here — to complain about articles and some editorials in the paper on the trade union question. We thought it did not exactly follow the last resolution of the Party. We had occasion to complain also about their handling of the German-Russian war. We thought their approach was not entirely in accord with the resolution as we interpreted it.

Q: So even when an official resolution is adopted, there are always, subsequent to the adoption, differences of opinion as to the interpretation of that resolution?

A: Yes, that is possible at any time. It does not always occur, but it is quite possible.

weapons and arms he is assigned to, and submit to discipline, and be concerned about the welfare of fellow-soldiers in order to establish his position in their respect and confidence.

THE COURT: May I inquire whether or not this is an oral or a written policy that Mr. Cannon has just given?

EXHIBITS RELATING TO THIS POSITION

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, I think the Government has introduced —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Let the witness answer the question.

MR. GOLDMAN: The Court is asking me the question. THE COURT: Yes, I am asking you. I was hoping you might develop it from the witness.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, the Government introduced the exhibit referred to by Mr. Cannon.

THE WITNESS: I think my speeches at the conference in Chicago last September were introduced as exhibits here, some extracts from them at least.

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, I am sure they were.

THE WITNESS: This policy was developed there, and the speech was an official speech I made on behalf of the National Committee at the conference.

MR. GOLDMAN: I am not introducing many things, because the Government has introduced them for me.

THE COURT: Mr. Myer, you should be able to put your finger on those particular exhibits, I believe.

MR. MYER: I think they are exhibits 116 and 186.

ed themselves in the affairs of workers' organizations, and who come from the rank and file of the workers. Such men as officers would be much more concerned about the welfare of the rank and file of soldiers than a college boy from Harvard or Yale, who never saw a factory, and never rubbed elbows with the worker, and considers him an inferior being.

That is, I would say, the heart of our military proposal, of our military policy.

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE SOLDIERS

Q: What is the position of the Party with reference to civil rights in the army?

A: Oh, yes. We stand also for soldiers' citizens' rights. We do not agree with the idea that when you take a million and a half young men out of civil life, that they cease to have the rights of citizens. We think they should have all the rights of citizens. They should have the right to petition Congress; they should have the right to vote; they should have the right to elect committees to present their grievances; they should have the right to elect their own officers, at least the minor officers, and in general they should have the democratic rights of citizens, and we advocate that. We advocate legislation to confer upon the soldiers those rights, and doing away with the present inefficient military set-up.

Q: Did the Party officially, or to your knowledge, did any Party member now in the service, ever attempt to create insubordination in the ranks of the armed forces?

A: Not to my knowledge.

Q: If there have been incidents of insubordination within the last year, or since the Selective Service Act was passed, did the Party either know about it, or participate in the creation of that insubordination?

A: So far as my knowledge goes, the Party has not had any knowledge of any such incidents, except insofar as they may have been reported in the daily press.

THE EXAMPLE OF PLATTSBURG

A: Yes. In fact, that was part of the origin of the idea. As I said before, the chief sore point in the military set-up is the class distinction between the officers and the ranks. We know that in the period prior to the first World War, special camps were set up for the training of business and professional men to be officers in the army. Plattsburg was one of these. This was a part of the so-called preparedness campaign, before the United States finally got into the war. The government appropriated some funds, and some business men donated funds. The government provided instructors, and furnished the neces-

sary equipment for the training of a large number of business and professional men who were ultimately to be officers in the army.

We cannot see why the workers should not have the same rights. We think it is perfectly fair and reasonable, certainly it is compatible with the existing laws. As I said before, it is a legislative proposal on our part. We would if we could, incorporate that into the law of the country.

THE COURT: We will take our morning recess at this time.

(MORNING RECESS)

Q: I call your attention, Mr. Cannon, to the testimony of some witnesses for the prosecution to the effect that certain Party members told them to join the Army, and then to start to kick about the food, and create dissatisfaction. What can you say with reference to the Party policy about that?

A: In the military forces, as far as our information goes from members who have been drafted and from others whom —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Now, just a moment. You are not answering the question at all. He asked you whether the Party had a policy, whether it does or does not. If so, tell us what that policy is, not what you heard from people in the service.

THE WITNESS: I want to explain why our policy is what it is.

THE COURT: We have not heard that there is a policy yet.

Q: Is there a policy?

A: Yes, we have a policy on everything.

Q: What is that policy?

A: The policy is not to support or to initiate any agitation about food. I want to tell you the reason.

So far as our knowledge goes, from members of the Party who have been drafted and whom we have seen on furlough, and

from other investigation, there is not much dissatisfaction with the food in the present set-up.

Q: And if there is any dissatisfaction with food, what would you say it was caused by?

NO GRIEVANCES WITHOUT FOUNDATION

A: So far as our information goes, there are only isolated cases now. We do not propose to kick about the food if the food is satisfactory. If the food is bad, the soldiers will kick about it themselves, and they should kick about it.

Q: What would you say about the testimony of these witnesses —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I object to that.

MR. GOLDMAN: Strike it out.

Q: Then will you state definitely, what is the policy of the Party with reference to creating dissatisfaction in the army, when causes for dissatisfaction do not exist?

A: I do not know of anything in the Party program or Party literature that proposes to incite grievances without foundation. Where causes for dissatisfaction exist, they create the dissatisfaction, not the Party.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Just a moment, please.

Q: If there have been grievances, and if there has been dissatisfaction, is the Party in any way responsible for that?

A: No, I don't think so, in any way at all. That is the present situation.

Q: And the people who have charge of feeding the army are the ones responsible for that, or for the grievances?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Well, that is leading.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, he has not objected, so you may proceed and answer it.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Then I will object to it now.

THE COURT: I will sustain the objection.

HOW WE SEEK TO PUT MILITARY POLICY INTO EFFECT

Q: Now, on the question of military training under trade union control — you were speaking about Plattsburg at the time of the recess. Will you continue and explain further the policy on that?

A: I used that as an illustration of how special camps were instituted and government instructors provided to train business and professional men in the period shortly prior to our entry into the last World War.

In the Spanish Civil War all the parties and unions not only had their own training camps authorized by the government, but even supplied their own regiments, in the fight against the fascist army of Franco.

Q: Now, the present trade unions are not under the control of the Party, are they?

A: No, they are under the control, essentially or practically completely, of leaders who are in harmony with the present Roosevelt administration.

Q: As I understand, the Party favors military training under trade union control?

A: Yes. The idea is to give to the unions as they are, a wider authority and supervision over their people.

Q: And that policy is not dependent upon the Party controlling the trade unions?

A: No. We can only take our chances that we will be in the minority in those training camps, as we are in the unions.

WE WOULD INTRODUCE IT INTO CONGRESS

Q: What measures do you propose in order to effectuate the policy of military training under trade union control?

A: As I think I said before, it is a proposal for a legislative program. We would have such a bill introduced into Congress and passed, if we had the power, or if we could gain the support of Congressmen who are opposed to us on other grounds, but who would agree to this. This is a program that is not necessarily socialist.

Q: If any member of the Party would either attempt to obstruct the Selective Service Act, or advise the obstruction of it, what would the Party do about that?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: That is objected to on the ground that there has been no evidence offered by the Government that the Party attempted to obstruct the Selective Service Act.

MR. GOLDMAN: Then the Government admits that the Party has not attempted to obstruct the Selective Service Act?

THE PARTY'S POSITION ON THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Q: Does the Party have an official position on the Russian Revolution, Mr. Cannon?

A: Yes.

Q: What is that position? Has it ever been adopted in the form of an official resolution?

A: It is incorporated in the Declaration of Principles.

Q: What is that position?

A: That the Party supports —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Just a moment. I will object to that on the ground that, the witness having stated that it is incorporated in the Declaration of Principles, therefore, it speaks for itself.

MR. GOLDMAN: An explanation of the Declaration of Principles is in order.

THE COURT: He may answer.

A (Continuing): We support the Russian Revolution of 1917. We consider that it embodies the doctrines and the theories of Marxism which we uphold.

Q: How many revolutions were there in Russia in 1917?

A: There was a revolution in February according to the Russian calendar, in March according to the modern calendar, which developed into the proletarian revolution of November 7th according to the modern calendar.

"MOST PROGRESSIVE EVENT IN HISTORY"

Q: What is the general position taken by Marxists with reference to the Russian Revolution?

A: The one that I have given here, in support of the revolution.

THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION OVERTHREW CZARISM

A: The Czar and Czarism were overthrown in March by an uprising of the masses, of the people in the big cities, and the peasants.

Q: Was the Bolshevik Party responsible for that uprising in any way?

A: No, the Bolshevik Party was a very infinitesimal group at the time of the March revolution.

Q: What is the meaning of Bolshevism?

A: The word "Bolshevik" is a Russian word meaning "majority". It acquired a political meaning in the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. In the Congress of 1903 a controversy developed which divided the party into groups, the majority and the minority, the majority called the Bolsheviks and the minority called Mensheviks.

Q: Those are Russian words, meaning minority and majority?

A: Yes. They split up, and divided into parties. Each call-

Q: And what does "support" mean?

A: Well, that is a rather mild — it would be a mild description of our attitude. We consider it the greatest and most progressive event in the entire history of mankind.

Q: And I think you said in your reply to a previous question, that you consider the doctrines embodied in that revolution as Marxist doctrines? Explain that.

A: The theory of Marxism in our opinion was completely vindicated in the Russian Revolution, and the theory of Marxism, which is the establishment of a government of workers and peasants, which undertakes to bring about a social transformation from capitalism towards socialism — all this was undertaken in the Russian Revolution.

Q: That is, insofar as the Russian Revolution put the workers and peasants in power, and expropriated the capitalists, we support that revolution?

A: Yes.

Q: That is the special meaning of that revolution?

A: That is the essence of the matter.

Q: Now, can you tell us anything about the legality of that revolution?

A: Yes.

THE COURT: Judged by what standards?

MR. GOLDMAN: What I mean by that is to have him explain exactly how the revolution occurred, because counsel for the Government tries to present it as a violent upheaval of the minority against the majority, and the facts are the very contrary. I want the witness to explain the nature of that revolution.

SOVIETS ESTABLISHED EVERYWHERE

When Czarism was overthrown by the masses of the people, the whole structure of that tyranny was destroyed. A new government was constituted, but the new government machinery was based on the Soviets, which sprang up spontaneously in the revolutionary upheaval. Soviets of workers and soldiers were established everywhere. In Petrograd, the workers and soldiers sent delegates — deputies — to the central council or, as they

(Continued on page 5)

THE CAUSE OF GRIEVANCES IN

Q: In your opinion, if there have been such incidents, what is the cause of them?

