

# WPA Strike Sweeps Pa.

(Continued from Page 1)  
present time the active head of the Pennsylvania Security League and has been organizing workers on WPA projects.

At a meeting of 2,500 project workers in Allentown on Wednesday night, Sam Gordon, State Organizer of the Pennsylvania Unemployed League, denounced Mr. Jones' attack against Rauschenbusch in scathing terms.

"I do not share Mr. Rauschenbusch's political views," Mr. Gordon said, "but Jones' propaganda against him is an attack against an organization of the unemployed. The Pennsylvania Unemployed League will stand shoulder to shoulder with the Pennsylvania Security League in the fight and back it up to the limit against this underhanded and slanderous attack." He indicated that the organizations represented in the Joint Action Committee would push irreconcilably for the ousting of Mr. Jones and presented a resolution to this effect, which was endorsed by the 2,500 present in a rising vote without any opposition or abstentions.

Mr. Jones' circular and Sam Gordon's resolution follow below:

**Reply of Mr. Edward N. Jones**

"So Mr. Rauschenbusch is back in town."

"Isn't he the gentleman who undertook to smear the memory of Woodrow Wilson in the recent munitions investigation, and who let J. Pierpont Morgan emerge from the inquiry with one coat of whitewash? And the same person whom the Pinchots put on the state payroll?"

"Mr. Rauschenbusch is, I understand, senior member of the firm of Rauschenbusch and Ruttenberg, whose chief and only occupation is attempting to form a third political party in Pennsylvania."

"Rauschenbusch and Ruttenberg are quite put out because I will not instruct all WPA directors to compel all relief workers to join their outfit, which when completely organized is to be transformed overnight into a third political party."

From now on until after the November election, I expect that WPA and my administration of WPA will be regularly blasted and denounced by such representatives of the Republican Old Guard and friends of the down trodden as M. Harvey Taylor, G. Mason Owlett and Gifford Pinchot, and by the firm of Rauschenbusch and Ruttenberg, promoters of a third political party in the state of Pennsylvania."

"Mr. Rauschenbusch had nothing to do with the creation of WPA, wherever 300,000 jobless and destitute men and women have been given employment in Pennsylvania."

"He had nothing to do with establishing a security wage for these workers."

"And so far as I am concerned neither Mr. Rauschenbusch nor any other political gigolo is going to capitalize or cash in on this great enterprise, the sole credit for which belongs to President Franklin D. Roosevelt."

"If Mr. Rauschenbusch is so concerned over the lot of the relief worker, as he professes to be, I would like to ask him where he was when his friend and political god-father, Gifford Pinchot, was paying relief workers—not a security wage—but an hourly wage that amounted to, even when the sun shone regularly, \$10 a month less than the lowest WPA security wage."

"You may as well take off your whiskers, Mr. Rauschenbusch. You're not fooling anyone. You're not interested in the lot of the relief workers."

"You're just a would be political boss."

**Resolution Presented by Gordon**  
Whereas Mr. Edward N. Jones, state WPA administrator, has used the WPA repeatedly as a political football against adversaries, and

Whereas: This is especially evident from a circular Mr. Jones recently had distributed on the projects; said circular attacking one of the unemployed organizations in the state, under the guise of a dispute with Mr. Stephen Rauschenbusch, and

Whereas: Mr. Jones has repeatedly displayed a vicious anti-labor attitude ever since his appointment as WPA director;

Therefore, be it: Resolved that this mass meeting of 2,500 Allentown project workers goes on record, demanding the immediate removal of Mr. Edward N. Jones from his post as WPA director.

## NEW MILITANT

with which is merged THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the New Militant Publishing Co., 55 East 11th St., N. Y. C. Phone: ALgon, 4-9058. Entered as second class mail matter at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

JAMES P. CANNON: Editor

Subscription rates: In the United States \$1.00 per year; 65c per six months; Canada and foreign \$1.50 per year; \$1.00 six months. Single copies: Two cents per copy

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1936  
Vol. 2, No. 12 (Whole No. 64)

# GT. BRITAIN REARMS

## On Land, Sea, Air British Imperialism Girds Itself for New War--While Workers Starve

By T. C.