A: Well, I think there are a number of causes of discontent and dissatisfaction in the conscript army. That is a matter of public comment in all the newspapers and magazines, and various opinions and theories have been expressed as to the reasons for it.

Q: How does the Party propose to realize the demands for compulsory training under trade union control?

A: Well, our program is a legislative program. Everything we propose we would have incorporated into law. If we had a delegation in Congress, they would introduce a bill, or a series of bills, providing for the incorporation into the law of the country of these proposals, these military proposals of ours.

THE ARMED FORCES

Q: Did any authoritative leader of the Party ever refer to Plattsburg as an example?

The Possibility Of Peaceful Revolutions

(Continued from page 4)

called it, the Soviet; similarly in Moscow and other places. This body was recognized as authoritative.

The government that was constituted after the overthrow of the Czar was headed by Prince Lvov, with Miliukov as Foreign Minister; it derived its authority from the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.

In April they had a National All-Russian conference of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets, and there they elected an All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets. In May, the Peasant Soviets had an All-Russian Congress and elected an All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the peasants.

Q: What proportion of the population did those Soviets represent?

A: They represented the people, the great mass of the people. I think it was impossible even to speak in terms of majorities or minorities. They were the masses themselves. The peasants and the soldiers and the workers were the people; those two bodies, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Peasant Soviets, formed a joint body which was recognized as the most authoritative and representative body in Russia. It was by their consent that the government cabinet ruled.

The All-Russian Executive Committee of the Soviets repudiated Miliukov, who was the leader of the bourgeoisie. The Soviet body opposed him because of his foreign policy, involving secret treaties that had been exposed. He therefore had to resign, because without the support of the Soviets, authority was lacking; and I think that could be likened, as an analogy, to the French system of the resignation of the Prime Minister when there is a no-confidence vote in the Chamber.

Q: So that the Soviets constituted the authority of the people of Russia?

A: That is right.

Q: In what way did the Bolsheviks progress to power?

THE ROLE OF THE BOLSHEVIKS

A: I wish to go on with the chronology, if you will permit me.

Following the fall of Miliukov, Kerensky rose — there is a popular impression in this country that he became Premier with the fall of the Czar. That is not so. Kerensky became Premier in July. He was made a Minister and eventually Premier because he was a member of the Social Revolutionary Party. That was the Peasant party, which then led the Soviets. He was also supported by the worker element, because he had been a labor lawyer. That was the basis of Kerensky's office; that is, his authority was derived directly from the Soviets.

Now in this period the Bolsheviks were a small minority. They did not create the Soviets. The Soviets were created by the masses; they were initiated by the masses. Neither the Bolshevik Party nor any other party could do anything without the support of the Soviets. In the midst of the revolution of 1905 and again in the overthrow of the Czar in 1917, the Soviets sprang up spontaneously.

The most influential one naturally was in Petrograd, which was the seat of government. The Bolsheviks were a small minor-

HOW THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY CAME TO POWER

A: An armed action of a small group. The Bolshevik Party demanded, with Lenin as their spokesman, that the Social Revolutionary Party and the Menshevik Party take complete control of the government by removing the bourgeois ministers and make it a completely labor and peasant government, and they issued the promise that, "If you do that, we promise that as long as we are in the minority, we will not try to overthrow you. We will not support you politically, we will criticize you, but we will not undertake to overthrow the government as long as we are in the minority." That was the policy of the Bolsheviks in the March days of the revolution against the Czar, and into July.

In July the workers in Petrograd staged a demonstration with arms, against the advice of the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks advised against it on the ground that it might unduly provoke the situation, and tried to persuade the workers in Petrograd not to go into that action. It was not a rebellion; it was simply a parade with arms. This action, carried out by the Petrograd workers against the advice of the Bolsheviks, brought repressions against the workers on the part of the Kerensky government.

Then the Kerensky government undertook to discredit and frame-up the Bolshevik Party. They accused Lenin and Trotsky of being German spies. This was the predecessor of Stalin's Moscow Trials. They accused Lenin and Trotsky and the Bolsheviks of being German spies. Trotsky was thrown into jail, Lenin was forced into hiding, and repressions continued against the Bolsheviks, but it did not do any good, because the policy and slogans of the Bolsheviks were growing in popularity. One by one the great factories and soldiers' regiments began to vote in favor of the Bolshevik program.

THE ATTEMPTED UPRISING OF KORNILOV

In September an attempt at counter-revolution was made under the leadership of General Kornilov, who could be properly described as a Russian Monarchist-Fascist. He organized an army and undertook to overthrow the Kerensky government in Petrograd, with the idea of restoring the old regime.

The Kerensky government, that had put Trotsky in jail, had to release him from prison to get the support of his party to fight down the counter-revolutionary army of Kornilov.

Trotsky was brought from prison, and went directly to the Military-Revolutionary Committee, in which government men also sat, and there drew up with them plans for a joint fight against Kornilov. Kornilov was crushed; the counter-revolution was crushed, primarily by the workers under the inspiration of the Bolshevik Party. They tied up his railroad trains; he could not move his troops; his best troops were induced to fight against him, and his counter-revolution was crushed.

As this was going on, the Bolsheviks became more popular all the time, as the genuine representatives of the revolution. They gained the majority in the Petrograd Soviet, the most influential Soviet in the country, and in Moscow and others. The Kerensky government was losing ground because it was not solving any of the problems of the people. The Bolsheviks' slogans of "Bread", "Peace", "Land", and other slogans — those were the slogans that the masses wanted.

On November 7th was held the Congress of the All-Russian Soviets of Workers and Soldiers. The Bolsheviks had a majority there, and simultaneously with the meeting of the Soviets, where the Bolsheviks had a majority, they took the power from the government.

VIOLENCE AND THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Q: And was there any violence connected with the gaining of the majority by the Bolsheviks?

A: Very little — just a little scuffling, that's all.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: That was in Petrograd?

THE WITNESS: In Petrograd, yes. That was also where the Czar was overthrown.

Q: And subsequently to the gaining of the majority by the Bolsheviks what violence, if any, occurred?

It Exists Until Ruling Class Resorts To Violence



FARRELL DOBBS, Labor Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party and former General Organizer for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. (Testimony on Page 2)

ity in this Soviet at the time of the overthrow of the Czar. When Kerensky became Premier, the combination of his Social Revolutionary Party and the Menshevik Socialist Party — those two parties together had an overwhelming majority in the Soviets, and ruled by virtue of that. The Bolsheviks were an opposing faction.

During that time Lenin, as the spokesman for the Bolsheviks, said over and over again, "As long as we are in the minority in the Soviets, all we can do is patiently explain." The Bolshevik Party opposed any attempt to seize power by a putsch.

Q: What is a putsch?

A: One point more first. A month or so later, a special All-Russian Congress of the Peasant Soviets met, and there also the Bolsheviks had a majority. Then the minority withdrew from those authoritative bodies of government, and began an opposition struggle against the Bolshevik government.

Q: What violence, if any, occurred, and who initiated the violence?

A: That began following the armed struggle against the government.

HOW SOVIETS WERE ELECTED

Q: Who began it?

A: The Czarists, the White Russian element, the bourgeoisie generally, the deposed capitalists and others. They undertook a counter-revolution, and the civil war that ensued lasted until almost 1921. The civil war lasted so long because the White Guard and bourgeois elements received the support, first, of the Germans, and then of England and France, and even the United States sent an expedition.

The Soviet government had to fight against the whole capitalist world, on top of fighting against their own opposition at home; and the fact that the Bolsheviks represented the great majority of the people was best evidenced by the fact that they were victorious in this civil war, not only against their opponents at home, but also against the outside powers who supplied the opposition with arms, soldiers and funds.

Q: How were the Soviets in those days elected?

A: They were elected in the factory workers' meetings; that is, the factory workers would gather to elect their delegate. Each Soviet constituted a unit of government, and the combination of Soviets constituted the government.

In the Soviet system, the factories select delegates, according to their number, one for each 1,000, or whatever the proportion may be. The soldiers' regiments do the same; the peasants or dirt farmers do the same, so that the government established in that way, by those Soviets, represents the whole mass of the people who are involved in productive activity.

Q: What was the number of members of the Bolshevik Party at the time of the Russian Revolution in November, 1917?

A: Well, the most authoritative figure I have seen given is 260,000, or a quarter of a million. That seems to be the figure that has the best authority.

BOLSHEVIKS SUPPORTED BY GREAT MAJORITY

Q: And what proportion of the population supported the Bolshevik Party at that time?

A: Well, in my opinion, the great majority of the workers, peasants and soldiers supported them at the time they took power and afterwards.

Q: From which group or class of society did the Bolshevik Party get most of its members?

A: From the workers. It was a workers' party, a party of industrial workers and agricultural laborers. There were some peasants in the party, but the party was primarily constituted of industrial workers in the cities, agricultural laborers and some intellectuals, some educated people who had put themselves at the service of the workers in the party.

Q: What is the best authority as to the number of workers in Russia at the time of the revolution — by "workers" meaning industrial workers?

A: 5,000,000.

Q: And the majority of the population consisted of peasants?

A: Peasants, yes.

Q: What is your opinion as to the number of members that the Socialist Workers Party will probably have when the majority of people in this country adopt the program of the party?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I object to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the basis of your objection?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: He is asking this witness to guess today as to the number of members that the Socialist Workers

Party will have when a majority of the people in the United States adopt its policy.

THE COURT: There are too many elements of speculation in that. Objection sustained.

"CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER" DOCTRINE

MR. GOLDMAN: I want to urge this, Your Honor; one of the elements in this case is, as Your Honor knows, the "clear and present danger" doctrine. I ought to be permitted to develop the size of the party now, and the approximate size in the opinion of experts, that the Party will have, must have, at the time a majority adopts the program of the Party, to show, I submit, the relative position of the Party at the present time. If, for instance, it would be necessary to have a party of three million or four million, and at this time there is a party of 2,000, you could readily see how the doctrine of "clear and present danger" applies to that situation.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: It clearly calls for speculation, as to events in the future, that no one can possibly know about now.

THE COURT: I do not see any tangible factor that has

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TROTSKY AND STALIN

MR. GOLDMAN: All right — question withdrawn.

Q: Will you tell the Court and jury what differences arose between Stalin and Trotsky subsequent to the Revolution?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I object to that, because I do not see any materiality or relevancy in it.

THE COURT: I would like to have the question read, please. (Question read by the Reporter).