LONDON, March 16.—(The British Government has rushed through Parliament a new plan for national defense. Claiming that certain foreign powers are rapidly increasing their armed forces. The British ruling class has no intention of being left behind. The air force is to be increased by an additional 1,750 first line aeroplanes. The navy is to be strengthened by the building of two capital ships at a cost of 8 million pounds each and the cruiser strength is to be brought up to 70 modernized ships with air carriers. Four new army battalions are to be raised and certain units are to be mechanized while a special drive is to be made for recruits for the Territorial Army (Citizens). Industry is to be organized with the collaboration of the Trade Unions so that it can be converted from a commercial to a war basis at any given moment. A Minister of Defense has been appointed who is to supervise the working of the new plan and although the cost of the scheme is not known, it is hinted that a 300 million pound loan for National Defense will be floated soon.

### 1. War in the Air

During the last great world war, London and other British cities were bombed by German Zeppelins and aeroplanes and towards the end of the war, a specially organized British air force bombarded German towns on the Rhine. These events marked the beginning of a revolution in the technique of modern warfare with the aeroplane supreme. Since then great progress has been made in the development of aerial bombing with results entirely unfavorable to the British militarists. The insular position of Britain and the scattered Empire which used to be a great advantage in time of war has now become a heavy handicap. In a war with any Continental Power, London and the great industrial centers would be an easy target for an attack by air. This is now clearly recognized—no less an authority than Sir Samuel Hoare, when Secretary of State of Air, stated that "London was, in the world, most vulnerable to an air attack, owing to its geographical situation." As to the method of attack, M. Pierre Cot, the former French Air Marshal, has explained in the columns of the "Spectator," 1934: "There are in existence incendiary bombs weighing a couple of pounds and sufficient to create a fire center. A single aeroplane can carry enough of these bombs to start in London more fire centers than there would be the possibility of coping with."

Yet another form of attack is the dropping of gas bombs as described by Lord Halsbury, a chemist of government explosives, in the Daily Telegraph, 1934: "London could be kept in a lethal atmosphere of gas up to a height of 30 feet by the discharge of 40 tons of gas." To meet this rather gloomy outlook, the Government has carried out extensive air maneuvers with searchlights, anti-aircraft guns and gas dug-outs, as well as warning local authorities to be prepared for gas drill. The results do not seem to have been favorable, however, an it now seems that there is no real defense from attacks from the air.

Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the Prime Minister, speaking in the House of Commons on November 10, 1933, declared that attack was the only means of defense in air warfare. "It is well for the man in the street to realize that there is no power on earth that can protect him from being bombed. Whatever people may tell him, the bomber will always get through. The only defense is in offensive, which means that you have got to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy if you want to save yourselves." Acting upon this dictum, the Air Defense League, a jingo propaganda body, carries on its work under the slogan: "Create a new winged army of British bombers to smash the foreign hornets in their nests." The new Defense Plan is an attempt to put these theories into practice by increasing the air force to a strength of 2,500 additional aeroplanes with additional reinforcement from civil aviation. In this way British imperialism hopes to get in the first blow.

### 2. A Naval Dilemma

Britain has always planned her faith in a large navy and, at the present time, the British fleet is probably first in the world so far as numbers are concerned, but the change in the methods of naval warfare has created a division in the ranks of the experts. In order to hold the Empire in time of war, the navy must be in a position to freely police the seas and as the food supply of Britain as well as raw materials come from the far corners of the earth. The danger from submarines and hostile aircraft needs no exaggeration.

The problem has given rise to a series of debates in the press between the old naval school and the new. The modernists swear by the seaplane and the old sea-dogs stick to the dreadnought. Thus the editor of the "Army, Navy and Air Force Gazette," in the issue for December, 1935, declares that the British government has wasted millions of pounds in building super-dreadnoughts which will be blown to smithereens by a few well-directed blows from the air or a few torpedoes from down below.

To these charges, a correspondent signing himself "Navalis" replies with the following weighty arguments: "It would require about 7,000 freight-carrying aeroplanes to transport the same amount of wheat as one tramp steamer. It follows, therefore, that the problem of feeding the country continues, and must continue, and in safeguarding the sea-transport of supplies—a naval problem. Furthermore, it is of little use for 100 squadrons to fly to the Middle East in two days if when they get there their ground staffs, armaments, repair installations, spare parts and machines, remain in England. All these things, amounting to many thousands of tons of materials can only be transported by sea."

Other writers support their case by pointing to the results of naval maneuvers where moving targets were either easily hit from the air or completely missed, according to who is telling the tale. The Government has chosen a middle course, and two dreadnoughts and seven cruisers with air-carriers has pleased neither the old school nor the new but probably the real problem will only be solved in the course of actual warfare which may not be so far distant as some people would have us believe.

### 3. Army Recruiting Revelations

It was generally thought that the prevalence of unemployment and the intensive recruiting campaigns had increased the strength of the army but the parliamentary debates have revealed an entirely different state of affairs. In the House of Commons, March 12, 1936, Mr. Duff Cooper, Secretary for War, was forced to admit that at the end of the year the Army would be 10,000 men under strength and the Territorial Army 40,000 men under strength and he argued that this was the result of an increase in employment and a higher living standard. This, of course, is a Tory joke as unemployment figures have only decreased slightly and even then mostly by government manipulation while the standard of living has remained stationary.

## Five Months of Sanctions

(Continued from Page 3)  
hind the scenes, and to strengthen the fortifications at Hongkong and Singapore. They left it to the United States Secretary of State, Stimson, to express "world indignation against the aggressor" by his blundering and meaningless "non-recognition policy."

But the Italian preparations for the conquest of Ethiopia placed both France and Great Britain in dilemma. If Italy, acting alone, won undisputed sway over Ethiopia, she would threaten the British Empire lines of communication, the headwaters of the Nile, and Egypt. On the other hand, if Ethiopia defeated the Italian legions or even resisted too strongly, there would be repercussions adverse to the British rulers among the native populations of the British colonies. Consequently, what Great Britain wanted in the Ethiopian matter was "neither peace nor war." The needed a deal—a deal which would have given Italy what Italy could not do without, but would not involve too much fighting, and would leave Ethiopia not unrestrictedly under Italian rule, but in part at least under a more "international" control—that is, a control which would not put the British lines of communication and the Nile too easily at Italy's mercy. Naturally, Great Britain was not concerned over the fate of the Ethiopians.

Great Britain, for the past year, has consistently aimed toward such an end. Through the League, an offer along these lines was made to Italy last summer—but this offer could not satisfy Mussolini's internal requirements. He needed a war. A half-way and muddled sanctions policy was adopted after the fighting started, in order to keep the dispute within an international framework. Then the Hoare-Laval proposal revived the summer plan; its announcement was premature, but it paved the way. Now, reports indicate that the Rhineland crisis will be utilized to clean up sanctions, and fix the whole Ethiopian question up in a Franco-British "tally."

Our old friend, the editor of the "Army, Navy and Air Force Gazette" let the cat out of the bag in his notes for February 1936:

"Out of 79,903 men who presented themselves for enlistment a total of 44,466 or 52 per cent had to be rejected on grounds of health. Most of these rejections would seem to point to a too low standard of living, not in the sense of an absence of luxury but of necessities and this is confirmed by the large number of under-fed. There is a deficiency of 46,773 in the Territorial Army. Like everybody else the potential recruit is convinced that war is a bad thing and the pacifists keep rubbing it in. The Government has taken measures to counter this propaganda."

The said government now intends to get down to business, and special bounties and family allowances are being dangled in front of the workers. Press, cinema and radio are to be brought into action and money prizes are offered for good recruiting suggestions by the "Daily Mail". Employers are asked to bring pressure upon their workers and if all these measures fail, then according to Lord Rothermere, "there is really nothing for it but military conscription." This is no doubt the real aim of the government which is moving cautiously.