MR. GOLDMAN: The prosecution has contended, and I think Mr. Anderson has made many statements, to the effect that Trotsky, being the arch-conspirator in this case, had certain ideas and certain doctrines. I think the jury is entitled to know in a general way — it is impossible to go into great detail — but the Government has opened up its case in such a way that it is essential for the jury to know at least some of the basic principles of Trotsky, who it is alleged was one of the arch-conspirators.

THE COURT: Well, if you will agree to limit it to a reasonable amount of testimony.

MR. GOLDMAN: I certainly will — otherwise, we might be here two years.

MR. ANDERSON: All we ever brought out, on Trotsky, was some literature and speeches and pamphlets, in the Party press.

MR. GOLDMAN: I should think that after the prosecution takes three weeks, that they should give me a week at least to try the case.

THE COURT: I don't think it is necessary to try it that way.

MR. GOLDMAN: Mr. Schweinhaut made various remarks — THE COURT: Mr. Schweinhaut has made very few objections to the direct examination, which has covered a tremendously wide field.

Q: Will you describe briefly the fundamental differences that arose between Stalin and Trotsky subsequent to the revolution?

STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

A: I mentioned the other day that the fight originated in the struggle over democracy. That was the origin of the fight, really inspired by Lenin, during his last illness, in collaboration with Trotsky. Lenin did not survive to take part in the fight,

WHY WE DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION

THE COURT: He may answer that.

A: What do you mean, how we characterize it?

Q: How you characterize it, and explain the characterization.

A: Well, the characterization we make of the Soviet Union as it is today, is of a workers' state, created by the revolution of November, 1917, distorted by the bad present regime, and even degenerated, but nevertheless retaining its basic character as a workers' state, because it is based on nationalized industry, and not on private property.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: The answer proves that my objection is good. It is not relevant in this case. I will object to it, therefore, Your Honor.

MR. GOLDMAN: A lot of evidence was introduced with reference to the Soviet Union, and our defending the Soviet Union.

THE COURT: Yes, that was why I allowed this to go in. There has been testimony here that, in the event of a war in which the United States was involved, this Party would defend the Soviet Union. Under that testimony, I feel that you are entitled to show the reasons why, if that is true.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I agree with that, that they should have that right, but I don't see how the last answer has anything to do with it.

THE COURT: Well, perhaps it doesn't, but it may stand.

BECAUSE IT IS A WORKERS STATE

Q: Now, what is the position of the Party towards the defense of the Soviet Union, and why?

A: We are in favor of defending the Soviet Union against imperialist powers for the reason I just gave, because we consider it a progressive development, as a workers' state, that has nationalized industry and has eliminated private capitalism and landlordism. That is the reason we defend it.

Q: That is, you consider the Russian or the Soviet State, a state based on the expropriation of private industry from the capitalists?

A: Yes, the operation of industry as a nationalized industry.

Q: And you are defending that kind of a state?

A: Yes.

Q: Isn't it a fact that Stalin has killed most all of the so-called Trotskyists in Russia?

A: Yes. We are against Stalin, but not against the Soviet form of industrial production.

Q: Will you explain why a violent revolution is necessary, for a Russian revolution?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Do you mean now?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes. Your Honor, I think it has a very important bearing.

THE COURT: Do you mean in the past?

MR. GOLDMAN: No, right now. The prosecution tends to argue that because we are in favor of a violent revolution, and the government exhibits I think will show it, in the Soviet Union and in Germany, therefore we are in favor of it here in this country. I want him to explain why a violent revolution is absolutely necessary in Russia and Germany and that it might not be necessary in the United States.

THE COURT: He may answer, but is this likely to be an extended discussion?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, I think so, Your Honor.

been suggested by the witness, or is involved in the question, that would justify the assumption that he could answer that without indulging in a great deal of speculation. I will adhere to the ruling.

Q: On the basis of the proportion of Party members to wage workers in the Russian revolution, have you an opinion as to the probable proportion of Party members to wage workers in the United States at the time a majority adopts the program of the Socialist Workers Party?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Same objection.

MR. GOLDMAN: "Have you an opinion" — that is all I am asking now.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: What good is his opinion? How can he answer that without indulging in a great deal of speculation?

THE COURT: Do you object to it?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Yes.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

MR. GOLDMAN: Exception.

Q: What is the Party membership at present, Mr. Cannon?

A: About 2,000.

Q: Then the figure testified to by Bartlett was correct, about?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I object to that question, if Your Honor please.

and Trotsky had to lead it. This soon developed further.

It soon became apparent to critical observers, this tendency of Stalin to crush democracy in the party, and in the life of the country generally. It was based on Stalin's desire to change the program and the course of direction of the revolution, which could only be done by this means. Trotsky struggled for free discussion of the problem, with the confidence that the majority of the workers in the party would support his program. Stalin and his group represented, in our opinion, the conservative tendency, based upon a certain stratum of the party and the government, that had acquired official positions and privileges and wanted to stop there.

Q: Stalin then represented in your opinion the party of the bureaucratic?

A: The bureaucratic and conservative. As a matter of fact, Trotsky designated it as the bureaucratic-conservative faction, at one stage in the struggle.

Q: Interested in what?

A: It was interested in preserving its privileges, and not extending and developing the benefits for the great mass of the people.

Q: What form did this dictatorship of Stalin assume?

OBJECTIONS BY SCHWEINHOUT

A: It assumed the form of crushing democracy inside of the Communist Party and establishing a dictatorial regime there. For example —

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Well, while Mr. Cannon is pausing; may I object now to this line of testimony because it is immaterial and irrelevant to the issues here? It is immaterial what form of government Stalin set up in Russia. What do we care?

THE COURT: I do not see any reason why he should go into all the details. I think you should recognize that, Mr. Goldman. I want to give you every opportunity, every reasonable opportunity, to present your theory of the case before this jury, but I do think that there is much here that is immaterial and unnecessary.

Q: What is the position of the Party on the Soviet Union at present?

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: I object to that, Your Honor.

WHY WE DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION

THE COURT: The jury will keep in mind the admonition heretofore given them, and we will recess now until two o'clock this afternoon.

Wednesday, November 19, 1941
(AFTERNOON SESSION)

(Hearing resumed pursuant to recess at 2:00 P. M.)

THE COURT: Proceed, gentlemen.

JAMES P. CANNON

resumed the stand, having been previously duly sworn, and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

By Mr. Goldman:

Q: I think I asked you when we closed this morning, Mr. Cannon, to explain to us the position of the party on the necessity of a violent revolution in the Soviet Union against the Stalin regime, and why.

A: We are in favor of a political revolution in the Soviet Union. That is, as distinguished from a social revolution, in that we would not change the property forms, only the governmental superstructure. We would retain the nationalized property and the collectivized farming system.

We propose to overthrow the Stalin regime by revolution, and in the Soviet Union that revolution must necessarily be a violent revolution.

LACK OF WORKERS' DEMOCRACIES

Q: Why?

A: Because there is absolutely no democracy permitted under the Stalin regime, no freedom of speech, press, or assembly, no possibility of organizing the people in a peaceful way or reaching them in a democratic process, and under those conditions in Russia, as in Hitler's Germany, one cannot conceive of any possibility of the masses finding liberation from these dictatorships, except by a violent revolution.

Q: And in what way —

A: There can't be any ambiguity or alternatives about it, just as the Czar could only be overthrown by a violent rising of the masses.

Q: And is there any distinction in the conditions of those countries from the condition in the United States?

A: There is, certainly at the present time, insofar as the working people and the minority parties here have the opportunity to participate in elections, to publish their papers, to conduct their meetings. You can very consistently and logically undertake to proceed along that peaceful democratic road as long as the opportunity is offered.

Q: And the party would exhaust all the possibilities for a peaceful transformation if the democratic rights are given to the working masses?

A: In my opinion, to the very end, yes.

Q: Even to the end of trying to amend the Constitution of the United States, as provided for by the Constitution of the United States?

A: If the democratic processes are maintained here, if they are not disrupted by the introduction of fascist methods by the government, and the majority of the people supporting the ideas of Socialism can secure a victory by the democratic processes, I don't see any reason why they cannot proceed, continue to proceed, by the democratic method of amending the Constitution to fit the new regime.

Naturally, the amendments would have to be of a very drastic

(Continued on page 6)

The Part Comrade Trotsky Played In Our Movement

(Continued from page 5)

character, but parts of the Constitution I would be willing to write into the program of the party at any time — that is the Bill of Rights, which we believe in.

That section of the Constitution which protects private property rights, we think, would absolutely have to be changed in the society which we envisage, which eliminates private property in industrial enterprises of a large-scale nature.

Q: But it is your belief, is it not, that in all probability the minority will not allow such a peaceful transformation?

A: That is our opinion. That is based on all the historical precedents of the unwillingness of any privileged class, no matter how it is outlived, to leave the scene without trying to impose its will on the majority by force. I cited examples yesterday.

Q: What is the —

A: I might give you another example on the same point. For example, the Bolshevik revolution in Hungary was accomplished without the shedding of one drop of blood, in a completely peaceful manner.

Q: When was that?

A: That was in 1919. The government that was established

MARXISM IS OUR PARTY'S GUIDE TO ACTION

Q: What is the position that the party gives to Karl Marx and his doctrines?

A: Karl Marx was the originator of the theories and doctrines and social analyses, which we know as scientific socialism, or Marxism, upon which the entire movement of scientific socialism has been based since his day.

In the Communist Manifesto of 1848 his ideas were sketched, and then in other big volumes, notably in Capital, he made a most exhaustive scientific analysis of the laws governing the operation of capitalist society, showed how the contradictions within it would lead to its downfall as a social system, showed how the conflict of interests between the employers and the workers would represent an uninterrupted class struggle until the workers gained the upper hand and instituted the society of socialism.

So Karl Marx can be viewed not only as the founder of our movement, but as the most authoritative representative of its ideology.

Q: Does the party accept all of the statements found in all of the books written by Karl Marx?

A: No, the party has never obligated itself to do that. We do not consider even Marx as infallible. The party accepts his basic ideas and theories as its own basic ideas and theories. That does not prohibit the party or members of the party from disagreeing with things said or written by Marx which do not strike at the fundamental basis of the movement, of the doctrine.

Q: And you interpret Marx, or you apply the Marxian theories, under conditions that prevail at the present time, is that right?

A: Yes. You see, we don't understand Marxian theory as a revelation, as a dogma. Engels expressed it by saying our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action, which means that it is a method which the students of Marxism must understand and learn how to apply. One can read every letter and every line written by Marx and still not be a useful Marxist, if one does not know how to apply it to the conditions of his own time. There have been such people, whom we call pedants.

Q: You are acquainted with the Communist Manifesto, are you not?