### 4. Industry and War

In order to keep a modern war force supplied with food and arms, industry must be carried on upon a mass basis with centralized control. To accomplish this, the Defense Plan aims at negotiating a deal with certain firms not now on war work, while it is hinted that armament trusts will be asked to cooperate with a Minister for Munitions. Skilled labor is to be diluted with drafts of unemployed apprentices with the permission of the trade union officials who are said to be quite ready to strike a bargain with the Government and risk the protests of the rank and file.

During the last war, workshop committees sprang to life upon the Clyde, the Midland and in South Wales and they wrought great havoc with all such state schemes. The ruling class have not forgotten this, however, and they hope to draft their munition works away from these storm centers and also to pick their men from the ranks of the demoralized sections of the unemployed. There is no real enthusiasm for war amongst the British masses, and with catastrophe looming near, a tremendous ferment is taking place within all groups and parties. The Government will no doubt steam-roller through its plan but if war comes British capitalism will be in serious danger.

## AN ALLY!

### C.P. Supports Cardenas of Mexico; He Calls Troops Against Peasants

March 26.—President Lazaro Cardenas of Mexico today ordered all provincial governors and military commanders to take steps against attempts of landworkers to occupy large estates. The president's order followed recent seizures of land, the most notable recent case being the occupation of an estate belonging to former president Calles, the workers seizing it announcing that they would make it into a Workers' Home. They were driven off by government soldiers.

In an interview in the Daily Worker of March 24 Hernan Labrador, secretary of the Communist Party of Mexico, said:

"The position of the Communist Party of Mexico is to support the government of President Cardenas because it is a progressive, nationalistic government, because it is anti-reactionary and opposed to the penetration of imperialism, and because it is trying to support itself upon the mass of the people for the defense of the interests of the nation. This government, while fighting reaction and resisting the pressure of foreign capital, gives to the proletariat and its party, the Communist Party, liberty of action necessary for the forwarding of the Mexican national revolution to its ultimate triumph, to the liberation of the country today dominated by foreign capital, to the liquidation of the hereditary, semi-feudal land-holdings—creating these conditions necessary for the transition from a nationalistic, democratic, anti-imperialist revolution to the proletarian revolution."

of sanctions served the cause of peace and the defense of the oppressed. Imperialism has made its sacrifices, but has not gone unrewarded. Great Britain would have preferred no trouble at all. However, since trouble could not be altogether avoided, Great Britain has been able to keep strings on Italy, and has laid the basis for a settlement within an international framework which will not be too threatening to imperial interests. Meanwhile British troops have cleared up awkward resulting situations in India and Egypt (Lithvinov somehow forgot to suggest sanctions against Great Britain for its treatment of the Egyptian students and the border tribes in India). France, by throwing first oil and then political monkey wrenches into the sanctions machinery, has managed to keep friendly with Italy while at the same time not breaking with Great Britain. If she has been having certain difficulties in Syria, we must observe that she has the mission of preserving peace within her own domains as well as in Ethiopia. Lithvinov has kept in the good graces of his imperialist colleagues, built up sentiment against Germany, and secured the ratification of the Franco-Soviet Pact. If, in the affair, Soviet diplomacy has acted almost exclusively as the pawn first of British and then of French imperialism, we must remember that it is only Trotskyites and such-like counter-revolutionists who believe that the dictatorship should put its reliance on the international proletariat and the extension of the October revolution. The realists of the Kremlin know that the choice now is not between socialism and capitalism but between democratic imperialism and fascist imperialism—and that we had better take the former and like it, even if it leads next month to the latter.

Imperialism has found the policy of sanctions useful enough for one stage of its deepening game. And in that stage, the policy of sanctions has served imperialism sufficiently well. It is, after all, only the position of the international working class that the policy of sanctions has injured. And this would hardly be of central concern to the imperialists themselves or to their social-patriotic agents, who must more rapidly make ready to turn the workers over to the war machine.

But the stage in which sanctions have been useful is dropping behind. The re-militarization of the Rhineland calls for new answers to new problems. The naked bones of the entire League structure stand more rudely revealed by the gesture of the Nazi troops. France complains over England's treachery in refusing sanctions now when she forced France into them against Italy. Lithvinov indignantly protests the violation of the sanctity of treaties (alas, the morals of imperialism!). And Great Britain desperately maneuvers to maintain the precarious balance a little longer, before the clouds burst wide open.

Meanwhile, as Selden, The Times London correspondent, remarked a few days ago, Ethiopia, in the face of the new complications, like Moses in the bush, has been forgotten by all but God. In this manner has the offer

"No honest working man and woman in the Republic is today against the army and against armaments. The army deserves the best and we must arm! Let us all advance with weapons in hands against the fascists who threaten us. And we desire that there shall be as many of these weapons as possible, and that they should be the best!"

"The Minister of National Defense brought forward in the Defense Committee the program of material demands of the army administration. These demands are numerous, but they are necessary! Now if there were no profits which the big armament manufacturers pocket, then the army would have two guns instead of one which the patriotic Czechoslovakian armament factories deliver; instead of one aeroplane, two; instead of one machine-gun, two....

"Everyone: the workers, the small traders, peasants, civil servants, officials must make sacrifices for the army. They will also sacrifice their lives in war. But they want to have the guarantee that nobody pockets hundreds of millions out of their hard sacrifices."

Gottwald comments on the above quotation:

"Nobody would believe, unless he saw it with his own eyes, that such a statement could appear in a Communist paper. Nevertheless that is what appeared in the 'Rude Pravo', central organ of the Party, on November 27, 1935. The writer of the above-quoted article is obviously an alien element, hostile to the proletariat and the Party. It is true that in other statements of the Party it did not come to such frightful distortions of the class principles of the Party. But the fact that the originator of such a monstrous statement was not ruthlessly driven out of the Party as an agent of the class enemy, immediately after its appearance, shows that there was no clear, consistent bolshevist attitude in the Party to the question of the army."

What Is Monstrous?  
Now let us recapitulate. Last summer we quoted Thorez, leader of the French C. P., as saying that "it would be monstrous to consider

# Why the Czechs Had to Eat Crow

By HENRY THURMAN

In preparation for the Seventh Party Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, official Stalinism in the person of Klement Gottwald demonstratively expels the anti-Leninist deviation of the Czech party out the front door, only to immediately smuggle it in again through the rear entrance.

This public abasement is necessitated by "the fact that it (the C.P.) neglected the concrete fight for the concrete rights and demands of the people against the present regime brought them, in the eyes of the masses, dangerously near to this regime." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13.)

The foreign policy of the Stalin bureaucracy cannot be carried out in the grossly social-chauvinist manner that has distinguished it for the past eight months, because these methods do not sufficiently hoodwink the Czech masses, and enable the party to carry out its betrayal under a safely red-dipped cloak. This is what Gottwald's reprimand tells the Czechoslovakian section.

He warns that "to approve the armament policy which is being carried on by the present government and even to call for increased armaments is perfectly incorrect and impermissible from the standpoint of the workers. Nevertheless this is what happened." To put it bluntly, what is not "perfectly incorrect and impermissible" from the standpoint of the party leadership (else there would have been no mouths of trial to test its effect) has proved to be too gross a betrayal in the eyes of the class-conscious workers who must be subtly brought into line and kept there!

### Social Patriotism with a Vengeance

The mentor quotes:  
"No honest working man and woman in the Republic is today against the army and against armaments. The army deserves the best and we must arm! Let us all advance with weapons in hands against the fascists who threaten us. And we desire that there shall be as many of these weapons as possible, and that they should be the best!"

And the proposal for supporting the building of the army under a 'real people's government', mind you, is made after the forced admission that "the bourgeois army remains a bourgeois army and an instrument of oppression wielded by the bourgeoisie even when the government is a non-fascist bourgeois government, which may even include Socialists, and that therefore the working class cannot grant the means for armaments to such a government if it is not willing to betray its own class interests." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13; Daily Worker, March 6.)