A: Yes.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO OF 1848

Q: And you remember — I think it is the last clause of the Manifesto, where Marx and Engels, co-authors, say: "We disdain to conceal our aims," and mention something to the effect about violent revolution. Do you remember that?

A: Well, it says, "We disdain to conceal our aims. We openly say that they can be achieved only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social institutions."

Q: When was the Communist Manifesto written?

A: 1848.

A: Subsequent to the writing of the Communist Manifesto, did Marx ever write anything with reference to the possibility of a peaceful revolution in democratic countries?

A: Yes.

Q: Where was that written, and explain to the jury what was said.

A: Well, the most authoritative place where it is stated and explained is in the introduction to the first volume of Marx's master-work, called Capital, the introduction by Frederick Engels, who was his co-worker, who was the co-author of the Communist Manifesto, and is recognized universally in the movement as completely identified with all of Marx's ideas and theories, who as a matter of fact edited and compiled the second two volumes of Capital, after the death of Marx.

Q: What did he say in that introduction?

A: This was the English translation of Capital and the introduction was introducing the volume to the English public, and he stated — I think I can quote almost literally — that he thinks the work of a man who, during his entire life, was of the opinion that the social transformation in England, at least, could be effected by purely peaceful and legal means — he thought such a book should have a hearing from the English

A WORKERS STATE WILL LEAD TO CLASSLESS SOCIETY

A: No, not in our view.

Q: Is it true that there is Communism in the Soviet Union?

A: No, there isn't any Communism in the Soviet Union.

Q: Is there Socialism in the Soviet Union?

A: No — well, I would like to clarify that now. Socialism and Communism are more or less interchangeable terms in the Marxist movement. Some make a distinction between them in this respect; for example, Lenin used the expression Socialism as the first stage of Communism, but I haven't found any other authority for that use. I think that is Lenin's own particular idea. I, for example, consider the terms Socialism and Communism interchangeable, and they relate to the classless society based on planned production for use as distinct from a system of capitalism based on private property and production for profit.

Q: Could there be a Socialist society and a dictatorship like Stalin has at the present time?

A: No. According to Marx and Engels, as you approach the classless Socialist or Communist society, the government, instead of becoming more of a factor in human affairs, becomes less and less and eventually withers away and disappears, and is replaced or evolves into an administrative body that does not employ repression against the people.

So the very term government implies, in our terminology, a class society, — that is, a class that is dominant and a class that is being suppressed. That holds true whether it is a capitalist government, which in our views oppresses or suppresses the workers and the farmers and represents the interests of the big capital, or a workers' and farmers' government immediately following a revolution which represents the interests of the workers and farmers and suppresses any attempt of the displaced capitalist class to resist its authority or to re-establish its rule.

Our Party "Regarded Him All The Time As The Theoretical Inspirer and Teacher Of Our Movement"

following the war, of which Count Karolyi was Premier, came to what it considered the end of its resources — it could not control the country, did not have the support of the masses, and Count Karolyi as head of the government, on his own motion, went to the head of the Bolshevik party, or the Communist Party, rather, of Hungary, who was in prison, and summoned him to take charge of the government in a peaceful, legal manner, like the change of a cabinet in the French Parliament — of course, prior to the Pétain regime.

Then this Soviet government, having been established in this way, peacefully, was confronted by an uprising of the privileged class, of the landlords and the big owners, who organized an armed fight against the government, and eventually overthrew it. The violence on a mass scale followed the change of the government, did not precede it.

public. That is very close to a literal report of what he stated in this introduction.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND EUROPE

Q: And why did Marx have that opinion with reference to England?

A: Well, he had that opinion with reference to England as distinct from the autocratic countries, because of its parliamentary system, its democratic processes, and civil libertarian method of political procedure.

Q: So at the time that Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto in 1848, there was no democracy in existence on the European continent, is that right?

A: The whole of Europe was seething with revolutions at that time.

Q: And no democratic processes were available?

A: At least not in the stable system that had been established in England.

I think I should add, to get the whole picture of this introduction that I am speaking of, that Engels said, after he had made this remark which I have reported, he said: "To be sure, Marx did not exclude the possibility of a pro-slavery rebellion on the part of the outmoded and dispossessed ruling class." That is, after the transfer of power.

Q: What would you say is the relationship of the Declaration —

THE COURT: Pardon me, Mr. Cannon. Would you be good enough to elaborate a bit upon the significance of that pro-slavery phrase?

THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

THE WITNESS: Yes. I think he had in mind the American Civil War. Marx and Engels attentively followed the American Civil War, wrote extensively about it in the New York Tribune. A collection of those writings, both political and military, have been published as a book, which is a classic in our movement, and what Marx undoubtedly had in mind when he spoke of a "pro-slavery rebellion," was an analogy with the American Civil War, which he had characterized as a pro-slavery rebellion on the part of the Southern slave owners. Of course, he did not maintain that the English bourgeoisie are slaveholders in the same sense, but that they exploit the workers.

Q: Now what, in your opinion, is the relationship between the Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Workers Party and the theories of Karl Marx?

A: Well, I would say that in so far as we understand Marxism and are able to apply it, it is an application of the Marxian theories and doctrines, his whole system of ideas, to the social problem in America.

Q: That is, the Declaration of Principles is based then upon the fundamental theories of Karl Marx?

A: Yes, we consider it a Marxist document.

Q: What is the position that the party gives to Lenin?

A: Lenin, in our judgment, was the greatest practical leader of the labor movement and the Russian Revolution, but not on the plane of Marx in the theoretical field. Lenin was a disciple of Marx, not an innovator in theory. To be sure he contributed very important ideas, but to the end of his life he based himself on Marx, as a disciple in the Marxist movement of the world. He holds a position of esteem on a level with Marx, with this distinction between the merits of the two.

Q: Does the party, or do party members agree with everything that Lenin ever wrote and published?

A: No. The same attitude applies to Lenin as to Marx. That is, the basic ideas and doctrines practiced, promulgated and carried out by Lenin, are supported by our movement, which does not exclude the possibility of differing with him about this or that particular writing, or of individual members of the party differing with Lenin on important respects, as has been the case more than once in our party.

Q: By the way, is it true that there is a Communist government in the Soviet Union?

But once the resistance of the old out-lived exploiting class is broken, and its members become reconciled to the new society and become assimilated in it, find their place in it; and the struggle between classes which is the dominating factor in all class societies is done away with, because of the disappearance of class distinctions; then the primary function of government as a repressive instrument disappears and the government withers away with it. This is the profound conception of Marx and Engels that is adhered to by all their disciples.

BLANQUISM AND OUR MOVEMENT

Q: Did Lenin ever use the term "Blanquism" to designate a certain type of movement?

THE COURT: What is that?

MR. GOLDMAN: Blanquism.

THE WITNESS: Yes, he wrote more than one article in the course of the Russian Revolution, more than once he wrote, "We are not Blanquists."

Q: Now, what is meant by "Blanquism"?

A: Blanqui was a figure in the French revolutionary movement who had followers in the Paris Commune of 1871. Blanqui had his own conception of party and of revolution, and his ideas are known among the students of the history of the labor movement as Blanquism.

Q: What are his ideas?

A: Blanqui's idea was that a small group of determined men, tightly disciplined, could effect the revolution with a coup d'etat.

Q: What is a "coup d'etat"?

A: That is a seizure of power, a seizure of state power by armed action of a small, determined, disciplined group; they would, so to speak, make the revolution for the masses.

Q: And what did Lenin say about that?

A: Lenin opposed this view and his articles were written in answer to opponents who had accused the Bolsheviks of aiming to seize power without a majority. He said, "We are not Blanquists. We base ourselves on mass parties and mass movements, and as long as we are in the minority, our task is to patiently explain the problems and issues until we gain the majority, and as long as we are in the minority we will not try to overthrow you. You let us have our freedom of speech and press, give us the opportunity to expound our ideas, and you don't need to fear any Blanquist putsch on our part."

Putsch, as I explained before, is an attempt of a small group to seize power by surprise tactics.

Q: So Lenin depended upon mass parties and upon gaining a majority for those mass parties, did he?

THE SUPPORT OF THE MAJORITY

A: Yes, in the early days of the Communist International — it is a period that I am familiar with through close study and personal participation in the movement — he hammered at this idea all the time, not only against his critics in Russia, but against various individuals and groups who came toward support of the Russian Revolution, and had some distorted idea. In Germany, for example, in 1921, the German party, which

RELATION OF TROTSKY TO THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

A: Well, our movement in 1928 — when our faction was expelled from the Communist Party — we had adopted the program of Trotsky.

We supported his program from the very beginning — and this was long before we had any personal contact with him, he had been expelled from the Russian party and was exiled in the Asiatic wilderness at a place called Alma Ata. We had no communication with him. We did not know where he was, whether he was dead or alive, but we had one of his important programmatic documents which was called, "The Criticism of the Program of the Comintern." This book, elaborated his theories as against those of Stalin at great length and in fundamental respects. This was adopted by us as our own program and from the very beginning we proclaimed our faction as Trotsky's faction.

We worked for about six months here without any communication with him, until he was deported to Turkey, Constantinople, and then we established communication with him by mail.

Later, various leading members of the party visited him. We had very extensive correspondence with him, and in this correspondence and in visits by individual members, we had an extremely close relation to him and regarded him all the time as the theoretical inspirer and teacher of our movement.

Q: When did you first visit Trotsky?

A: I visited him in France in 1934 — that is, for the first time after our expulsion from the Communist Party.

Q: And what role, if any, did Trotsky play in formulating the doctrines of the Socialist Workers Party?

A: Well, he played a very important role. Although he did not write our party documents, his ideas interpreting Marxism in our time were the source from which we got our main concepts and rewrote them in American terms, tried to apply them to American conditions.

Q: Did he write any articles about conditions and developments in the United States in those days?

A: I don't recall that he wrote much in those days about America.

Q: Did he at any time in those days tell you as to what practical action should be taken in the United States by your group?

A: Yes. One of the subjects of controversy in our early

NATURE OF DISCUSSIONS WITH TROTSKY

Q: What was the nature of the discussions that you held with Trotsky while you were there?

A: All the important problems of the world movement.

Q: Any problems of the American labor movement?

A: Yes.

Q: Did you ever discuss the question of Union Defense Guards and Local 544 with him?

A: No, I personally had no discussion with him about 544 Defense Guards. We discussed with him the question of Defense Guards in General. This, I think, was in our visit in 1938.

Q: Do you know of your own knowledge whether Trotsky had many visitors?