Why the New Shift?  
Two factors probably explain the new shift in the party line. The first is, of course, the discontent of an unstated number of rank-and-file Czech workers, as indicated in Gottwald's text. The second is a sinister undercurrent that Moscow must have sensed even prior to Hitler's occupation of the Rhine region, the pressure being put upon France to loosen its ties and the ties of its tool, Czechoslovakia, with the Soviet Union, and move closer to the united front with Germany and her friends, against the Soviet Union. The Stalin regime, clutching after the will-o-the-wisp of status quo, fears the possibility of fascism in the nations at present allied with it, and evidently has found a too subservient policy toward them by the sections of the Comintern a guarantee that is alarmingly insufficient. As Gottwald points out, the Czechoslovakian government "did nothing whatever against the fascists and to extend democratic rights, on the contrary, it bargained and is bargaining with the fascist reaction; it went and is going still further to the right. And we have expressed confidence in this government by voting for these two budget items (Foreign Ministry and Social Welfare). What else is that but to the one's hands, to abandon an independent policy and to confuse the masses?"

The policy of the "lesser evil", which is still continued under a different form in the new "change" of line, may well prove disastrous for the future of socialism, even "or "socialism in one country."

Now let us recapitulate. Last summer we quoted Thorez, leader of the French C. P., as saying that "it would be monstrous to consider

the country of socialism, the country of the working class." We insisted on the contrary that the formulation of Thorez itself was "monstrous". (New Militant, August 10, 1935) Now Gottwald states that a formulation of position akin to that of Thorez (assuming the non-imperialist character of a nation in war purely on the basis of its alliance with the Soviet Union, without regard to the nature of the government in control) is—monstrous. But as we shall see a little further on, Gottwald is worried not about the monstrous content, but about the monstrous form in which the betrayal is put before those who must be hoodwinked. What is needed are not "frightful distortions" but distortions that can be put across in an acceptable form.

### Gottwald's Quick-Change Act

Having accomplished the public renunciation, the mentor now pulls a quick-change act, and ushers in the culprit disguised in carefully retouched falseface.

"No, the toiling people can only trust the army to a government which is a real people's government. It is, however, the present coalition government in Czechoslovakia such a government? By no means, everybody knows this!"

"Everybody knows"; "in the eyes of the masses"; "from the standpoint of the workers"; "nobody would believe"; "obviously an alien element"; "great confusion in the minds of many workers"; these phrases are the touchstones of the present revision of the party's attitude, and show clearly to those who are alert how the Stalinist Party turns its eyes to the masses—to mislead them better!

And the proposal for supporting the building of the army under a 'real people's government', mind you, is made after the forced admission that "the bourgeois army remains a bourgeois army and an instrument of oppression wielded by the bourgeoisie even when the government is a non-fascist bourgeois government, which may even include Socialists, and that therefore the working class cannot grant the means for armaments to such a government if it is not willing to betray its own class interests." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13; Daily Worker, March 6.)

Why the New Shift?  
Two factors probably explain the new shift in the party line. The first is, of course, the discontent of an unstated number of rank-and-file Czech workers, as indicated in Gottwald's text. The second is a sinister undercurrent that Moscow must have sensed even prior to Hitler's occupation of the Rhine region, the pressure being put upon France to loosen its ties and the ties of its tool, Czechoslovakia, with the Soviet Union, and move closer to the united front with Germany and her friends, against the Soviet Union. The Stalin regime, clutching after the will-o-the-wisp of status quo, fears the possibility of fascism in the nations at present allied with it, and evidently has found a too subservient policy toward them by the sections of the Comintern a guarantee that is alarmingly insufficient. As Gottwald points out, the Czechoslovakian government "did nothing whatever against the fascists and to extend democratic rights, on the contrary, it bargained and is bargaining with the fascist reaction; it went and is going still further to the right. And we have expressed confidence in this government by voting for these two budget items (Foreign Ministry and Social Welfare). What else is that but to the one's hands, to abandon an independent policy and to confuse the masses?"

The policy of the "lesser evil", which is still continued under a different form in the new "change" of line, may well prove disastrous for the future of socialism, even "or "socialism in one country."

Now let us recapitulate. Last summer we quoted Thorez, leader of the French C. P., as saying that "it would be monstrous to consider

the country of socialism, the country of the working class." We insisted on the contrary that the formulation of Thorez itself was "monstrous". (New Militant, August 10, 1935) Now Gottwald states that a formulation of position akin to that of Thorez (assuming the non-imperialist character of a nation in war purely on the basis of its alliance with the Soviet Union, without regard to the nature of the government in control) is—monstrous. But as we shall see a little further on, Gottwald is worried not about the monstrous content, but about the monstrous form in which the betrayal is put before those who must be hoodwinked. What is needed are not "frightful distortions" but distortions that can be put across in an acceptable form.

Gottwald's Quick-Change Act  
Having accomplished the public renunciation, the mentor now pulls a quick-change act, and ushers in the culprit disguised in carefully retouched falseface.

"No, the toiling people can only trust the army to a government which is a real people's government. It is, however, the present coalition government in Czechoslovakia such a government? By no means, everybody knows this!"

"Everybody knows"; "in the eyes of the masses"; "from the standpoint of the workers"; "nobody would believe"; "obviously an alien element"; "great confusion in the minds of many workers"; these phrases are the touchstones of the present revision of the party's attitude, and show clearly to those who are alert how the Stalinist Party turns its eyes to the masses—to mislead them better!

And the proposal for supporting the building of the army under a 'real people's government', mind you, is made after the forced admission that "the bourgeois army remains a bourgeois army and an instrument of oppression wielded by the bourgeoisie even when the government is a non-fascist bourgeois government, which may even include Socialists, and that therefore the working class cannot grant the means for armaments to such a government if it is not willing to betray its own class interests." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13; Daily Worker, March 6.)

Why the New Shift?  
Two factors probably explain the new shift in the party line. The first is, of course, the discontent of an unstated number of rank-and-file Czech workers, as indicated in Gottwald's text. The second is a sinister undercurrent that Moscow must have sensed even prior to Hitler's occupation of the Rhine region, the pressure being put upon France to loosen its ties and the ties of its tool, Czechoslovakia, with the Soviet Union, and move closer to the united front with Germany and her friends, against the Soviet Union. The Stalin regime, clutching after the will-o-the-wisp of status quo, fears the possibility of fascism in the nations at present allied with it, and evidently has found a too subservient policy toward them by the sections of the Comintern a guarantee that is alarmingly insufficient. As Gottwald points out, the Czechoslovakian government "did nothing whatever against the fascists and to extend democratic rights, on the contrary, it bargained and is bargaining with the fascist reaction; it went and is going still further to the right. And we have expressed confidence in this government by voting for these two budget items (Foreign Ministry and Social Welfare). What else is that but to the one's hands, to abandon an independent policy and to confuse the masses?"

The policy of the "lesser evil", which is still continued under a different form in the new "change" of line, may well prove disastrous for the future of socialism, even "or "socialism in one country."

Now let us recapitulate. Last summer we quoted Thorez, leader of the French C. P., as saying that "it would be monstrous to consider

the country of socialism, the country of the working class." We insisted on the contrary that the formulation of Thorez itself was "monstrous". (New Militant, August 10, 1935) Now Gottwald states that a formulation of position akin to that of Thorez (assuming the non-imperialist character of a nation in war purely on the basis of its alliance with the Soviet Union, without regard to the nature of the government in control) is—monstrous. But as we shall see a little further on, Gottwald is worried not about the monstrous content, but about the monstrous form in which the betrayal is put before those who must be hoodwinked. What is needed are not "frightful distortions" but distortions that can be put across in an acceptable form.