A: Yes, I know that he did. I know that he had many visitors, because in my capacity as Secretary of the Party I frequently was called upon to give letters of introduction to people who wanted to visit him. He was visited, not only by our members, but by journalists, by school teachers, a history class which used to tour Mexico, and he was visited by public people of many kinds and opinions while he was there.

Q: Then the discussions that you had with Trotsky referred to and related to general political questions, did they not?

A: Yes — yes, questions of the war, of fascism, trade unionism —

Q: But they had nothing to do with party activities, branches, or of particular sections of the party?

A: No, I don't recall that Trotsky ever interested himself in the detailed local work of the party; I don't recall that.

TROTSKY'S WORK

Q: How busy a man was he?

A: Well, he was the busiest man I ever saw. Trotsky, in addition to all his political work and his enormous correspondence, and his journalistic work — and he wrote innumerable articles and pamphlets for us — he wrote for magazines and newspapers, such as the New York Times, Saturday Evening Post, Liberty, and other magazines — and in addition to that, he produced in the eleven years since his exile to Turkey in 1929 to his death in 1940, a literary output greater by volume than that of the average writer who does nothing else but write.

He wrote the three huge volumes on the Russian Revolution which, from the point of view of literary labor, could be considered a life task by any writer. He wrote a full-sized book

had recently been organized, attempted an insurrection without having the support of the masses; this became famous in the literature of our international movement, as "the March action." The tactics embodied in it, the conception of some of the German leaders that they could force the revolution by their own determination and sacrifices — this whole idea, the March action and all the ideas embodied in it, were condemned by the Second Congress of the Communist International at the insistence of Lenin and Trotsky. They refuted this theory, and they counterposed to it mass parties, mass movements, gaining the majority.

They put out the slogan to the German party that it should aim to have a million members. Zinoviev, who was Chairman of the Comintern, on the German question made that one of his leading ideas, that the task of the German party was not to get impatient or to try to force history, but to be busy with agitation and propaganda and have the goal of a million in the party.

Q: These million members would not by themselves make any revolution, would they?

A: Naturally not — Lenin did not expect to have a majority of the population become members of the party, but to support the party. But the very fact that he proposed — or rather, Zinoviev who was the lieutenant of Lenin, acting as Chairman of the Communist International proposed — as a slogan, "A million members in the German Party," certainly was a powerful indication that they did not expect to get a majority of the people until they had a numerically powerful party.

Q: Now, what relationship, if any, did Leon Trotsky have to the Socialist Workers' Party?

AFTER TROTSKY CAME TO MEXICO

days was what kind of activity we should occupy ourselves with.

He supported the idea of a purely propagandistic activity in our early days — that is, as distinguished from what we call mass work. We were so few in numbers, we could not hope to do anything except to try to publish a paper and convert some people to our basic ideas; a very, very modest task of routine propaganda was assigned by the necessity of the situation to our group at that time, and he supported that.

AFTER TROTSKY CAME TO MEXICO

Q: When did you first make frequent contact with Trotsky?

A: He was driven out of France and then out of Norway and finally received asylum in Mexico by the action of President Cardenas. If I am correct as to the exact month, I think it was January, 1937.

Thereafter he lived in Mexico until August 21, 1940, when he was assassinated. In the period that he was there we made frequent visits to him. I personally was there to see him twice, once in the spring of 1938 and again in the summer of 1940. Other party leaders and party members visited him frequently. I personally maintained a very active correspondence with him, and so did other members of the party, and I would say we were in very, very intimate contact with him after he came to Mexico.

Q: What did the Socialist Workers Party do with reference to helping Trotsky guard himself, and also with reference to aiding him in his expenses?

A: We knew that Trotsky was marked for assassination by Stalin, who had killed off practically all the important leaders of the revolution through his mass trials and his purges and frame-ups and so forth. We knew that Trotsky, as the greatest of all the opponents of Stalin, was marked for assassination, and we undertook to protect him. We set up a special committee which had the sole purpose of collecting funds to support this endeavor.

We supplied guards, we supplied money regularly and systematically for transforming his house into as close to a fortress as possible. We collected and supplied the funds to buy the house for him. We supplied the expenses of the guards who were sent there, and in general, in every way possible, extended ourselves to protect his life and facilitate his work.

NATURE OF DISCUSSIONS WITH TROTSKY

called, "The Revolution Betrayed," and he wrote his autobiography and innumerable smaller books and pamphlets and articles in that period.

Q: The party, then, never bothered him with minor questions of policy and activities?

A: Not to my knowledge; I know I never did.

READ THE RECORD OF THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

SPECIAL Subscription Offer

valid from November 7, 1941 to

February 1, 1942

2 issues of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (20c each)

8 issues of the MILITANT (5c each) both for

50¢

I enclose 50c, for which please mail me the MILITANT and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Mail to:

THE MILITANT

116 University Place

New York City

Next week's issue of THE MILITANT will conclude the testimony of Comrade Cannon on direct examination by Defense Attorney Goldman, and cross-examination by Assistant Attorney-General Schweinhaut. Every worker who is interested in the issues in this trial will want to read the full transcript of this historic debate between the National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, representing the interests of socialist ideas and militant unionism, and the carefully picked spokesman for Roosevelt and Biddle, representing the interests of the warmongering politicians and capitalists.

The Negro Struggle

By Ernest Williams

Negro Workers and the CIO Convention

The recent convention of the CIO in Detroit mapped plans that are of vital importance to Negro workers throughout the country. By far the most significant was the decision to launch an organizational drive of the CIO in the deep South.

With the majority of mass production industries in the North now organized, the next step is the organization of the underpaid Negro and white laborers of the South.

It is roughly estimated that there are well over 200,000 Negro workers already in the CIO. The largest proportion come from the United Mine Workers, the United Automobile Workers, as well as steel, meat-packing, etc. Now comes the drive to organize the Southern industrial workers and the cheated and underprivileged share-croppers and the agricultural workers.

These plans were greeted with great enthusiasm by the delegates, and particularly the Negro delegates who understand that the Negro people will benefit vitally through such a drive.

It was stressed by many Negro delegates that such a drive by the CIO would help in the fight to abolish the poll tax in the South. In fact, many insisted that *only* through the cooperation of the CIO was there any hope of wiping out these reactionary laws.

The attitude of Negro workers toward the CIO and its plans to organize in the South was probably best expressed by Rev. Owen I. Whitfield of Missouri, a delegate from UCAPOA and representative of the cotton field workers of Alabama and Arkansas. He declared:

"We Negroes in the South don't fear Hitler bombings because we haven't anything to be bombed. However, we are interested in the CIO because we believe that the CIO is more apt to give the Negro a square deal than any other organized labor group in America. We, in the South, are expecting the CIO to come to our rescue, to do in fact, what the New Deal has been able to do only in theory."

Resolutions of Interest

The CIO once again reaffirmed its attitude of welcome toward Negro workers and toward the active participation of Negroes as union leaders and field organizers. It endorsed a resolution condemning the practice of lynching and endorsing the principle of Federal anti-lynching legislation.

Another resolution condemned all racial and religious discrimination in defense jobs and in the Army, and called upon all CIO affiliates to use their resources to stamp out discrimination.

Then a resolution was adopted on the unity of Negro and white workers, stating that the fundamental interests of both are the same, and reaffirming their opposition to any and all forms of discrimination and pledging to work for the elimination of outworn prejudices in American life both among employees and employers.

Attitude Toward War

At the same time that plans were made for an organizational drive in the South, Murray and other CIO leaders issued statements in full support of the Roosevelt Administration and its pro-war policies. There was an obvious contradiction here. To organize the South, the CIO will have to fight bitterly against those same Southern poll-taxers and landlords who control the legislative and municipal powers of the South and who are the leading advocates of war in this country.

However, the Negro delegates at the convention, representing those to whom this "war for democracy" is the greatest deception, had something a little different to say.

Walter Harden of the UAW stated: "While Hitler is a menace to the world, discrimination that existed against Negroes before the Hitler menace came, cannot be forgotten. The only difference between the Jews of Germany and Hitler's government, and the Negroes residing below the Mason and Dixon line in America, is that in Germany the Jew has something that can be taken away."

Other statements were made to the effect that "if we are fighting for democracy abroad, it would be better to also fight for democracy at home, or to be assured, first, that democracy exists here in the United States."

Need for Militant Action

A real drive to organize workers in the deep South can be successfully carried out only through militant action. Not only must the fight be conducted against the reactionary landlords and employers, but it must also fight tooth and nail against their lynching and poll-tax methods of terrorizing and silencing the masses of people.

The militants of the CIO must guard against any attempt to abandon this organizing drive in the South on the plea of "national unity." The only unity worth while is the solidarity of the working class, Negro and white, Southern as well as Northern, throughout the country.

Announcing

HARLEM LABOR DEFENSE SOCIAL!

THIS SATURDAY NIGHT
DECEMBER 6, 1941

with

MOVIES! DANCING! HOT FOOD!
REFRESHMENTS!

Harlem Hdqrs. 72 West 125th St.
Socialist Workers Party New York City

Southern Drive Is A Key Task Of CIO

Organizing Campaign in South, Voted by Convention, Will Meet Violent Opposition

By JOE ANDREWS

In spite of the strong pro-war stand of the CIO convention and the general political retreat of the leadership, the discussions and decisions at Detroit dealt in a progressive way with many important and crucial problems of the American workers. Outstanding organizational decision of the convention was the firm resolve to organize the South.

The resolution unanimously adopted on this point, put the CIO invasion of the reactionary, poll-tax and open shop South as point number one on the CIO agenda for the coming year.

Other militant resolutions which gave the convention a progressive aspect, such as attacks on the poll tax system, against Negro discrimination, against lynching and the like are linked with an all-out campaign to crack the vile lante Bourbon dictatorship in the South.

The CIO, with its ability to inspire all the exploited, has already made its first successes in the South. The victory of the United Mine Workers in abolishing the wage differential in Southern mines, served to bring a ray of hope to Southern workers black and white, who have been given the dirty end of the stick in this country. The closed shop contract achieved by the historical Ford strike victory, established the CIO in Dallas. Cities such as Memphis, Birmingham, Atlanta and Norfolk, have been successfully opened up for organized labor by the CIO victories in mining, auto and steel.

Sounding the tocsin for this drive to bring industrial unionism to the white and Negro workers in the South, President Philip Murray said to the CIO delegates, "That is your job. . . Nobody else is going to do it. Yes, the slogan of the National CIO for the ensuing year is going to be one of organizing the . . . Great South. . . the great South must be organized before this convention meets next year!"

Murray further said, "Insofar as the CIO is concerned, there is not going to be anything to stand in our way of organizing the South during the current year. We have to do it, we are going to do it."