Gottwald's Quick-Change Act  
Having accomplished the public renunciation, the mentor now pulls a quick-change act, and ushers in the culprit disguised in carefully retouched falseface.

"No, the toiling people can only trust the army to a government which is a real people's government. It is, however, the present coalition government in Czechoslovakia such a government? By no means, everybody knows this!"

"Everybody knows"; "in the eyes of the masses"; "from the standpoint of the workers"; "nobody would believe"; "obviously an alien element"; "great confusion in the minds of many workers"; these phrases are the touchstones of the present revision of the party's attitude, and show clearly to those who are alert how the Stalinist Party turns its eyes to the masses—to mislead them better!

And the proposal for supporting the building of the army under a 'real people's government', mind you, is made after the forced admission that "the bourgeois army remains a bourgeois army and an instrument of oppression wielded by the bourgeoisie even when the government is a non-fascist bourgeois government, which may even include Socialists, and that therefore the working class cannot grant the means for armaments to such a government if it is not willing to betray its own class interests." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13; Daily Worker, March 6.)

Why the New Shift?  
Two factors probably explain the new shift in the party line. The first is, of course, the discontent of an unstated number of rank-and-file Czech workers, as indicated in Gottwald's text. The second is a sinister undercurrent that Moscow must have sensed even prior to Hitler's occupation of the Rhine region, the pressure being put upon France to loosen its ties and the ties of its tool, Czechoslovakia, with the Soviet Union, and move closer to the united front with Germany and her friends, against the Soviet Union. The Stalin regime, clutching after the will-o-the-wisp of status quo, fears the possibility of fascism in the nations at present allied with it, and evidently has found a too subservient policy toward them by the sections of the Comintern a guarantee that is alarmingly insufficient. As Gottwald points out, the Czechoslovakian government "did nothing whatever against the fascists and to extend democratic rights, on the contrary, it bargained and is bargaining with the fascist reaction; it went and is going still further to the right. And we have expressed confidence in this government by voting for these two budget items (Foreign Ministry and Social Welfare). What else is that but to the one's hands, to abandon an independent policy and to confuse the masses?"

The policy of the "lesser evil", which is still continued under a different form in the new "change" of line, may well prove disastrous for the future of socialism, even "or "socialism in one country."

Now let us recapitulate. Last summer we quoted Thorez, leader of the French C. P., as saying that "it would be monstrous to consider

the country of socialism, the country of the working class." We insisted on the contrary that the formulation of Thorez itself was "monstrous". (New Militant, August 10, 1935) Now Gottwald states that a formulation of position akin to that of Thorez (assuming the non-imperialist character of a nation in war purely on the basis of its alliance with the Soviet Union, without regard to the nature of the government in control) is—monstrous. But as we shall see a little further on, Gottwald is worried not about the monstrous content, but about the monstrous form in which the betrayal is put before those who must be hoodwinked. What is needed are not "frightful distortions" but distortions that can be put across in an acceptable form.

Gottwald's Quick-Change Act  
Having accomplished the public renunciation, the mentor now pulls a quick-change act, and ushers in the culprit disguised in carefully retouched falseface.

"No, the toiling people can only trust the army to a government which is a real people's government. It is, however, the present coalition government in Czechoslovakia such a government? By no means, everybody knows this!"

"Everybody knows"; "in the eyes of the masses"; "from the standpoint of the workers"; "nobody would believe"; "obviously an alien element"; "great confusion in the minds of many workers"; these phrases are the touchstones of the present revision of the party's attitude, and show clearly to those who are alert how the Stalinist Party turns its eyes to the masses—to mislead them better!

And the proposal for supporting the building of the army under a 'real people's government', mind you, is made after the forced admission that "the bourgeois army remains a bourgeois army and an instrument of oppression wielded by the bourgeoisie even when the government is a non-fascist bourgeois government, which may even include Socialists, and that therefore the working class cannot grant the means for armaments to such a government if it is not willing to betray its own class interests." (Rude Pravo, Feb. 13; Daily Worker, March 6.)

Why the New Shift?  
Two factors probably explain the new shift in the party line. The