DELEGATES CITE SOUTHERN CONDITIONS

Delegate after delegate rose to his feet to support this bold slogan. And many CIO organizers, who had fought the union fight the hard way, during the past couple of years in the South, recounted tales of anti-union brutality equalled only by the labor-

smashing violence of Hitler's storm troopers.

Delegate Mitch, of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee formerly of the Mine Workers camp in Alabama, in which organizers were shot and killed where companies had their gunmen stationed at every mine in the state. He pointed out that it was the poll tax senators in Congress, representing those areas where the workers were unorganized and terrorized, who were the strongest advocates of vicious anti-labor legislation.

"When we talk about democracy," said Mitch, "we are not getting democracy here in our own country. We want democracy here . . . and we want to whip Hitler . . . but we want to whip these other Hitlers in this country . . ."

Although a start has been made, the deep South is today largely unorganized. It is still the domain of low wages, lynching, intimidation, and anti-labor terror, ruled with an iron hand by the Southern employers and landlords. As one delegate pointed out, "In the South there are millions of workers in textile, furniture, wood-working and in farm labor that have had no chance to join the fold of the CIO. We are going to be confronted with a migration of Northern industry into the South if something is not done to bring organization to those workers."

Delegate Baldanzi of the Textile Workers, pointed out, "It must be a double-barrelled campaign. We must carry the fight against the poll tax, we must carry on a fight for legislation, we must see to it our organizers are not beaten up and tarred and feathered. The workers in the South are ready for freedom, if we can provide leadership."

This delegate hit upon the kernel of the problem of organizing the South. That it is the most important organizational problem confronting the labor movement is unquestionable. But the full implications go far beyond an ordinary organizational campaign.

Any serious struggle to smash the open shop rule of the Southern land and industrial barons.



Delegates representing 5,000,000 organized industrial workers are shown in this general view, looking towards the speakers platform, of the CIO national convention held November 17-22 in Detroit.

View of CIO Convention

will inevitably lead to a clash with the whole apparatus of the United States Government, including President Roosevelt himself.

The whole apparatus of the Roosevelt administration is loaded down with labor-baiting poll tax Congressmen from Southern states; these Congressmen are in the forefront of the current campaign in Congress to shackle and manacle the labor movement, and their purpose is above all to keep the labor movement out of the South.

The Roosevelt party's firmest base is these Southern Democrats, who for years have been the most powerful force in that party's apparatus. Roosevelt has refused to push the Anti-Lynch Bill in Congress, because he has feared a revolt on the part of these poll tax Democrats, whose support is so necessary for his war program. A CIO drive in the South would mean therefore, opposition from the Roosevelt administration, in response to the demands of the Southern Congressmen and industrialists.

Added to this fact, the CIO will face in the South the same anti-labor campaign under the guise of "national defense" which has characterized every major struggle to bring bargaining rights and union conditions to war industries in the recent period.

The steel, aircraft, munitions

and ordnance industries are spreading throughout the South precisely because the big business interests seek out the sections which offer low wages, the open shop, and the protection of openly reactionary, terroristic state and municipal governmental agencies.

SOUTHERN WORKERS READY FOR DRIVE

The Southern workers are more than ready for the CIO campaign. Just as the Ford workers, who lived under the whip for so many years, answered the CIO campaign by flooding the ranks of the CIO and by conducting a brilliant militant fight for unionism, the Southern workers, Negroes and white alike, will spring into the battle for unionism at the first sign of a real campaign by the CIO.

But no half measures will succeed in the South. A fight to organize the South means a battle with the government; it means militant action to defend the very lives of the workers in the union. It means a struggle with Standard Oil, whose agents patrol the streets of Southern cities, guns in hand, ready to murder the organizers and members of the union.

The delegates to the CIO convention who unanimously voted for the Southern drive as the most important organizational task for the next year, are mistaken if they believe that Roosevelt, whose war policies the convention un-

held, will prove his "fairness" by repaying their support of his foreign policy by aiding them to organize the South. Roosevelt will act as he acted on the Anti-Lynch Bill. He will support the poll tax Congressmen, the Rockefellers and the Bourbon industrialist-landlords, and fight the CIO every inch of the way.

But the militant membership of the CIO demands that the task be done, and it is equal to the task. The Southern millions, deprived of their economic and political liberty, are equal to the task.

The most uncertain factor bearing on the ultimate success of this drive is the political tie of the CIO leadership to the Roosevelt administration and its war program. This political attitude confronts the CIO leaders with a fundamental contradiction. In the showdown fight that must ensue in any effective union organization drive in the South, they will in all likelihood meet the opposition of the government. The CIO has the choice of successfully organizing the South and smashing the greatest reservoir of open shop strength, thus facing a break with the Administration, or watering down the drive and retreating on the basis of the CIO leadership's political commitments.

(A third article in this series on the results of the CIO National Convention will appear in next week's MILITANT).

Why Did Hitler Resurrect The Anti-Comintern Pact?

By Jack Weber

Why the Pact Is Now Revived

Why did Hitler feel it necessary to bring out and polish up the Anti-Comintern Pact at this time? Most people considered that pact well buried at the time the Hitler-Stalin Pact was signed in 1939. For that reason Hitler's bid to be considered as a super-Wrangler at the moment he invaded Russia, failed completely of its purpose. Why the second staging of this poor comedy?

The most obvious reason for its resurrection has to do with the German masses and their attitude towards the war. One of the overhead expenses of dictatorship is that the masses are always taken by surprise by the sudden moves of the Fuehrers. The signing of the pact with Stalin came as such a surprise, but at least it was probably a more or less pleasant surprise in one sense, since it seemed to assure the Germans that at least there would be peace with Russia so that any war might be a short war.

The sudden invasion of the Soviet Union was again a surprise, this time a most unpleasant one, particularly in view of the fact that Germany was still at war with an unbeaten England. The initial surprise has turned into dismay and now into gloom everywhere in Germany as the masses become aware of the terrible and unending losses of men and material deep in the steppes. The renewal of the Anti-Comintern Pact was a weak attempt at keeping up morale as the prospect of the end of the war fades into the dim future. Goebbels and Hitler were trying to reassure the masses that the war might be long but the victory would surely be theirs. See! Hitler was saying to the masses, all these countries sign this pact because they believe, whether they like it or not, that we will win the war.

The German people must have felt little comfort however in seeing the new signatory powers—Finland, Denmark, Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Croatia and Nanking-China. These weighed little in their minds against the entry of the U. S. on the side of the enemy. The Nazis failed miserably in this first aim, to reassure the Germans and to present them with some concrete fruit of the much-touted "new order" in Europe.

Effect On Japan-U. S. Crisis

A second aim was to press Japan back in line and thus disrupt the Washington conference between Hull and Kuruusu. But Berlin need not credit itself with the breakdown of the attempt at compromise. That breakdown was due to the fundamental nature of the imperialist conflict. Hitler will be elated at the spread of the war to the Pacific because it will weaken the enemy in the Atlantic. But the German masses will get little comfort over the thought that this means the extension and prolongation of the war.

The pact did serve Hitler's purposes in the case of Finland. This was the Nazi method of forcing Finland to give an unequivocal negative answer to Washington and London in their attempt to have her drop out of the war. It seems likely as a result that England will declare war on Finland, as well as Rumania and Hungary, as demanded by Stalin.

It is possible that Hitler also had in mind what might happen after Litvinov arrived in Washington. He wanted to lay first claim to the Anti-Comintern Pact! For it is not impossible that the Allies will yet sign their own Anti-Comintern Pact. It seems safe to predict that Litvinov, that League of Nations advocate of democracy, is ready to make concessions on behalf of Stalin looking towards the "democratization" of the Soviet Union — after the war. Stalin seeks in this way to obtain external support for the continuance of his regime, a support that will be lacking completely inside the Soviet Union when the war ends.

Not for nothing did Roosevelt try to persuade the Catholic clergy here that Russia allowed perfect freedom of religious worship. Not for nothing did Hopkins fly to Moscow and come away "thrilled" to give the signal for a complete rehabilitation of the Kremlin dictator in the eyes of the American masses. Davies' infamous article in the American magazine fits into this same scheme of things. The Allies propose to extract political concessions for their aid, and Stalin is not unwilling.

Intervention and Intervention

Democracy — to the capitalists — is something entirely different from proletarian revolution. The Soviet Union — they say — has no business interfering in the affairs of other countries. Stalin has agreed to that, as his speeches clearly indicated. Not only his speeches, but his endorsement of the "Atlantic Charter." The Comintern, originally designed for working class intervention wherever the workers needed aid, designed then also as the instrument for rallying proletarian aid for the Soviet Union precisely in a situation such as the present one, must be publicly sacrificed. Since the Comintern under Stalin long ceased to be the instrument for the proletarian revolution, nothing real will be sacrificed by this concession.

The democracies propose in this fashion to make clear to the workers that they have no right to intervene anywhere in the present world situation — as a class. The workers may think it strange that this notice should be served at the very moment when the imperialists of all lands show how necessary it is for them to intervene in every corner of the earth — for their own interests. But there is intervention and intervention. At the least, the present situation is pregnant with political lessons for the workers.

American-Japanese War Preparations Hastened

(Continued from page 1)

and both the British and Dutch began clearing the port of their ships.

In Australia, Prime Minister John Curtin summoned an emergency meeting of the War Cabinet to discuss developments in the Far East. Sidney was described officially as "now a war station."

At Hongkong British troops were held in "an advanced state of preparedness" following a three day test of defenses. All leaves were cancelled and navy men were ordered to stand by.

From Batavia came the report that the Netherlands East Indies Army Air Force was ordered mobilized. The Dutch Java-China Japan Shipping Line announced suspension of its services to Shanghai and Japan thus cutting off direct sea communication. Thailand sent a "military representative" to Singapore to confer with the British Far Eastern High Command.

AREAS ALREADY MINED

Dispatches to the Navy Department in Washington disclosed that the sea around Vladivostok has been proclaimed a prohibited area by the Soviet government. This was understood to mean that the area has been mined.

The Japanese government has revealed that the approaches to Yokohama, Kobe, and other ports were mined. Virtually all the Japanese in Hongkong left on Dec 2 via steamer for Canton. The liner Fuji Maru sailed from the Netherlands East Indies with more than 1,000 Japanese subjects for the homeland. The Tokyo

newspaper *Asahi* asserted that the closing of Japanese consulates in the United States was imminent. A heavy flow of Japanese troops and materials into Southern Indo China was reported, with British armies in Malaya massing for action in the event of Japanese invasion of Thailand. For the first time in seven months Japanese planes bombed the Burma road. Manila reported that a Japanese fleet headed by 16 cruisers and some aircraft carriers was near British and Dutch Borneo.

"PEACEFUL INTENTIONS"

For domestic consumption in Japan, Kuruusu insisted on the peaceful intentions of the imperial Japanese government. For domestic consumption in the United States, Hull insisted on the peaceful intentions of the imperialist Roosevelt government. What was actually discussed behind the closed curtains of secret diplomacy can only be surmised. It was permitted to "leak out" to the American press that Kuruusu was insisting on the policy of Japanese expansion whereas Hull was insisting on Wall Street domination of the rich natural resources of the Far East.

The Chinese representative was "unfortunately" late at the first conference of the Allied powers in Washington because of "illness." In the opening stage of World War II, it will be recalled, the British imperialists closed the Burma road for some months and turned over a huge sum of Chinese funds to Japan in the hope of reaching a deal with the Japanese imperialists.

We may surmise that the

southward for the time being, directly across Anglo-American imperialist interests. Her relatively small reserves in face of the enormous requirements of a major war have riveted her eyes on the fabulous wealth of the East Indies. Here is oil enough for her military machine, here already developed are all the natural resources she requires for her industry. On top of this there is the prospect of easy plunder and loot, not to speak of the large stores of food supplies that could be shipped immediately to Japan to quiet the unrest at home.

Against this in the event of "Northward expansion," she must measure the notoriously severe

Siberian winter weather, the fact that a Red Army comparable in strength to her own available forces is entrenched there. The resources of Siberia are largely undeveloped, especially oil. On top of this is the calculation that Stalin will eventually be forced to withdraw the Red Army forces from Siberia to strengthen the European front. By waiting longer, Japan hopes to seize Siberia at a much lower price than would be possible at the present time.

Whichever direction of expansion Japan takes, however, one thing is clear, Wall Street's plan to utilize the Far East to hasten entry into World War II is rapidly nearing its fruition.

WITCH HUNT IN MINNESOTA

The Federal Prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO

by

GEORGE E. NOVACK

foreword by

JAMES T. FARRELL

Author of 'Studs Lonigan', etc.

- is it treasonable to oppose the war?
- has the Bill of Rights been abolished?
- what was the Minneapolis Union Defense Guard?
- how does the Administration fight the C. I. O.?
- how does the Justice Department serve Daniel J. Tobin?
- have workers the right to choose their own union?

PRICE 5 CENTS

Order bundles and individual copies from:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE

160 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK CITY

THE MILITANT
Formerly the SOCIALIST APPEAL
VOL. V—No. 49 Saturday, December 6, 1941
Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547
Editor:
FELIX MORROW
Business Manager:
LYDIA BEIDEL
Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$2.00 per year, \$1.00 for six months. Single copies: 5 cents per copy in the United States; 6 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 6 cents.
"Registered as second class matter February 13, 1941 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879."

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, but under control of the trade unions. Special officers' training camps, financed by the government but controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
2. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
3. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces and the war industries—Down with Jim Crowism everywhere.
4. A peoples' referendum on any and all wars.
5. Confiscation of all war profits. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
6. For a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
7. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

They Fear CP Ranks Will Learn The Truth

With lies and slanders, the Stalinist *Sunday Worker*, November 30, in an article, "Trotskyism Continues to Give Its Services to Hitler," seeks to misrepresent the Trotskyist program for an international revolutionary class-struggle defense of the Soviet Union as "striving to hand over the Soviet Union to Hitler."

Articles of this type are intended as a "preventive" barrage, to keep the Stalinist rank-and-file from even reading the Trotskyist press by vilifying and falsifying our program. Our analysis of the Kremlin's responsibility for the losses and defeats of the Red Army, and the resultant peril confronting the Soviet Union, provides too logical and truthful an answer to the questions that are rising insistently in the minds of thinking Stalinist workers.

The Stalinist article alleges that our press "preaches 'doom' for the Soviet Union and gives a helping hand to the fiction of the 'invincibility' of Hitler."

These flunkies of Stalin call it "preaching 'doom'" to tell the truth about the terrible plight of the Soviet Union that has resulted from Stalin's policies. They call it giving a "helping hand to Hitler," when we correctly point out that the Soviet Union can be saved only by the revolutionary action of the masses of Europe, especially of Germany, and not by reliance on Stalin's anti-Soviet imperialist allies.

Those who actually read our press know that we are not "preaching doom" for the USSR when we state that a continuation of Stalin's policy of staking the fate of the Soviet Union on aid from the democratic imperialists — who have no real interest in saving the workers' state — will lead to disaster. We are warning the workers of the greatest danger to the defense of the Soviet Union and pointing out the methods of struggle which will achieve a Soviet victory. Far from supporting the notion of Hitler's "invincibility", we keep hammering away at his vulnerability to revolutionary attack.

The *Sunday Worker* emphasizes above all that we Trotskyists seek "to block full support by the labor movement of a second military front — which could turn the tide against Hitler — by opposing any move by America to engage in military cooperation with the Soviet Union and Great Britain."

The crux of the Stalinist charge that we are "agents of Hitler" is the fact that we consistently oppose support to the imperialists in this war, and appeal instead to the workers of the world to form the only "second front" which can defeat Hitler and save the Soviet Union, the international class front of proletarian struggle.

Which party has been proved right in its analysis of the character of the aid which the British and American imperialists would give the USSR, the Socialist Workers Party or the Communist Party? For more than five months, the Soviet Union has borne the overwhelming brunt of Hitler's mili-

tary attack. What material aid have the Allied imperialists given the Soviet Union in all that time? Not even the Stalinists have dared to claim that that aid has been more than a trickle.

Material aid alone cannot save the Soviet Union, the Stalinists are compelled to admit, and the Kremlin pleads with the Allies to open a "second front". All that Churchill has done, however, is to start a relatively small-scale offensive in the North African desert, an offensive that the Stalinists nowhere dare to describe as a "genuine" second front. And Churchill has made it clear that no other "second front" is contemplated until "possibly" in 1943.

By this plea for a "second front", the Stalinists admit that the aid of outside forces is necessary to defeat the Hitler invaders. What outside forces can and will give the needed aid? Stalin continues to sow the illusion that an imperialist "western front" will be forthcoming to save the USSR. We, however, maintain that decisive aid to the Soviet Union will come only from the proletarian masses of Europe and the world, especially through a revolutionary upsurge among the peoples of Germany and the Nazi-occupied countries.

Is our program "aid to Hitler"? On the contrary, even the Stalinists have to acknowledge, in the very article distorting and slandering our program, the tremendous revolutionary ferment in the occupied countries. The Stalinists, however, propose to channelize this upsurge into a struggle for the aims of British and American imperialism. We want to fan this revolutionary spark into a flame that will drive all imperialism from the face of the earth and ensure victory for the Soviet Union and the socialist emancipation of the European masses.

It is a sufficient commentary on the wholesale falsifications in the *Sunday Worker* article that the author, Louis Budenz, does not dare to quote directly a single entire sentence, much less a paragraph, from our press. The Stalinist workers must ask themselves, why does Budenz fear to quote us; why must he resort to falsifications?

To these slanders we offer the most conclusive refutation. We invite the Stalinist workers to secure copies of the articles mentioned, but not quoted, in Budenz's article. We invite them to compare what we actually profess and write with what the Stalinist leaders falsely claim is our program. We are confident the Stalinist leadership will be unable to "answer" the questions then raised by Stalinist workers.

'Controlling' Prices

The outbreak of the war in September 1939 was the signal for the industrialists and speculators to start boosting prices in anticipation of milking unlimited profits out of the war preparations. This year, as American war production hits its stride, prices are skyrocketing in earnest.

Although strike actions have been able to secure wage increases in many industries, price rises already have wiped out, or threaten to wipe out, these increases.

Price increases thus become a constant factor in compelling the workers to strike for higher wages. Because it wants to quiet unrest, the Administration is attempting to secure some control over prices.

Moreover, in war time, when each individual capitalist or corporation scrambles for war orders and seeks to hold up the government and other manufacturers for a maximum price on war materials, unregulated prices become a serious threat to war production. Unrelieved cut-throat profiteering might reduce production to utter chaos. Industrialists are already holding up delivery of war goods to secure increased prices and profits.

For the past six months, the government has tried to establish the authority of an administrative agency empowered to fix price ceilings. This agency, the Office of Price Control Administration, has proved completely ineffective. Its decisions have been openly flouted by a united front of industrialists.

On November 28, the House approved a watered-down version of the Administration's price-control bill. This measure simply sets up another administrative agency, scarcely different in function and powers from the present one, authorized to fix prices in certain restricted fields and at certain minimum levels. These levels are so high as to guarantee the maintenance of extortionate prices. Moreover, the bill establishes a review board to which manufacturers can appeal against the decisions of the price-fixing agency.

It is generally admitted that this bill will no more be able to control prices than a pebble can halt an ocean wave.

Prices can be controlled and fixed only when production is planned and regulated. But capitalism in its very essence represents unplanned, anarchic production. A disordered price structure is a reflection of capitalism's individualistic, dog-eat-dog methods.

The only way the workers can offset the immediate worst effects of price rises is by a constant struggle for higher wages and for a rising scale of wages to meet rising prices.

In the final analysis, however, there can be no definite control of prices under capitalism. Such regulation can be effected only when the war industries are removed from the control and ownership of the monopolies to be managed instead in a planned and coordinated fashion under the control of the workers.

USSR Scores First Major Victory In Rostov Battle

(Continued from page 1)
lansk areas, admitted by the Kremlin, imperil still further Moscow's lines of communications and supply. Only three such supply routes are now actually open. Leningrad remains besieged, and the recent Nazi advance in the Tikhvin area endangers not only Leningrad itself but also Moscow, since Tikhvin is directly on the road to Volodga, the capture of which would cut a vital supply route to the capital.

ILLUMINATING ADMISSION

One of the most significant aspects of the Rostov victory is the admission by the German General Staff that the workers of the city played a crucial role in driving back the invading troops. Far from conquering the city, the invaders had entered a living inferno — the flames of the Revolution, which is still alive, were licking at their heels. It is hardly surprising that the German High Command pours out its venom at these workers; that it resorts to bestial threats of "reprisals" against the city's civilian population.

It is equally understandable why the Nazi propaganda agencies suddenly dropped this "excuse" for the retreat from Rostov, and produced a different alibi. Nothing is more dangerous to Hitler than this news that the revolutionary workers of Rostov have stripped his military machine of its myth of invincibility in which the Nazi propaganda machine has so long sought to envelop it. Once again history is reaffirming the greatest lesson of all, namely, that the key to the whole situation in the Soviet Union as in Europe, Germany and the whole world is in the hands of the workers themselves.

What is necessary to spread the victory of Red Rostov to the en-

tire front, and, above all, to Hitler's rear?

There is only one way, and that is by returning to the policy and methods of revolutionary war employed by the Soviet masses under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky in the days of the Civil War and imperialist intervention. The Red Army was victorious then because the soldiers openly fought under the banner of socialism and international solidarity; because the Soviets, representing the workers and peasants, functioned democratically behind the lines; because the revolutionary propaganda disintegrated the morale of the enemy armies.

The German High Command who have not forgotten how their Ukrainian armies of occupation were "poisoned by the virus of Bolshevism" must tremble at even the thought of a repetition of that struggle and strategy on their armies today.

Stalin's greatest crime is his rejection of this policy of revolutionary war in favor of a policy of dependence on aid from the "democratic" imperialists.

WHAT HOLDS GERMAN SOLDIERS BACK

As long as the bulk of the German army continues to believe that only another Versailles Treaty, or something far worse, is in store for them in event of defeat, they will continue to support the war. Stalin's policies enable the Nazi leaders to tell the German masses that the workers state and the British Empire are one in their war aims to crush Germany. Goebbels is able to hammer away at this point at the moment when the German generals are trying to reform the ranks of their southern armies and to bring up reinforcements. Even now as the crucial battle for Moscow continues unabated,

the main weapon of the German High Command in whipping up the spirit of the soldiers is this threat of what will happen to the German people at the hands of the imperialists if the German armies are defeated.

In this way the effect of the Rostov defeat upon the morale of the German troops is in large measure dissipated. Naturally, military defeats are bound to have repercussions, the soldiers begin to think and the seeds of doubt are planted. But only an appeal to the German workers and soldiers, pledging them solidarity and support in their struggle against Hitler and the German ruling class, pledging them aid in the struggle against "democratic" imperialists, and against another Versailles, can have the necessary explosive effect on the German masses.

STALIN SURRENDERS THIS WEAPON

Stalin has surrendered this decisive weapon in return for promises of aid from Churchill and Roosevelt. What these promises amount to were shown in Churchill's recent statement that Stalin can expect no military aid from Britain until possibly 1943. This means — as we have persistently pointed out — that the Soviet Union with its admitted shortage of tanks and aircraft, can depend only on the aid of the revolutionary masses of Germany and Europe.

With Stalin's policies and the Stalinist leadership the Rostov victory, inspiring as it is, can remain only an episode.

If the necessary steps are taken, if the policy of revolutionary war and revolutionary appeal to the European masses is adopted, the victory at Rostov could immediately be utilized for the turning point in the war.

Behind The Scenes Of "America First"

By MYRA WARD

The American First Committee was officially formed on September 19, 1940. It represented a conglomeration of congressmen, financiers, fascists, and a few "liberals". Its purpose was ostensibly opposition to an immediate war against Germany. However, as last week's article pointed out, the group lacked the elementary guiding principles necessary to conduct a real struggle against the war.

It is important that those workers and sincere liberals who support the America First Committee know what goes on "behind the scenes" of the organization. Because they fear such exposure, the leaders of the Committee maintain the strictest secrecy concerning their records, finances, etc. They are careful to avoid associations with people who are openly known as enemies to the masses of American people.

Henry Ford, for example, was suddenly dropped from the National Committee of the America First Committee, and his name was quietly erased from the letterhead of official stationery. All indications show that he thoroughly agrees with the Committee, and is one of its main financial supporters. But the name of this notorious labor-hating, reactionary industrialist was dangerous to a group which hopes to gain wide popularity among the masses.

Avery Brundage was similarly dropped because of his open pro-Nazi sympathies, and anti-Semitic views. Merwin K. Hart, another known fascist, was told by one of the leaders of America First, that an open connection would be "dangerous."

Lindbergh himself at first was considered risky because of his past friendship to the Nazis. But it was hoped that his reputation as an "American hero," and his mid-West origin would give him prestige and following.

WHO FINANCES AMERICA FIRST?

The America First Committee has a huge payroll of directors, speakers, secretaries, etc., in various parts of the United States. It maintains a sizeable mailing list, issues bulletins, prints leaflets and speeches. There are no dues or assessments; contributions are purely voluntary.

The Committee seems to obtain all its money from a small group of industrialists and financiers. Many of them belong to America's Sixty Families. All of them feel

a heavy contributor to the organization.

On the National Committee are figures such as William Regnery, Chicago multimillionaire, Clay Judson, wealthy Chicago lawyer, etc. John Cudahy, one of the leaders and speakers of the America First Committee, belongs to the family which owns the Cudahy meat-packing company.

Also in the "isolationist" camp is Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the famous Chicago Tribune, and inheritor of the McCormick reaper industrial dynasty.

The America First Committee does not publicize these and many other revealing facts because it does not dare. It hopes to gain the support of the masses of the American people, the workers and farmers. How can it reveal to these people that it receives finances and direction from millionaires, labor-hating and reactionary owners of industry, public utilities, etc.? That these capitalists are in the "isolationist" camp because a war will cut down their profits? That they are not interested in the common people, in their genuine sentiment against the war — that they will turn against the workers and farmers whenever their profits are threatened by the militancy of the common people. How can the America First Committee reveal these facts? It would collapse in a moment.

New York Mass Meeting Protesting The Minneapolis Trial
Hear
DOROTHY SCHULTZ
one of the 28 defendants
ROGER BALDWIN
Director, American Civil Liberties Union
JAMES T. FARRELL
Noted Author
GEORGE NOVACK
Secretary, Civil Rights Defense Committee
OTHER PROMINENT SPEAKERS
HOTEL DIPLOMAT
108 WEST 43rd STREET
Monday, December 15, 1941, 8 P. M.
AUSPICES—Civil Rights Defense Committee—ADMISSION 25c

The Crimes Of Stalin

By Lydia Beidel

Stalin Goes 'Left' — 1928-33

BACKGROUND:

By the end of 1927, Stalin and the Communist Parties were suffering the blows which the opportunistic course of the preceding several years had brought. To cover up his criminal mistakes, Stalin now forced a violent and extreme turn to the left, no less disastrous in its effects than the period before it.

In the USSR: Stalin's concessions to the rich peasant (*kulak*) and the small trader (*Nepman*) had enhanced the relative strength of these capitalist elements, which were menacing Soviet economy. Stalin now swung away from them and launched a program of forced collectivization against the peasantry as a whole. Trotsky, exiled to Alma-Ata, warned against the danger of this pseudo-left turn of Stalin, both for the Soviet Union and the parties of the Communist International.

In the International: Despite the opportunistic alliances formed by Stalin, he was in a position of isolation by the end of 1927. The British trade union leaders had broken from the Anglo-Russian Committee, after using it for their own purposes; Chiang Kai Shek had crushed the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese revolution.

In the capitalist world: Capitalism was plunging heading into the greatest economic crisis of its history, bringing mass unemployment, starvation and unrest to the workers and the poorest sections of the middle class.

THE "THIRD PERIOD"

The Stalinist bureaucracy abandoned for the time being the policy of collaboration with capitalist groups that had proved so ruinous in the period between 1924 and 1927, went into reverse and adopted a policy which in effect excluded united action with even working class organizations.

In July, 1928, the Sixth World Congress of the C. I. convened and its theoreticians laid the basis for the "Third Period". They discovered that the post-war era was divided into three periods, and that capitalism would never survive the "third period." According to this scheme, the first, from 1917 to 1924, was the period of capitalist collapse and the first wave of proletarian revolutions; the second, 1924 to 1929, was the period of the stabilization of capitalism; and the third, from 1927 on, the period of successful workers' revolutions.

The "Third Period" was characterized by the adoption of a series of ultra-left tactics by the parties of the C. I. and the abandonment of all alliance with non-Communist elements in the working class and peasantry. Purges in the International removed the leaders of the "Second Period," the right-wingers, the followers of Bukharin, of whom Lovestone-Gillow-Wolfe were the American representatives.

Stalin enunciated the theory which formed the basis of the "Third Period" tactics: the theory of Social-Fascism, according to which "fascism and the Social-Democracy are not antipodes, but twins." With one gesture, the Nazis and the large numbers of workers who still followed the leadership of the Second International were lumped indiscriminately together. As a matter of fact, the main blows of the Communist organizations were directed against the Social-Democratic and other workers' parties in this period, for according to the Stalinist theory, they were the main obstacle to the overthrow of capitalism.

"UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW"

The Second Congress of the C. I. under Lenin and Trotsky had developed one of the most valuable tactics in the possession of the revolutionary party, the united front — to win support of the masses still unprepared to accept revolutionary leadership.

A vulgar perversion of this tactic was now dished up by Stalin, under the name of the "united front from below." This was to operate by appealing to the Social-Democratic masses to desert their party leaders and follow the C. P. Its effect was to nullify the entire policy of the united front (intended to swing masses of organized workers into joint class action against common enemies and for common objectives) and substituted for it an exaggerated recruitment campaign employing all the wrong methods, which resulted only in repelling the worker Socialists from the Communist Parties and leaving them fully under the influence of the treacherous reformist leaders.

EFFECTS OF THE STALINIST LINE

In the USSR: By 1930, Stalin's policy of forced collectivization had driven the peasants as a class into open revolt. They refused to grow grain and the Soviet Union faced famine. In his article, "Dizzy With Success," Stalin finally called a halt, but too late to forestall the horror of mass starvation which descended on the Soviet Union in 1931-32.

In the unions: Communist workers were ordered to withdraw from the large trade unions under the control of reformist or Socialist leaders and were organized into separate "Red Trade Unions." As a result, Communist and progressives were isolated.

In the International: As economic conditions worsened internationally from 1927 to 1933, class antagonism increased and the need for real united working class action (the united front) became imperative.

In China, the Communist Party retreated to the remote provinces, there to operate without a base in the proletariat, and consequently without any real influence.

In England, America, France and the other countries where the Communist Parties existed, the membership of the parties now stood isolated and discredited, without influence among the workers.

But the false and ruinous policies of "Third Period" Stalinism, at a time when the unity of the class front in the struggle against fascism was indispensable, had succeeded only in further dividing the ranks of the working class and confusing them as to the main enemy and their main tasks.

At a time when capitalism was in the throes of its gravest crisis, the vanguard of the working class, betrayed by Stalinism and the Social Democracy, was prevented from taking advantage of its historic opportunity, and fascism was permitted to come to the rescue of the decaying social order.